Horizon Award Recipient Perceptions of the Importance of Cooperating Teacher's Characteristics and the Frequency the Cooperating Teacher Exhibited Each Characteristic

Lana M. Gerber
B.A., Avila University, 1993
M.S., Mid America Nazarene University, 1998

Submitted to the Graduate Department and Faculty of the School of Education of Baker University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership

Susan K. Rogers
Susan Rogers, Ph.D.
Major Advisor

Verneda Edwards
Verneda Edwards, Ed.D.

Christy Ziegler
Christy Ziegler, Ph.D.

Date Defended: December 3, 2018

Abstract

The first purpose of this study was to determine Horizon Award recipient perceptions of the importance of cooperating teacher's characteristics: personal attributes, professionalism, teaching/instruction, and cooperating teacher/student teacher relationships and the frequency the cooperating teacher exhibited each of the characteristics. The second purpose of the study was to determine the extent there is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of each of the cooperating teachers' characteristics and perceptions of the frequency cooperating teachers exhibited the characteristics. The sample included all Horizon Award recipients with current active email accounts included in the Kansas Department of Education (KSDE) 2003-2018 Kansas Exemplary Educator Network. Specifically, the findings indicated all personal attributes to be important or very important and showed cooperating teachers exhibiting all personal attributes often or always. The findings provided evidence for a moderately strong positive relationship between the Award recipients perceptions of the importance of two of their cooperating teachers' personal attributes and the Award recipients perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited each of those two attributes (having a sense of humor and being trustworthy). The results indicated all professional characteristics as being important or very important and indicated that cooperating teachers exhibited the professional characteristics often or always. The findings provided evidence for a moderately strong positive relationship between the importance of and the frequency the cooperating teacher exhibited each of the following professionalism characteristics: loving their jobs, knowledge of school policy, establishing positive community relations, and being

recognized by other teachers and administrators as a good faculty member at their school. The findings indicated the importance of all instruction characteristics as being important or very important and indicated that the Award recipients cooperating teachers exhibited all the instructional characteristics often or always. The results of the data analysis provided evidence of the relationship between the importance and frequency exhibited as moderately strong for all the teaching and instruction characteristics. The results of the data analysis indicated the relationship between the importance of the characteristic as perceived by the award winner and the frequency the award recipients cooperating teacher exhibited the characteristic as moderately strong for 10 of the 14 relationship characteristics. Having a list of perceived characteristics of effective cooperating teachers, district and university leaders can utilize the characteristics to set clear guidelines for the selection of effective cooperating teachers. Once those cooperating teachers are paired with student teachers, the university and district can provide professional development based on the results of this study with the purpose of making them aware of and discuss award recipients' perceptions of characteristics of effective cooperating teachers. Future research can now focus on the perspectives of other stakeholders.

Dedication

I dedicate this dissertation to my family, friends, and colleagues who have supported me throughout my career and life. My most sincere gratitude goes out to my daughters, Sydnie, Rylie, and Madalyn. My dear nieces, Ellen and Emma, and nephew, Jack, have also been supportive and understanding in this time-consuming process. Thank you for your unconditional love and support over the years. I have spent many hours, weekends, and evenings preoccupied and away writing, doing homework, completing projects, or attending night class. This journey we have taken together has taught me the value of hard work, perseverance, loyalty, and dedication. I not only have earned this honorable degree, but I also have a new-found resilience and love for time with family and friends and simply reading something just for the joy of reading. I value each of you, and my life is richer each day because you are part of it. I hope my children, nieces, and nephew, grandchildren, and great nieces and nephews are blessed as I have been with amazing teachers and mentors in their lives that motivate them to love learning and life. I love you more, stronger, and no doubt longer.

I set out on this journey eight years ago, and in that time my life has had many turns and adventures. The constants amidst all the change are the amazing people in my life. I began my teaching career in Turner in the early 1990s with a unique group of educators whom we call the OakGrovies. Lachelle, Marcia, Pam, and Linda I owe you many hours of leisure and laughs to make up for the hours missed. I want to thank this powerhouse team of strong women I am proud to claim as family. My work families in Gardner Edgerton, Blue Valley, and Turner have been invaluable in the amount of support, laughs, motivation, and unconditional friendships. Together we change lives,

and collectively you all have changed mine. Thank you for showing up and going above and beyond what is expected in your professional and personal lives. You make a difference.

Above all, I thank my biggest fan and cheerleader, my mother who has taught me to love God, others, this amazing gift of life, and appreciate the grace we are given. Your guidance and love have been the glue and fuel to keep our family moving ahead through the toughest of times. Stevie, Brady, and I hit the jackpot with you. On the days I wanted to quit I would think of you or give you a call, and you would be at the door with a Sonic drink and a hug. You make life brighter in every aspect. I love you!

Acknowledgements

After eight years, I am finally writing this note of thanks as I place the finishing touches on my dissertation. This process has been one of intense learning on a professional and personal level. Writing this dissertation has had a profound impact on my life. I would like to express my thanks and gratitude to the people who have supported and guided me throughout this time in my life. First, I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Susan Rogers, for setting high expectations and providing me with the tools needed to complete my research and writing while also allowing me to be human. Likewise, I must acknowledge Dr. Peg Waterman for also supporting my research through her expertise and feedback. Whether it was an email, text message, or Zoom meeting, you were both so giving of your time, patience, and expertise. I want to thank Dr. Edwards for serving on my committee. A great deal of thanks to Dr. Christy Ziegler for her time in serving on my dissertation committee and being a cheerleader while providing me with valuable feedback and forever friendship. Finally, I would like to thank my colleagues and friends for being master collaborators and always lending an ear or shoulder with hugs and words of encouragement.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1

Introduction

In the United States, traditional teacher education programs require university pre-service teachers seeking a degree in Pre-Kindergarten-12 (PK-12) education to complete one or two semesters in an internship (student teaching). Student teaching serves as the real-world classroom trial (Pomerance, Greenberg, & Walsh, 2016). During this time, the pre-service teachers are under the direct supervision of a practicing educator certified in their field of study (cooperating teacher). Harlin, Edwards, and Briers (2002) argued that student teaching is one of the most important aspects of the certification process and plays a key role in forming the pre-service teachers' attitudes and perceptions about expectations of their performance as future teachers. Pomerance et al. (2016) indicated that "on an annual basis, approximately 190,000 teacher candidates graduate from the 1,400 colleges universities offering traditional teacher prep programs nationwide" (p. 29).

Human resource directors of local education agencies, i.e., school districts, have found that student teaching involves the placement of a pre-service student in a school setting and the assignment of the pre-service student to a cooperating teacher (Greenberg et al., 2014). University supervisors are responsible for the initial placement of pre-service teachers by collaborating with school districts in the proximity of the university or pre-service teacher's home address. Universities set specific criteria for selecting cooperating teachers based on matching pre-service student degree area with a highly-qualified teacher in the same degree area. Final pre-service teacher placements are often made by school district leaders or building principals by identifying a qualified teacher

and matching them with the pre-service teacher, with little direction from the university supervisor.

During student teaching, the pre-service student is observed and evaluated on their ability to set up, operate, manage, and instruct students effectively and successfully. When student teaching, pre-service teachers "synthesize everything they have learned about collecting or developing instructional materials, teaching a lesson, guiding small-group activities, establishing and maintaining classroom" management and organization (Greenberg et al., 2014, p. 1) and interacting with colleagues, parents, and students. Ultimately, the experiences and evaluation during the student teaching internship determine if the pre-service teacher is recommended for licensure. The cooperating teacher mentors, models, and assesses the pre-service teacher in this process with the guidance of the university supervisor.

The student teacher's experiences, coupled with formal coursework, are expected to prepare them for employment. Student teaching shapes the pre-service student's expectations for their performance as teachers; an adverse or negative student teaching experience can never be undone. "The stakes in student teaching are high: Teacher candidates have only one chance to experience the best possible placement" (Greenberg et al., 2014, p. 1). University supervisors and district leaders must identify the most effective cooperating teachers when pairing pre-service candidates for student teaching.

Background

Public education in the State of Kansas is governed by the Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) and organized into school districts identified by a unified school district (USD) number. In 2017, the state of Kansas reported an

approximate PK-12 public school enrollment of 491,000 students, in 286 USDs with individual enrollment ranging from 70 to 50,000 students. Of those 491,000 students, approximately 64% (*n* = 315,000) identified as White, 7% (*n* = 34,000) Black, 20% (*n* = 97,000) Hispanic, 1% (*n* = 4,500) Native American/Alaskan Native, 3% (*n* = 15,000) Asian, and 5% (*n* = 25,500) Multi-Ethnic. The 2017 KSDE report estimated the following demographics for students: 30% (*n* = 148,000) students qualified for free and reduced-priced lunches, and 14% (*n* = 70,000) students qualified for special education services. In 2017, approximately 42,000 licensed employees worked in Kansas public education (KSDE, 2018).

Since 2003, the State of Kansas has recognized exemplary first-year teachers with the Kansas Cable Telecommunications Horizon Award (Kansas Horizon Award). Per KSDE (2016), the Kansas Horizon Award is sponsored by the KSDE. The mission of the Kansas Horizon Award program is to "recognize exemplary first-year teachers who perform in a way that distinguished them as outstanding" (KSDE, 2018, p. 4). Each school district in the State of Kansas can nominate one elementary and one secondary classroom teacher each year that results in 32 award recipients annually. Since the program's inception, there have been 512 award recipients. To be nominated a teacher must have been teaching full time, responsible for grading, assessing, planning lessons, conferencing with parents, taking attendance, disciplining students, and performing daily functions in a classroom. Nominations are made without regard to age, sex, race, or religion (KSDE, 2016). The superintendent and building principal select qualified nominees identified to have performed in a way distinguishing them apart from other first-year teachers.

Statement of the Problem

The annual results from surveys administered by the National Center for Teacher Quality (NCTQ), to "new teachers suggest that student teaching is the most important part of their teacher training experience" (NCTQ, 2011, p. 1). One challenge often faced by district leaders and building principals is how to efficiently select and recruit the most effective and qualified cooperating teachers. Before educational leaders can select and retain the best cooperating teachers for pre-service teachers, they must know the characteristics needed to identify an effective and qualified cooperating teacher. The demand for highly qualified teachers is greater now than ever before (Sutcher, Darling-Hammond, & Carver Thomas, 2016), and the educational leaders responsible for selecting cooperating teachers do not readily understand nor know the specific characteristics of effective cooperating teachers and to which extent the characteristics are perceived as important by pre-service teachers. This lack of knowledge has the possibility of causing the cooperating teacher selection process to be less effective. According to Rickenbrode, Drake, Pomerance, & Walsh, (2018) approximately 6% of alternate route and graduate programs include the two essential components that are attributed to effective student teaching experiences: "checking the quality of the cooperating teachers who open their classrooms to student teachers, and providing frequent feedback to student teachers" (p. 2).

University supervisors, district leaders, and building principals are responsible for establishing the criteria for selecting and recruiting cooperating teachers. Universities lack consistency in placement of pre-service teachers with cooperating teachers (Greenberg et al. 2014; Zeichner, 2006). Direction or guidelines given to district-level

leadership vary depending on the university requesting placement (D. Marx, personal communication, April 12, 2017). General universal guidelines require cooperating teachers to have taught three or more years in the profession, at the time of selection, and be in a teaching position of the same subject as the endorsement being sought by the pre-service student (Wilson, & Floden, 2003). Because the cooperating teacher plays a critical role in the success of the pre-service teachers' student teaching experience, it is important to select the most qualified cooperating teachers.

Purpose of the Study

Student teaching is structured to provide an opportunity for the pre-service teacher to learn with a cooperating teacher in the field with the purpose of preparing to become an effective and independent teacher. The first purpose of this study was to determine Horizon Award recipient perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teacher's characteristics (personal attributes, professionalism, teaching/instruction, and cooperating teacher/student teacher relationship) and the frequency their cooperating teacher exhibited each characteristic. The second purpose of the study was to determine the extent there is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers' characteristics and perceptions of the frequency cooperating teachers exhibited each characteristic.

Significance of the Study

Information gained from this study could provide some insight into the effective characteristics that successful first-year teachers perceive as important for cooperating teachers to have and exhibit. Once effective characteristics are identified, they could be aligned to assist university, district, and school leaders in placing pre-service teachers in

the most compatible and competent student teaching assignments. Being assigned an effective cooperating teacher should not be a gamble (Killian & Wilkins, 2009). According to Osunde (1996) student teachers' perceptions of cooperating teachers could provide university programs and school administration additional insight by identifying behaviors and practices of effective cooperating teachers and in turn assist in identifying and assigning the most effective cooperating teachers with pre-service teachers.

Knowing the characteristics and behaviors of effective cooperating teachers could also provide content knowledge and training for cooperating teachers. Cooperating teachers should be expert veterans with the ability to provide adequate expertise and oversight (Darling-Hammond & Baratz-Snowden, 2005). Universities and school districts could use this information to train or provide professional development to mentors and cooperating teachers prior to placing pre-service teachers in their classrooms.

Delimitations

Per Lunenburg and Irby (2008), delimitations "are self-imposed boundaries set by the researcher on the purpose and scope of the study" (p. 134). The participants in this study were intentionally limited to the Horizon Award recipients from 2003 to 2018 and were not randomly selected, prohibiting generalizations beyond the Horizon Award recipients. An online survey adapted from Epps (2010) was used to address Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teacher's characteristics (personal attributes, professionalism, teaching/instruction, and cooperating teacher/student teacher relationship) and how often those characteristics were exhibited.

Assumptions

Leedy and Ormrod (2010) asserted that "assumptions are so basic that, without them, the problem itself could not exist" (p. 62). Two assumptions were identified in this study. First, the list of Horizon Award recipients from the KSDE was current and accurate. Next, participants completed the survey independently, without seeking support from outside influences, resources, or materials.

Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to identify characteristics that Horizon Award recipients perceive as important and effective characteristics for a cooperating teacher to exhibit. The specific research questions addressed in this study were:

RQ1. What are the perceptions of Horizon Award recipients regarding the importance of personal attributes of their cooperating teachers?

RQ2. What are the perceptions of Horizon Award recipients regarding the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited the personal attributes?

RQ3. To what extent is there a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers' personal attributes and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited the personal attributes?

RQ4. What are the perceptions of Horizon Award recipients regarding the importance of the professionalism of their cooperating teachers?

RQ5. What are the perceptions of Horizon Award recipients regarding the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited professionalism?

RQ6. To what extent is there a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers' professionalism and their perceptions of the frequency cooperating teachers exhibited professionalism?

RQ7. What are the perceptions of Horizon Award recipients regarding the importance of the instruction characteristics of their cooperating teachers?

RQ8. What are the perceptions of Horizon Award recipients regarding the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited the instructional characteristics?

RQ9. To what extent is there a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of the instruction characteristics of their cooperating teachers and the perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited the instruction characteristics?

RQ10. What are the perceptions of Horizon Award recipients regarding the importance of the cooperating teacher/student teacher relationship?

RQ11. What are the perceptions of Horizon Award recipients regarding the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited the cooperating teacher/student teacher relationship characteristics?

RQ12. To what extent is there a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of the cooperating teacher/student teacher relationship and perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited the cooperating teacher/student teacher relationship characteristics?

Definition of Terms

According to Lundenburg and Irby (2008), key terms used throughout the study should be clarified and consistently used or referenced in the dissertation. The following terms are used throughout this study:

Cooperating teacher. Henry and Weber (2010) defined a cooperating teacher as an educator selected to oversee pre-service teachers who are training to teach and working toward earning a teaching license. The supervisor or mentor assigned by the public school to oversee the pre-service teacher is referred to as the cooperating teacher.

Horizon Award recipient. KSDE (2016) indicated that a Horizon Award recipient is a second year teacher in the state of Kansas selected by a superintendent and building principal identified to have performed in a way distinguishing them apart from other first-year teachers and have been a full-time teacher, responsible for grading, assessing, planning lessons, conferencing with parents, taking attendance, disciplining students and other daily functions in a classroom.

Pre-service teacher. NCATE (2008) defined a pre-service teacher, also referred to as a teacher candidate, as a student enrolled in an education program actively being trained to be a teacher. The college student is referred to as a pre-service teacher.

Student teaching. Henry and Weber (2010) referred to student teaching as the full-time clinical field experience in a public-school system varying from one semester to a year in length; this is usually the last requirement for a pre-service teacher before teacher certification. For this study student teaching occurred at the end of the formal education program lasting one or two semesters.

University supervisor. Henry and Weber (2010) defined the university supervisor as an employee of the college or university who works with the pre-service teacher and cooperating teacher to oversee the student teaching experience.

Organization of the Study

This study is organized into five chapters. Chapter 1 included the background, statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, the significance of the study, delimitations, assumptions, research questions, the definition of terms, and the organization of the study. The second chapter is a review of the literature, which is comprised of the history of teacher education in America, best practices in student teaching, and effective characteristics of cooperating teachers. Chapter 3 includes a description of the research design, selection of participants, measurement, data collection procedures, data analysis and hypothesis testing, and limitations. Provided in Chapter 4 are the descriptive statistics and the results of the data analysis and hypothesis testing. Finally, Chapter 5 provides a study summary, the findings related to the literature, and the conclusions.

Chapter 2

Review of the Literature

The first purpose of this study was to determine Horizon Award recipient perceptions of the importance of cooperating teacher's characteristics (personal attributes, professionalism, teaching/instruction, and cooperating teacher/student teacher relationship) and perceptions of the frequency the cooperating teacher exhibited each characteristic. The second purpose of the study was to determine the extent there was a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of cooperating teachers' characteristics and perceptions of the frequency cooperating teachers exhibited characteristics. This chapter is organized into three sections with a review of the literature for each: history of teacher education in America, best practices in student teaching, and effective characteristics of cooperating teachers.

History of Teacher Education in America

Many early schools were privately managed by local churches (Hamburger, 2002). In the late 1700s and early 1800s, town commissioners, board members, or clergy administered oral examinations to prospective teachers with a focus on personal character and skills ensuring the teacher knew more than the students. Later in the mid to late 1800s, education officials began to regulate written examinations and issue certificates upon passing.

In America during the early 1800s, teaching was a respected occupation, and the responsibility of teacher training was left to the community with local control. Due to the religious influence of the era, clergy often filled the role of training, selection, and educating teachers. In the early 19th century to become a teacher, a person simply "had to

persuade local school boards of their moral character and pass a test of their basic knowledge" (Ravitch, 2003, p. 1). It was not until 1834 that higher standards emerged when Pennsylvania became the first state requiring "future teachers to pass a test of reading, writing, and arithmetic" (Ravitch, 2003, p. 1).

The common school was born in the mid-1800s. During the 19th century, the populations of cities grew significantly forming city school systems. City or urban school systems required more teachers and one lead teacher to supervise the teachers and instruction. Supervision of teachers and teacher education became more complex and defined focusing on instruction and common standards. Supervision and teacher education were the first steps to what we know today as teacher training and supervision (Marzano, Frontier, & Livingston 2011).

In 1837, Horace Mann signed the act creating the Massachusetts State Board of Education and later that year accepted the position of Secretary of the State Board of Education (Hinsdale, 1898). In 1839, the first two-year state-funded public normal school was founded in Lexington, Massachusetts. Normal schools were common for training primary school teachers and provided a norm for all teachers that would assure a level of quality in providing common curriculum in "writing, grammar, arithmetic, and geography" (Reese, 2011, p. 30). Between 1839 and 1910, most of the 48 states had established state-funded normal schools in operation (Reese, 2011).

In 1843, New York was the first state to authorize or require a written examination and issue certificates that were valid statewide. Indiana and Pennsylvania followed in the early 1850s. By the end of the 1800s, 28 states required a diploma from a normal school or examination to be certified to teach (Angus, 2001). Throughout the

nineteenth century, the community was in control of the selection and certification of teachers.

"In 1852, a little more than 200 years after passing the first compulsory education law, Massachusetts required parents to send their children to a public school in their city or town" for at least twelve weeks, if the public schools of such city or town so continue, six weeks of which shall be consecutive (Katz, 1974, p. 17). At that time, there was a significant increase of poor immigrant families entering the United States. The intended outcome of compulsory attendance was to instill and teach the values of the church and to ensure children of poor immigrants were taught obedience and restraint to create competent workers who could contribute to the social good. There were also concerns over child labor and the possible exploitation of children as the number of working immigrants increased. The compulsory attendance law was intended to limit child labor. However, many states with large textile production plants were reluctant to pass this law, "Mississippi was the last state to pass the law in 1917" (Katz, 1974, p. 61).

During the reconstruction era, school attendance rates in the United States grew substantially between 1870 and 1915, and the landscape of education in the United States changed (Lingwall, 2014). The National Education Association (NEA), established in 1865, expanded its membership to become a strong influence supporting equalizing pay and clear regulations for teachers. In 1906, state departments of education assumed responsibility for the preparation of teachers and administrators and in 1920, the normal school extended to 4-year colleges (Sniegoski, 1988).

The beginning of the twentieth century propelled public education reform with the restructuring of normal schools and adding compulsory attendance laws. Many systemic

changes occurred with the passage of federal legislation, e.g., Plessy v. Ferguson and the implementation of agencies elevating the profession of educators, i.e., the NEA. In fact, at the beginning of the twentieth-century, teacher training and certification brought about many changes enhancing teacher training course content to include both academic and pedagogical subject being taught by skilled educational professionals. In the mid-1900s, institutions began to develop graduate programs such as "school administration, educational psychology, educational sociology, and curriculum. Experts and professionals sought to create an education profession, which had its own preparation programs and its own technical language" (Ravitch, 2003).

In 1930, the American Council on Education established a National Teacher's Examination (NTE) (Ravitch, 2007). NTE was first administered in 1940 by the American Council on Education. The NTE was a nationally standardized secure test that provided comparisons of candidates, intended to be administered to college seniors completing a teacher education program. The exam was created to determine competence in the specific area of focus. "The NTE consist of the Common Examinations, which offer subtests in Professional Education and General Education, and the Teaching Area Examinations which measure understanding of subject matter and methods in 24 areas" (Quirk, Written, & Weinberg, 1972, p. 2). The exam was not intended to measure "teacher aptitude, interests, attitudes, motivation, maturity, personal social characteristics, or to be a measure of classroom performance" (Quirk et al., 1972, p. 3). In 1950, Educational Testing Service (ETS) in Princeton, New Jersey assumed responsibility for the preparation, administration, and scoring of the NTE (Quirk et al., 1972). Every state has set licensure requirements for public school teachers that

necessitate education and nationally normed examination requirements: a minimum of a bachelor' degree in education for elementary certification and bachelor's degree in a specific subject area for high school certification (Wilson, 1986).

The NTE is now called the Praxis exam and continues to be administered by the ETS. The Praxis exam consists of Praxis I: Pre-Professional Skills, the assessment of basic skills in reading, writing, and mathematics, primarily used as an entry requirement for teacher education programs and taken as an undergraduate. Additionally, the exam contains the Praxis II: Subject–Area Assessments, several content knowledge tests, primarily an exit requirement and is taken at the end of student teaching. Most states require both Praxis I and Praxis II as a teacher certification requirement. There are no passing or failing scores set, rather each state's department of education and its state board of education establishes a cut score that is permitted for licensure. For example, a candidate could earn a score on the Ohio Basic Education Skill test but to teach in Kansas a teacher candidate would need to pass the Kansas basic skill test (Roth & Swail, 2000).

The advent of the United States' involvement in World War II changed the momentum of public education in America. As the war continued, there was a teacher shortage. Funding for education was scarce; teacher availability dropped dramatically causing an increase in the number of emergency certificates issued. The political focus and financial state of the country due to the war motivated students and teachers to learn more about the war, taking a new-found pride in patriotism (Giordano, 2004). As the war ended, teachers' salaries were so low that there was roll back in certification requirements. However, the federal government was keen to realize the importance of rebuilding American society (History.com Editors, 2010). It sought to assist families,

industries, and cities with a number of important societal initiatives. Higher education experienced a boom with over ten million veterans taking advantage of the G.I. Bill (History.com Editors, 2010).

Teacher education in the United States became a national focus as the teacher shortage continued into the 1950s. Due to the post-war baby boom, the country continued to focus on education, push for higher standards for teacher training and certification (Angus, 2001). "The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) was founded in 1954. NCATE replaced the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Before NCATE, the American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education" was responsible for overseeing teacher accreditation (NCATE, 2008, p. 5). NCATE's mission was to provide leadership and reform in teacher preparation. They did this through assessment, standards, and performance-based learning. The purpose was to ensure the institutions they accredit were current, productive, and relevant.

According to the U.S. Department of Edcuation (2010), in the 1950s and 1960s, the Federal government and family advocacy agencies developed and validated programs for children of minority families, children in low-income families and children with disabilities. The Training of Professional Personnel Act of 1959 (PL 86-158) was the beginning of many notable examples of early federal legislation supporting the effort to improve programs for special education and the socially disadvantaged. This act began the practice of specific pre-service training and certification for special education teachers. When President Lyndon Johnson was elected in 1964, he pushed The Great Society social reform agenda (U.S. Department of Education 2010).

Public education in the 1970s had setbacks brought about in part by the relatively large number of children born, known today as the baby boomers. Not only did enrollments spike in public education but an economic crisis was also experienced during this period. As a result, although temporary, the higher national standards for teacher certification requirements of the recent past were again ignored due to the teacher shortage, and economic crisis. To ensure the integrity of programs did not fail, most states began establishing standards for student teaching with the norm ranging from four to 18 weeks (Ravitch, 2003). The setback did not last long, and on November 29, 1975, the United States Congress enacted the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (PL 94-142), which was signed by President Ford in 1975. PL 94-132 was landmark legislation requiring every federally funded state and local school district to identify and educate all children with handicaps in their attendance area at the public's expense. PL 94-142 began the process of creating and requiring individual education programs. This act passed the threshold of sunset and continues to be amended per congressional oversite (Triano, 2000).

In the 1970s and 1980s, a general perception that U.S. education was falling behind foreign counterparts in the skills necessary to keep the U.S. economy and industries competitive (Edwards, 2009). In 1983, the National Commission on Excellence in Education released a report titled *A Nation at Risk*. The Nation at Risk recommendations for public education in the United States included a focus in four areas: content, expectations, time, and teaching. Also, the Nation at Risk research documented that teachers were underpaid, worked in poor conditions, experienced underachievement by their students, and were often underqualified for the job. After the 1983 report was

published, training for pre-service teachers became a priority and was reflected in certification requirements (Voskuil, 1999).

The 1990s brought to light the idea of 21st-century skills. These 21st-century skills were geared toward teaching students higher level thinking, reasoning, problem-solving, and experiential and active learning goals. This shift changed how teachers were taught, how schools were designed, and how instruction was delivered (Dede, 2009). Goals 2000, Educate America Act, came into law in 1994 and was amended in 1996. The mission of the act was to fulfill the American goal of raising academic standards. A focus of the legislation was teacher preparation and professional development. The implementation of statewide standards-based education created a clear focus for professional development and licensure standards requiring student teaching or mentoring for every teacher preparation program. NCATE applied performance-based standards to pre-service teacher competencies that were expected to be mastered in subjects taught. The teacher preparation performance standards and content standards were aligned and established by Goals 2000 (Summary of the Improving America's Schools Act, 1994). More importantly, they were to align with individual state new teacher licensing requirements to certify highly qualified teachers (Elliot, 1996).

The Goals 2000: Educate America Act of 1994: Goal 4, Title II-Dwight D. Eisenhower Teacher Education and Professional-Development Program authorized $800 million for the fiscal year 1995 to fund a competitive national teacher-training program. Part A-Improving Basic Programs, operated by local education agencies, mandatorily required states to develop school improvement plans to include content standards in math and reading or language arts identifying what constitutes adequate yearly progress

(Summary of the Improving America's Schools Act, 1994). With the goal of improving the quality of classroom teachers, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) was created to develop a national certification program for teachers who attained an objective level of demonstrated competence (Heise, 1994). As Danielson and McGreal (2000) noted, "Adding also to the changing focus of teaching was a new understanding of content knowledge and how content is taught" (p. 14).

In May and June of 2009, the executive boards of NCATE and TEAC recommended forming a new accrediting body named Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP, 2016). They believed CAEP would elevate educator preparation to a new level of excellence. There was a two-year transition period. In 2012, the Commission on Standards and Performance Reporting developed the next generation of accreditation standards and performance measures for educator preparation. In 2016, CAEP accreditation standards were fully implemented, and NCATE and TEAC legacy standards were no longer used for accreditation (CAEP, 2016)

Best Practices in Student Teaching

In the United States during the early 1700s, "teachers were considered servants to the local community and were trained and hired by local government and churches to uphold the structures of local religion and maintain social order" (Tracy, 1995, p. 320). The teacher was supervised by committees that were responsible for what was taught and had the authority to hire and fire (Burke & Krey, 2005). Supervision during this time was mostly focused on ensuring teachers were compliant with the clergy's expectations and custodial responsibilities (Tracy, 1995). The industrial age brought about urban areas which complicated the school system by requiring more specialized skilled instruction.

Before the industrial age, the supervisors were clergy with a broad knowledge base; the new industrial age required employees to specialize and have knowledge focused in specific areas causing the need for supervisors to be knowledgeable in the same subject areas as the student teacher (Tracy, 1995).

During the late 19th century and early 20th century, PK-12 education was influenced by two competing views (Marzano et al., 2011). The first view was scientific management (Taylor, 1911). Taylor was an American mechanical engineer and leader of the efficiency movement. His scientific management theory, also known as Taylorism, analyzed workflows with the goal of improving efficiency in labor productivity. In 1911, Taylor published an article "The Principles of Scientific Management," which focused on the manual work and mechanics of productivity and efficiency rather than the human experience element. The scientific management principle promoted teaching students in a process related to producing raw materials and products, focusing on efficacy and task completion (Kanigel, 2005). The second view influencing education was derived by Dewey, a highly regarded author and functional psychologist during the early 20th century. Dewey was a proponent of progressive educational reform, with the idea that education should be based on learning by doing. Dewey's philosophy, also known as experimentalism, believed teacher training should focus on promoting student citizenship and connect the classroom and student learning to the real world, differentiating based on individual learning needs, and moving toward active learning (Dewey, 1938). The two perspectives did not allow for integration causing tension in PK-12 education reform until after the 1930s.

During World War II pre-service teacher education began to focus on individualized learning practices and emotional needs of both the teacher and student. Pre-service teachers were assigned school level and university level supervisors who focused on management, shared decision making, human limitations, democratic classroom management, and delegation of responsibility (Coleman, 1945). This change was the start of inservice, frequent observations and evaluations, and the promotion of individual teacher growth models (Phipps, 1966). During this post-World War II era, a strong foundation for classroom observations and a defined need for supervision emerged.

During the late 1940s and 1950s, clinical supervision formally emerged in discussions, practices, and the literature. The emphasis on supervision was explained as managerial with a focus on the organization of materials and facilities, teaching personnel, emotional quality of the classroom, lunch service, attendance, public relations, community connections, and distribution of textbooks (Swearingen, 1946). Melchoir (1950) described supervision as conducting “individual meetings with teachers, faculty meetings, business meetings, social meetings, workshops, and other committee meetings in addition to classroom visitation for observation and study" (p. 51).

In the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s, teacher preparation programs required student teaching and field experience for undergraduate pre-service teachers, but curriculum, length of time required, and what year and semester it was assigned slowly changed over the decades. In the 1960s, pre-service teaching programs began requiring early exposure to public school settings with a culminating fall semester student teaching term the senior

year. During the 1970s, universities frequently placed four or five pre-service student teachers in the same school to provide a more collective experience.

During this era, Madeline Hunter introduced an instructional model to enhance teaching. The Hunter model brought a nationwide focus on how to teach and supervise pre-service teachers in the areas of instruction and time management. Hunter partnered with the University of California Los Angeles in 1973 to establish a guide for instructing preservice teachers; this instrument focused on identifying the learning situation and managing time (Hunter, 1973). These approaches to curriculum and teaching were frequently paired with the four phases of clinical supervision and Goldhammer's (1969) five-stage process of clinical supervision when designing programs for pre-service teachers. These instructional and supervisory practices became the standard for college and university pre-service teacher training program (Hosford, 1984).

The basic five-stage sequence suggested by Goldhammer (1969) remains the most popular and widely used. This basic five-stage clinical supervision model consisted of four phases that are modified depending on the pre-service teacher and clinical supervisor with the fifth stage being an overall critique of the first four stages. The five stages consist of "pre-observation, classroom observation, analysis and strategy session, conference stage, and post-conference observation" or a critique of foregoing the first four steps (Okafor, 2012, p. 3).

In the 1980s, A Nation at Risk report resulted in more accountability in education. This report sparked the era of assessment and supervision for the sake of accountability. More building and district leadership positions were created, teacher evaluations were more specific, and individual content knowledge became a focus. The challenge of

training and certifying highly qualified teachers to meet the growing needs of schools sparked more government and agency regulations and oversight (Cochran-Smith, 1991). Twentieth-century research identified nationwide efforts to reinvent student teaching based on classroom and student learning needs (Cochran-Smith, 1991).

The initiation of the Holmes Group Professional Development School (PDS) in the 1980s caused many universities in the United States to adjust their student teaching and field experience programming. NCATE (2008) defined PDS as

> Specially structured schools in which the P–12 school and higher education faculty collaborate to (1) provide practicum, student teaching, and internship experiences; (2) support and enable the professional development of school and higher education faculty; (3) support and enable inquiry directed at the improvement of practice; and (4) support and enhance student achievement. PDSs require the institutional commitment of colleges and universities, school districts, and teachers' organizations. (p. 90)

The PDS teacher preparation programs were committed to providing better field experiences for the teacher education students and increased university faculty cooperation and involvement in the public school systems. Student teacher experiences have historically been the single most impactful portion of the teacher preparation program (Carnegie Foundation Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986).

The NBPTS was founded in 1987 in response to a Carnegie-commissioned report on education and the economy (Carnegie Foundation Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986). The NBPTS was governed by a 63-member board consisting of classroom teachers. The Board adopted a policy statement entitled *What Teachers*

Should Know and Be Able to Do (Baratz-Snowden, 1990). The statement clearly outlined five core principals reflecting what the NBPTS Board valued in teaching and served as a foundation for its work. Teacher programs in the United States adopted these principals.

1. Teachers are committed to students and their learning.
2. Teachers know the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects to students.
3. Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning.
4. Teachers think systematically about their practice and learn from experience.
5. Teachers are members of learning communities. (NBPTS, 1991, pp. 13-15)

These 21st-century teacher preparation programs evolved from a predominant focus on teacher-centered approach, teaching with isolated learning structures, and use of fragmented curriculum to student-centered teaching approach with a focus on real life, relevant, collaborative project-based learning structures (Schleicher, 2012). The 21st century also saw a shift from general observation supervision of pre-service teachers to a more specific documented pre-service teacher observation evaluation while also moving away from teacher behavior to student achievement. Pre-service teacher expectations shifted from teaching in isolation with a focus on the teacher's instructional skills, delivery and understanding of the content to co-teaching, collaboration, reflection, and inquiry-based instruction. The purpose of this shift was to determine how learners learn and collaborate with other professionals regarding how to ensure individual student growth.

The intention of the partnership between the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium and NCATE was to build a tighter connection between public

school and universities. This connection could allow school systems and universities to form a common knowledge for strengthening collaboration and communication between university supervisors and cooperating teachers. A recent review of research on supervision in teacher education reported communication among university faculty and coordination between university faculty and cooperating teachers during student teaching is often nonexistent (McIntyre & Byrd, 1998).

McIntyre and Byrd (1998) discussed varying methods of teacher education, focusing on how "Teachers learn about teaching and learning and develop their own professional education plans and goals. Universities and schools collaborate on career-long teacher education through professional development schools. Teacher education courses provide (or fail to provide) necessary training" (p. 72).

Teacher education is critical in the process of preparing a pre-service teacher. McIntyre and Byrd (1998) confirm the importance of three specific concepts:

1. Ongoing dialog is crucial — there must be continuous feedback and fine-tuning of teacher education programs.
2. Discussions of case studies can be powerful tools for critical reflection by students. They can learn to identify more easily with other perspectives.
3. Teacher education programs need to "individualize" to increase effectiveness. Students' own beliefs and attitudes greatly affect how they respond to learning to teach. (p. 38)

Education reform focuses on systemic change with the goal of achieving long-term, large-scale results. However, according to Pajak (2000), "education in the United States has long been characterized by loose coupling, manifested in the relationship

between administration and instruction, between universities and schools, and between preservice and in-service expectations" (p. 233). Pajak (2000) refers to this reform as loose coupling, a term used to describe the "weakness or relative lack of control, coordination, influence, and interaction among events or components within a system" (p. 234). Barnhart, Hansell, Smith, and Black (1995) identified the weak and indecisive relationship between K-12 schools and universities as the weakest coupling in education as they half-heartedly collaborate in the task of training new teachers into the profession. This weak coupling is demonstrated in the disconnect between relationship and roles and behaviors exhibited as perceived by university supervisors and cooperating teachers. "In too many instances, beginning teachers are left to sink or swim with little support as they attempt the difficult transition from novice to practitioner" (Pajak, 2000, p. 235). He went on to state.

> The key to success as a clinical supervisor is to first understand the teacher's perception of the data and its meaning. Only then can one accurately determine the course of action that is needed to further the emergence of the teacher's unique professional style and identity. And that takes time. If we fail to provide empathy-based supervision, the current standards-based environment will ultimately prove stultifying for both teachers and their students. (Pajak, 2000, p. 241)

Pajak (2000) concluded that if supervision relies too heavily on monitoring externally imposed expectations or standards for teachers and student learning outcomes, it runs a serious risk of threatening the affective bond between student and teacher and the teacher's emotional commitment to the calling to teach.

Pauli (2006) examined survey responses of 35 pre-service teachers and compared their self-evaluation responses with the responses of their 35 university supervisors and 45 cooperating teachers with the purpose of measuring similar perceptions of the student teachers disposition toward teaching. The survey items included "accepting of others, adaptable to change, caring, compassionate, competent, cooperative, disciplined, effective communicator, enthusiastic, flexible, hardworking, honest, intelligent, life-long learner, open-minded, organized, patient, reliable, responsible, and understanding" (Pauli, 2006, p. 70). The survey was administered during a semester-long student teaching session in South Dakota. Participants were limited to pre-service teachers' mid-semester and then again at the end of their student teaching phase. Kramer (2003) said, "Every teacher must develop the characteristics of a professional and model professionalism every day" (Kramer, 2003, p. 22). Professionalism can be accomplished with a comparison of the candidate's self-evaluation and the supervisor and cooperating teacher's evaluations (Pauli, 2006). The results of Pauli's study identified that cooperating teachers and university supervisors similarly viewed student dispositions. However, pre-service teachers saw themselves at a significantly lower level of performance when comparing their self-evaluation to the ratings of their supervisor and cooperating teacher.

The early research on teacher education and supervision was local and overseen by clergy and local leadership with curriculum based on local religious and industrial need. Once the educational landscape in the United States became more complex with the Industrial Age, educational leadership and pedagogy were identified as best practice. After World War II, education was a focus related to worldwide competition and the fear

of America falling behind other countries. The 20th and 21st centuries streamlined national standards with policies and practice. Today, best practice in pre-service teacher training and learning can be summarized with a kaleidoscope of notions (Wang, Lin, Spalding, Klecka, & Odell, 2011). This kaleidoscope, while not widely agreed upon, consisted of three overall concepts. According to Wang et al. (2011), the success of a future teacher is widely based on the following three concepts: the teacher's cognitive resources, ability to demonstrate competencies on academic/professional tests, their performance in the classroom, and their effect on student achievement.

Effective Characteristics of Cooperating Teachers

Student teaching is arguably the most important experience for a pre-service teacher in their education program (Levine, 2006). The cooperating teacher plays a key role in determining if the student teaching experience will be effective (Blair, David, & Bacharach, 1984; Hamilton, 1984). Just as research shows the teacher is the single most important indicator of an effective learning environment (Copeland, 1977; Cunningham & Allington, 1999), the cooperating teacher is the single most important factor in the student teaching experience according to pre-service teachers (Connor & Killmer, 1995).

In 1984, Hamilton's descriptive research identified ideal roles and functions of cooperating teachers as perceived by cooperating teachers, principals, student teachers, and university supervisors. The four groups (118 cooperating teachers, 62 principals, 96 student teachers, and 10 university supervisors) were administered a two-page questionnaire of 30 "actual and ideal role functions for elementary cooperating teachers in public schools" (p. 68). Ideal roles realized by all four groups were being involved in with the student teacher, classroom management professionalism, and orientation.

Discrepancies were discovered between the actual desired roles and function and actual occurrences of these roles. Evidence showed ideal roles were not always observed. "There are significant differences between perceptions of ideal and actual role functions between all four groups (Principals, Student Teachers, Cooperating teachers, and University Supervisors" (Hamilton, 1984, p. 133).

Platz (1994) conducted a study in which teacher education students, pre-service teachers, and cooperating teachers rated the criteria used in the selection of cooperating teachers. The purpose of the study was to identify the important criteria used in the selection of cooperating teachers. Teacher education students, pre-service teachers, and cooperating teachers were surveyed using the following criteria in selecting cooperating teachers:

1. Three years of experience.
2. Experience at the school for one year.
3. Completion of a course or seminar in the supervision of student teaching.
4. Express interest in working with student teacher
5. Demonstrates good interpersonal skills.
6. Demonstrates flexibility in planning and teaching.
7. Willingness to discuss concerns.
8. Demonstrates an openness to teaming.
9. Maintains a positive classroom environment with students.
10. Perceived as a master teacher. (Platz, 1994, p. 299)

Platz (1994) discussed that in the past the criteria for selection of cooperating teachers were based on opinions and the data from this study identified that when selecting a

cooperating teacher, an organization should look for interpersonal and teaching/standard criteria. Platz (1994) concluded the following to be the most important criteria for the selection of cooperating teachers: (a) willingness to discuss concerns, (b) maintains a positive classroom environment, and (c) perceived as a master teacher.

Connor and Killmer (1995) suggest the cooperating teacher directly influences the success of a pre-service teacher and because of this teacher preparation programs should provide specific roles for the cooperating teacher to fulfill. Connor and Killmer (1995) collected data to determine what constitutes an effective cooperating teacher according to the perceptions of pre-service teachers and practicing cooperating teachers. Data were collected from pre-service teachers and cooperating teachers at the elementary level. Three semesters of data were collected from urban and rural public elementary school placements.

Connor and Killmer (1995) collected data from 307 pre-service teachers and 78 cooperating teachers from both rural and urban settings. The participants were asked four questions related to "the single most valuable thing an effective cooperating teacher can provide a student teacher" (p. 4), "what cooperating teachers did that was most valued or appreciated by student teachers" (p. 4), "the qualities of an effective cooperating teacher" (p. 4), and "the most valuable experiences you can provide a student teacher" (p. 4). The open-ended format was selected to avoid leading questions and to elicit genuine responses. Comparing the pre-service teachers and cooperating teacher responses, Connor and Killmer (1995) identified three main characteristics of effective cooperating teachers to identify when selecting cooperating teachers. Individuals could be selected to

be a cooperating teacher, if they were open to sharing their resources, provided feedback to the pre-service teacher, and had good communication skills.

Most teacher preparation programs evaluate the performance of the college supervisor and the pre-service teacher but rarely do they evaluate the cooperating teacher. Connor and Killmer (1995) contended that the cooperating teacher evaluation was the missing link. Therefore, they developed an optional cooperating teacher feedback form for both the pre-service teacher and the college supervisor to use. The 12 criteria on the evaluation were drawn from the open-ended survey administered to examine what constitutes an effective cooperating teacher. The purpose of the feedback form or cooperating teacher evaluation was to enhance cooperating teacher effectiveness and identify areas of needed improvement. The feedback from the survey identified specific topics for cooperating teacher professional development. Those areas were strong feedback techniques, willingness to share ideas, and promoting a positive learning environment.

The purpose of Osunde's (1996) study was to identify behavior and classroom practices of effective cooperating teachers from the perspective of the pre-service teacher. Data was gathered from 50 randomly selected elementary and secondary pre-service teachers from the University of Pennsylvania over two years. The top six positive behaviors exhibited by effective cooperating teachers were ranked in order of importance as previewed by the randomly selected pre-service teachers: "good classroom organization, positive rapport with students, knowledge of subject matter, establishment of daily routines, good classroom control and management, compassion toward students." (p. 615). The pre-service teachers perceived that classroom organization and planning

were the most important behaviors and practices that they perceived made an impact on them. The next most impactful qualities identified by the pre-service teachers were positive rapport, "knowledge of subject matter, daily routine, good classroom management, and compassion" (p. 615) towards students. The results of the study also identified that pre-service teachers spend more time with their cooperating teacher than any other individual instructor during the undergraduate degree program. According to Osunde (1996), student teachers' perceptions of cooperating teachers could provide university programs and school administration additional insight by identifying behaviors and practices of effective cooperating teachers and in turn assist in identifying and assigning the most effective cooperating teachers with pre-service teachers. This practice could result in a more meaningful student teaching experience.

Roberts and Dyer (2004) studied the relationship between the student teacher and cooperating teacher to determine the characteristics of effective agricultural teachers. They determined 19 characteristics that supported five categories of effectiveness and 28 characteristics. The five categories included: instruction, advising, professionalism, relationship, and personal. First, determine a list of characteristics that identify an effective agricultural teacher with the purpose of designing a teacher preparation program that would develop agricultural teachers with these specific characteristics. Roberts and Dyer (2004) used a 36-member expert panel of "agricultural teachers, county-level administrators, FFA supervisory staff, and agricultural university faculty" (p. 84) all from the state of Florida. Second, was to categorize those characteristics into a working model. Three questionnaires were mailed using open-ended, rating, and open-ended response. The panel identified forty characteristics of agricultural teachers and put them

in a working model. Characteristics of effective agricultural teachers can be categorized into "instruction, FFA, SAE, building community partnerships, marketing, professional growth/professionalism, program planning, and personal qualities" (Roberts & Dyer, 2004, p. 93). The implication for action was to use these same criteria to select cooperating teachers.

Roberts (2006) replicated the work of Roberts and Dyer (2004), thus employed the same Delphi methodology to develop a model of effective cooperating teachers as determined by active student teachers. Roberts (2006) concluded that there were 30 characteristics of an effective cooperating teacher that supported four constructs. "This conclusion expands the findings of Roberts and Dyer (2004), who found only 19 characteristics" (Roberts, 2006, p. 10). The constructs were teaching/instruction, professionalism, student teacher/cooperating teacher relationship, and personal characteristics with a total of thirty cooperating teacher characteristics. Teaching and instruction characteristics were identified as "effective teaching, has good subject matter knowledge, conducts a program that has teaching, FFA, & SAE, experienced, good classroom management, excellent FFA advisor, and effectively supervises SAE projects" (Roberts, 2006, p. 8). Characteristics for professionalism were identified as "exhibits professionalism, serves as a role model, is an effective communicator, has good knowledge of school policies, good relations with other faculty, and good relations with the community" (Roberts, 2006, p. 10). Characteristics for student teacher/cooperating teacher relationships were identified as:

> provides clear expectations, provides constructive feedback/evaluation, provides a variety of experiences to student teachers, anticipates needs of student teacher,

> shares resources with student teacher, assists student teacher when needed, praises student teacher when appropriate, supports decisions of student teacher, and gives student teacher control. (Roberts, 2006, p, 10)

Personal characteristics were identified as "caring or understanding; patient; dependable, responsible or reliable; trustworthy; cooperative; fair; good interpersonal skills; and open to new ideas or being flexible" (Roberts 2006, p, 11). Roberts (2006) provided more detailed criteria regarding the effective characteristics of cooperating teachers with the purpose of using these characteristics when selecting cooperating teachers.

Kasperbauer and Roberts (2007) explored pre-service teacher perceptions of the student/cooperating teacher relationship during the student teaching experience. The sample was comprised of 33 Texas A&M University Agricultural education pre-service teachers during their semester-long student teaching experience in 2004. Data was collected through paper instruments at four points during the semester-long student teaching experience: "1) the first day of the block; 2) the last day of the block; 3) the midpoint of the 11-week student teaching experience; and 4) the end of the 11-week student teaching experience" (Kasperbauer & Roberts, 2007,p. 33). Two items were explored: "1) the student teachers' perceptions of the importance of the relationship and 2) the student teachers' perceptions about the current level of relationship exhibited by their cooperating teachers" (Kasperbauer & Roberts, 2007, p. 133). This instrument was developed based on Roberts (2006) research. Kasperbauer & Roberts found that the perceptions of pre-service teachers during the semester-long student teacher experience did change. Their perceptions of the importance of the pre-service/cooperating teacher

relationship decreased by the conclusion of their student teaching experience. The first round of data collection showed the "average importance of the student teacher/cooperating teacher relationship to be moderately high to high. The pre-service teachers' level at the time of the survey was also moderately high, but lower than the importance. The second round of data collection showed the average importance level to be moderately high to high. The level at the time of the survey showed cooperating teachers were also moderately high, but lower than importance" (Kasperbauer & Roberts, 2007, p. 39). The level of cooperating teachers at the time the survey was administered "was average to moderately high. At the final round of data collection, participants indicated their importance level as high, while current level of their cooperating teacher was average to moderately high" (Kasperbauer & Roberts, 2007, p. 39).

In 2009, the NCTQ Teacher Prep Review surveyed student teachers and cooperating teachers and with the information gathered, recommended that school districts enact policy assigning cooperating teachers who are found to be: 1) highly effective (based on measurable student learning results), 2) capable adult mentors, 3) necessary experienced, and 4) willingness to serve (Killian, & Wilkins, 2009). The NCTQ (2011) identified two essential elements to increase the chance a pre-service teacher will have a positive experience when student teaching: 1) the universities student teacher program's policy on how and how often a student teacher must be visited during the observations, and 2) The program's role in assigning qualified cooperating teachers.

To determine what characteristics affected the supervisory effectiveness of the cooperating teacher, Killian and Wilkins (2009) studied 13 different pairs of cooperating teachers and student teachers from four public elementary schools near a large western

university. The 13 cooperating teachers were considered highly effective based on these qualities: "(1) being midrange in number of teaching years, (2) exhibited having supervised more than five earlier field experience students, and (3) exhibited having closely collaborated with the university supervisor. However, the most powerful association for high effectiveness was the graduate-level preparation" (Killian & Wilkins, 2009, p. 1). This pragmatic sequential mixed methods research design findings determined that the most effective cooperating teachers have several determining factors. Once the most highly effective cooperating teachers were identified three factors the highly effective cooperating teacher group had in common were: "(1) exhibited having taught for 10 to 29 years, (2) exhibited having supervised more than five field experience students, and (3) exhibited having had sustained influence from the university supervisor" (Killian & Wilkins, 2009, p. 76). Student achievement was the focus of the most effective cooperating teachers and duplicating lesson plans or mirroring how they taught was less important. These effective cooperating teachers were also found to address behaviors and correct problems where less effective cooperating teachers avoided problems (Killian & Wilkins, 2009).

Knowing the influence, a cooperating teacher has toward the success of the pre-service teacher's student teaching experience; it is important to identify specific characteristics of the cooperating teacher that are important to the pre-service teacher (Epps, 2010). Epps's research implied that an alignment between important characteristics of effective cooperating teachers, and behaviors demonstrated by cooperating teachers, as perceived by both student teachers and cooperating teachers need to occur. The research results indicated that there was a correlation between what student

teachers found to be effective characteristics and how often the cooperating teacher exhibited those characteristics. However, there was a discrepancy between what cooperating teachers and student teachers identified as effective characteristics and the cooperating teacher exhibiting those behaviors.

Epps (2010) conducted a study utilizing Roberts, Greiman, Murphy, Ricketts, and Harlin (2009) model of an effective cooperating teacher. The purpose of Epp's descriptive correlational study was to identify those characteristics of cooperating teachers that student teachers perceive as important. An additional purpose of the study was to determine how frequently the cooperating teacher exhibited those behaviors. The survey was administrated during the 2008-2009 school year to 32 student teachers and 40 cooperating teachers from a list provided by the Ohio State University Department of Human and Community Resource Development. Data collection began during spring of 2010. The study identified four constructs and characteristics in each construct. The four constructs identified specific characteristics. Teaching/Instruction had nine related characteristics, professionalism had ten related characteristics, relationship between cooperating teacher/student teachers had 14 characteristics, and personal characteristics had 10 related characteristics.

The results of the Epp's (2010) study identified the four constructs in order of importance as perceived by student teachers and cooperating teachers: student teacher perceptions of behaviors occurring most often are, 1) teaching/instruction, 2) professionalism, 3) personal characteristics, and 4) relationship. Cooperating teacher perceptions of behaviors observed most often are, 1) personal characteristics, 2) professionalism 3) relationship, and 4) teaching/instruction. The study also ranked the

four constructs in order of behaviors perceived to occur most often by student teachers and cooperating teachers: Student teacher perceptions of behaviors observed most often were, 1) professionalism, 2) personal characteristics, 3) teaching/instruction, and 4) relationship. Cooperating teacher perceptions of behaviors offering most often were, 1) relationship, 2) characteristics, 3) professionalism and 4) teaching/instruction.

Student teacher data showed their cooperating teachers demonstrated professionalism by establishing positive community relations. The student teachers also reported cooperating teachers demonstrated patience most often. The least often demonstrated behaviors were in the relationship construct. The behaviors least often demonstrated consisted of assisting the student teachers in finding a job and help planning lessons and activities. As a group, cooperating teachers reported they demonstrated personal characteristics more often than establishing a relationship with the student teacher and teaching/instruction. Recommendations from Epp's study focused on identifying the characteristics cooperating teachers and student teachers deem important. Information should be accounted for when selecting cooperating teachers, training cooperating teachers, and preparing pre-service teachers for the student teaching experience (Epps, 2010).

Paulson (2014) explored cooperating teacher's perceptions related to mentoring pre-service teachers, the support and training the cooperating teacher received before and during the field experience in the hope of providing a more focused role for the cooperating teacher, and more effective process and experience for the pre-service teacher during their field experience. The group surveyed was comprised of 394 cooperating teachers who were mentoring pre-service teachers from rural middle and

high schools in central Illinois. Of the 394 cooperating teachers, 356 responded to the survey. The participants were given close and open-ended questions to gather data in 4 areas (Paulson, 2014).

Paulson (2014) analyzed his data using a sequential, mixed methods design which was administered in two phases. During the first phase, Paulson used an online survey to gather opinions. The data collected in this study "identified six main roles played by cooperating teachers: mentor, content expert, role model, evaluator, collaborator, and encourager" (Paulson, 2014, p. 104). The following behaviors were also identified as important: "be supportive providing guidance throughout the experience; be knowledgeable about the content being taught; be transparent about all the aspects of teaching; model best practices; consistently provide formative evaluations; plan lessons with the student teacher; and encourage independence" (Paulson, 2014, p. 104).

Phase two of the study was entirely qualitative and involved interviews. Interview questions were grouped into five themes: "cooperating teachers' lack of preparation for the semester, cooperating teachers' desire for feedback, need for better selection of student teachers, roles cooperating teachers should play, and cooperating teachers' desire for power and respect" (Paulson, 2014, p. 66). Results of the survey showed cooperating teachers stated often they would like to have more training or professional development associated with being a cooperating teacher. All participants considered themselves colleagues rather than subordinates with university supervisors and would benefit from more collaboration related to providing summative evaluations for the student teacher (Paulson, 2014).

Lubell, Drake, and Putnam (2017) examined how post-secondary schools operate by determining "overall ratings based on a set of key standards for 608 institutions. Altogether the review provided data on these institutions that prepare 99% of the nation's traditionally trained teachers" (Lubell et al., 2017, p. 4). They found that nearly all university programs leave the responsibility of selecting the cooperating teacher with the school district without any method for determining if the teacher can mentor adult learners.

Summary

The review of the literature provided insight into the history and best practices of pre-service education and student teaching in the United States. Several studies have been conducted regarding what cooperating and pre-service teachers perceive as characteristics of effective cooperating teachers and models of cooperating teacher effectiveness. Chapter 3 includes the research design; population and sample, sampling procedures, instrumentation, measurement, validity and reliability, data collection procedures, data analysis and hypothesis testing, and limitations related to this research study.

Chapter 3

Methods

The first purpose of this study was to determine Horizon Award recipients perceptions of the importance cooperating teacher's characteristics (personal attributes, professionalism, teaching/instruction, and cooperating teacher/student teacher relationship) and perceptions of the frequency cooperating teachers exhibited each characteristic. The second purpose of the study was to determine whether there was a relationship between the Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of cooperating teachers' characteristics and perceptions of the frequency. In this chapter, the methodology used to conduct the study is included. The research design, selection of participants, measurement, data collection procedures, data analysis and hypothesis testing, and limitations are presented.

Research Design

A quantitative descriptive research design using survey data was utilized. Per Creswell (2009), "A survey design provides a quantitative or numeric description of trends, attitudes, or opinions of a population by studying a sample of that population" (p. 145). The variables of interest were Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teacher's characteristics (personal attributes, professionalism, teaching/instruction, and cooperating teacher/student teacher relationship) and Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the frequency the cooperating teacher exhibited the characteristics.

Selection of Participants

The population utilized in this study included all Horizon Award recipients from 2003 to 2018. Kansas Horizon Award Recipients were selected because they were identified by administrators in their second year of teaching and have performed in a way distinguishing them apart from other first-year teachers. The sample included all Horizon Award recipients with current active email accounts included in the KSDE 2003-2018 Kansas Exemplary Educator Network. Since the program's inception in 2003, 32 recipients have been selected each year; 512 Horizon Award recipients have been recognized. Only responses received from the Horizon Award recipients were included as part of the sample. This method allowed for the selection of individuals who best help the understanding and research of the problem and questions (Creswell, 2009).

Measurement

The survey utilized in this study (see Appendix A)was adapted from Epps's (2010) cooperating teacher effectiveness study. Epps collected responses from 29 student teachers and 35 cooperating teachers participating in the 2008-2009 Ohio State Agricultural Education program. Epps's survey was based on Roberts' (2009) model of an effective cooperating teacher, which was created using a Delphi study of student teachers at the University of Florida the spring semester of 2004 (N = 13). The student teachers were asked to develop a consensus list of perceived characteristics of an effective cooperating teacher. There were four constructs: personal characteristics of the cooperating teacher, professionalism of the cooperating teacher, teaching and instructional characteristics of the cooperating teacher, and the cooperating teacher/student teacher relationship. The original survey included both pre-service and

cooperating teachers in agricultural education, used a different Likert scale, and included questions specific to agricultural education (Roberts, 2006). Epps granted permission to use and modify the Cooperating Teacher Effectiveness survey (see Appendix B).

Epp's (2010) survey items related to the participant's perceptions of agricultural cooperating teacher's characteristics and were scored using a 5-point Likert-type scale: *1-Unimportant, 2-Of Little Importance, 3-Moderately Important, 4-Important, 5-Very Important*. Next, the survey items related to how often agricultural cooperating teachers demonstrated those characteristics were scored using a 5-point Likert-type scale: *1-Never, 2-Rarely, 3-Sometimes, 4-Often, 5-Always* (Epps, 2010).

The survey by Epps measured four constructs: personal characteristics of the cooperating teacher, professionalism of the cooperating teacher, teaching and instructional characteristics of the cooperating teacher, and the cooperating teacher/student teacher relationship. Three of the four constructs measured in this study were identical to those measured in the Epps study. The one construct that was changed from Epps study was teaching/Instruction construct, four items were omitted due to agricultural specific content: maintains an appropriate balance between classroom, FFA & SAE; teaches effectively in laboratories; advises the local FFA chapter effectively; and supervises SAE programs effectively.

An online survey instrument consisting of two parts was used in the current study. The first part contained four constructs with measurement of the perceived importance of each construct and the frequency the cooperating teacher exhibited the construct. The four constructs were: personal attributes, professionalism, teaching/instruction, and

cooperating teacher/student teacher relationship. The second part if the survey was a demographic section of the instrument, which measured gender and school level.

The measurement of the perceptions of the importance of the characteristics of the 39 items on the survey involved the use of a 5-point Likert-type scale: *1-Unimportant, 2-Of Little Importance, 3-Moderately Important, 4-Important, 5-Very Important*. A sample characteristic for construct 1 was *having a sense of humor*. A sample characteristic for construct 2 was *demonstrated knowledge of school policies*. A sample characteristic for construct 3 was *importance of demonstrating a thorough knowledge of subject matter*: A sample characteristic for construct 4 was *importance of providing constructive feedback.* Additionally, the measurement of the perceptions of the frequency Horizon Award recipients' cooperating teachers exhibited those characteristics listed in the previous paragraph used a 5-point Liker-type scale: *1-Never, 2-Rarely, 3-Sometimes, 4-Often, 5-Always*.

The reliability and validity of a survey are critical to the quality of the results. "Validity is the degree to which an instrument measures what it purports to measure" (Lunenburg & Irby, 2008, p. 181). A panel of experts from The Ohio State University Department of Human and Community Resource Development established the validity of the original survey (Epps, 2010). Suggestions, additions, deletions, and corrections made by the panel were taken into consideration. The instrument was modified, and changes reflected the suggestions of the panel.

Reliability, as defined by Lunenburg and Irby (2008), "is the degree to which an instrument is a consistent measure" (p. 181). The reliability of Epp's survey was established through a pilot study (N = 19) of in-service student teachers and cooperating

teachers from the University of Georgia and The Pennsylvania State University (Epps, 2010). A Cronbach's alpha coefficient was used to determine the consistency of the summation characteristics and the constructs of an effective cooperating teacher. The values of the Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the four constructs (personal attributes, professionalism, teaching/instruction, and cooperating teacher/student teacher relationship) can be viewed in Table 1.

Epps (2010) conducted a reliability analysis using Cronbach's alpha coefficients. However, the description of the reliability analysis was not clearly detailed. Also, adaptations were made to the survey items for the use of the survey in the current study. Therefore, to provide complete evidence for reliability, Cronbach's alpha coefficients were calculated to evaluate the reliability of each of the subscales that measured the importance of each of the four constructs as well as each of the subscales that measured the frequency that the cooperating teachers demonstrated those four constructs. The results of the reliability analyses are reported below in Table 1. All the coefficients were above .70, providing strong evidence for the reliability of the survey subscales.

Table 1

Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficients for Revised Epps Survey

Construct	Importance Alpha	*K*	*N*	Frequency Alpha	*K*	*N*
Personal	.70	10	135	.93	10	136
Professional	.84	10	139	.95	9	134
Instruction	.71	5	138	.89	5	138
Relationship	.86	14	136	.95	14	135

Note. K = The number of items used in the reliability calculations for survey subscales.

Data Collection Procedures

Permission to use and modify the Cooperating Teacher Effectiveness Survey was granted by Epps (2010) via an email on August 3, 2015 (see Appendix B). Approval to collect data and conduct the research was requested from the Baker University Institutional Review Board (IRB) on January 8, 2018 (see Appendix C). Formal approval was received from the IRB on January 12, 2018 (see Appendix D).

All Kansas Horizon Award recipient's emails were obtained with assistance from the KSDE and the Horizon Award recipient contact directory. These email addresses were then used to send each Horizon Award recipient an invitation to participate in this study. The email (see Appendix E*)* provided the purpose of the study, as well as clarification that participation was voluntary and responding to the survey served as consent to participate. A link to the survey in SurveyMonkey was also included in the body of the email communication. The survey link was initially sent to all Horizon Award recipients on March 1, 2018. A reminder email was then sent to those, who had not yet responded, on March 14, 2018. A third reminder was provided on April 11, 2018. A fourth and final reminder was sent to those that had not yet responded on April 18, 2018, indicating that the survey would be closed on April 25, 2018. The data was downloaded from SurveyMonkey into an Excel spreadsheet. Data were then uploaded to IBM SPSS Statistics Faculty Pack 25 for Windows for analysis.

Data Analysis and Hypothesis Testing

For each research question, hypotheses were identified. A paragraph describing the hypothesis test follows the list of research questions and associated hypotheses.

RQ1. What are the perceptions of Horizon Award recipients regarding the importance of personal attributes of their cooperating teachers?

H1. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers being patient as being important or very important.

H2. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers being fair as being important or very important.

H3. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers being dependable/reliable as being important or very important.

H4. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers being cooperative as being important or very important.

H5. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers exhibited having a sense of humor as being important or very important.

H6. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers being caring as being important or very important.

H7. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers being respectful as being important or very important.

H8. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers being open-minded as being important or very important.

H9. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers being trustworthy as being important or very important.

H10. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers being organized as being important or very important.

Ten one-sample *t* tests were conducted to test H1-H10. The sample mean for the perceptions of the importance of each of the personal attributes was tested against a null value of 3. The level of significance was set at .05.

RQ2. What are the perceptions of Horizon Award recipients regarding the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited the personal attributes?

H11. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited being patient as often or always.

H12. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited being fair as often or always.

H13. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited being dependable/reliable as often or always.

H14. Kansas Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited being cooperative as often or always.

H15. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited having a sense of humor as often or always.

H16. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited being caring as often or always.

H17. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited being respectful as often or always.

H18. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited being open-minded as often or always.

H19. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited being trustworthy as often or always.

H20. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited being organized as often or always.

Ten one-sample *t* tests were conducted to test H11-H20. The sample mean for the perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited each of the personal attributes was tested against a null value of 3. The level of significance was set at .05.

RQ3. To what extent is there a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers' personal attributes and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited the personal attributes?

H21. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers being patient and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited being patient.

H22. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers being fair and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited being fair.

H23. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers being dependable/reliable and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited being dependable/reliable.

H24. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers being cooperative and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited being cooperative.

H25. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers exhibited having a sense of humor and their

perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited having a sense of humor.

H26. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers being caring and the perceptions of their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited being caring.

H27. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers being respectful and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited being respectful.

H28. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers being open-minded and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited being open-minded.

H29. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers being trustworthy and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited being trustworthy.

H30. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers being organized and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited being organized.

Ten Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were calculated to index the strength and direction of the relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers' personal attributes and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited the personal attributes. Ten one-sample *t* tests were conducted to test for the statistical significance of the correlation coefficients. The level of significance was set at .05.

RQ4. What are the perceptions of Horizon Award recipients regarding the importance of the professionalism of their cooperating teachers?

H31. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers loving their jobs as being important or very important.

H32. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers exhibiting a positive attitude as being important or very important.

H33. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers exhibiting professionalism as being important or very important.

H34. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers serving as a good role model for them as a prospective teacher as being important or very important.

H35. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers demonstrating knowledge of school policies as being important or very important.

H36. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers establishing working relationships with administrators as being important or very important.

H37. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers establishing positive community relations as being important or very important.

H38. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers having good interpersonal skills as being important or very important.

H39. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers communicating effectively as being important or very important.

H40. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers being recognized by other teachers and administrators as a good faculty member at their school as being important or very important.

Ten one-sample *t* tests were conducted to test H31-H40. The sample mean for the perceptions of the importance of each professionalism characteristic was tested against a null value of 3. The level of significance was set at .05.

RQ5. What are the perceptions of Horizon Award recipients regarding the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited professionalism?

H41. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited loving their jobs as often or always.

H42. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited a positive attitude as often or always.

H43. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited professionalism as often or always.

H44. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers served as a role model for them as a prospective teacher as often or always.

H45. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers demonstrated knowledge of school policies as often or always.

H46. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited a working relationship with administrators as often or always.

H47. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers established positive community relations as often or always.

H48. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited good interpersonal skills as often or always.

H49. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers communicated effectively as often or always.

H50. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers were recognized by other teachers and administrators as a good faculty member at their school as often or always.

Ten one-sample *t* tests were conducted to test H41-H50. The sample mean for the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited each professionalism characteristic was tested against a null value of 3. The level of significance was set at .05.

RQ6. To what extent is there a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers' professionalism and their perceptions of the frequency cooperating teachers exhibited professionalism?

H51. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers loving their jobs and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited loving their jobs.

H52. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers exhibiting a positive attitude and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited a creative attitude.

H53. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers exhibiting professionalism and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited professionalism.

H54. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers serving as a good role model for them as a prospective teacher and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers served as role model for them as a prospective teacher.

H55. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers demonstrating knowledge of school policies and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited knowledge of school policies.

H56. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers establishing working relationships with administrators and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited working relationships with administrators.

H57. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers establishing positive community relations and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers established positive community relations.

H58. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers exhibited having good interpersonal skills and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited good interpersonal skills.

H59. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers communicating effectively and their

perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited communicating effectively.

H60. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers being recognized by other teachers and administrators as a good faculty member at their school and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers were recognized by other teachers and administrators as a good faculty member at their school.

Ten Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were calculated to index the strength and direction of the relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers' professionalism and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited professionalism. Ten one-sample *t* tests were conducted to test for the statistical significance of the correlation coefficients. The level of significance was set at .05.

RQ7. What are the perceptions of Horizon Award recipients regarding the importance of the instruction characteristics of their cooperating teachers?

H61. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers exhibiting enthusiasm for the subject as being important or very important.

H62. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers demonstrating a thorough knowledge of the subject matter as being important or very important.

H63. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers possessing classroom management skills as being important or very important.

H64. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers enforcing a well-defined discipline policy as being important or very important.

H65. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers teaching effectively in the classroom as being important or very important.

Five one-sample *t* tests were conducted to test H61-H65. The sample mean for the perceptions of the importance of each instruction characteristic was tested against a null value of 3. The level of significance was set at .05.

RQ8. What are the perceptions of Horizon Award recipients regarding the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited the instructional characteristics?

H66. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited enthusiasm for the subject as often or always.

H67. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers demonstrated a thorough knowledge of the subject matter as often or always.

H68. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited classroom management skills as often or always.

H69. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers enforced a well-defined discipline policy as often or always.

H70. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers taught effectively as often or always.

Five one-sample *t* tests were conducted to test H66-H70. The sample mean for the perceptions of the frequency cooperating teachers exhibited the instruction characteristics was tested against a null value of 3. The level of significance was set at .05.

RQ9. To what extent is there a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of the instruction characteristics of their cooperating teachers and the perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited the instruction characteristics?

H71. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers exhibiting enthusiasm for the subject and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited enthusiasm for the subject.

H72. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers demonstrating a thorough knowledge of the subject matter and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited a thorough knowledge of the subject matter.

H73. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers possessing classroom management skills and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited classroom management skills.

H74. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers enforcing a well-defined discipline policy and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers enforced a well-defined discipline policy.

H75. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers teaching effectively in the classroom and

their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited teaching effectively in the classroom.

Five Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were calculated to index the strength and direction of the relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers' instructional characteristics and perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited instruction characteristics. Five one-sample *t* tests were conducted to test for the statistical significance of the correlation coefficients. The level of significance was set at .05.

RQ10. What are the perceptions of Horizon Award recipients regarding the importance of the cooperating teacher/student teacher relationship?

H76. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers encouraging them as being important or very important.

H77. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers giving them the freedom to try things as being important or very important.

H78. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers turning classes over to them as being important or very important.

H79. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers supporting decisions made by them as being important or very important.

H80. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers helping them plan lessons and activities as being important or very important.

H81. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers routinely observing them as being important or very important.

H82. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers providing constructive feedback to them as being important or very important.

H83. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers providing a variety of experiences as being important or very important.

H84. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers assisting them when needed as being important or very important.

H85. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers treating them as a fellow professional as being important or very important.

H86. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers anticipating their needs as being important or very important.

H87. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers providing clear expectations to them as being important or very important.

H88. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers sharing resources with them as being important or very important.

H89. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers assisting them in finding a job as being important or very important.

Fourteen one-sample *t* tests were conducted to test H76-H89. The sample mean for the perceptions of the importance of each cooperating teacher/student teacher relationship characteristic was tested against a null value of 3. The level of significance was set at .05.

RQ11. What are the perceptions of Horizon Award recipients regarding the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited the cooperating teacher/student teacher relationship characteristics?

H90. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers encouraged them as often or always.

H91. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers gave them the freedom to try things as often or always.

H92. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers turned classes over to them as often or always.

H93. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers supported decisions made by them as often or always.

H94. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers helped them plan lessons and activities as often or always.

H95. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers routinely observed them as often or always.

H96. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers provided constructive feedback to them as often or always.

H97. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers provided a variety of experiences for them as often or always.

H98. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers assisted them when needed as often or always.

H99. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency of their cooperating teachers treated them as a fellow professional as often or always.

H100. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency of their cooperating teachers anticipated their needs as often or always.

H101. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers provided clear expectations to them as often or always.

H102. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers shared resources with them as often or always.

H103. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency of their cooperating teachers assisted them in finding a job for them as often or always.

Fourteen one-sample *t* tests were conducted to test H90-H103. The sample mean for perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited each cooperating teacher/student teacher relationship characteristics was tested against a null value of 3. The level of significance was set at .05.

RQ12. To what extent is there a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of the cooperating teacher/student teacher relationship and perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited the cooperating teacher/student teacher relationship characteristics?

H104. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers exhibiting encouragement to them and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers encouraged them.

H105. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers giving them the freedom to try things and perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers gave them the freedom to try things.

H106. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers turning classes over to them and the perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers turned classes over to them.

H107. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers supporting decisions made by them and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers supported decisions made by them.

H108. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers helping them plan lessons and activities and their perceptions of cooperating teachers exhibiting helping them plan lessons and activities and the perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers helped them plan.

H109. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers routinely observing them and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers routinely observed them.

H110. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers providing constructive feedback to them and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers provided constructive feedback to them.

H111. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers providing a variety of experiences for them and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers provided a variety of experiences for them.

H112. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers assisting them when needed and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers assisted them when needed.

H113. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers treating them as a fellow professional and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers treated them as a fellow professional.

H114. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers anticipating their needs and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers anticipated their needs.

H115. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers providing clear expectations to them and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers provided clear expectations to them.

H116. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers sharing resources with them and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers shared resources with them.

H117. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers assisting them in finding a job and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers assisted them in finding a job.

Fourteen Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were calculated to index the strength and direction of the relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of the cooperating teacher/student teacher relationship and

perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited each of the cooperating teacher/student teacher relationship characteristics. Fourteen one-sample *t* tests were conducted to test for the statistical significance of the correlation coefficients. The level of significance was set at .05.

Limitations

Most research studies have controlled and uncontrolled variables. Limitations are not within the control of the researcher but are identified because they "may have an effect on the interpretations of the findings or on the generalizability of the results" (Lunenburg & Irby, 2008, p. 133). The collected survey responses may not yield accurate data because of inaccurate recall or lack of information from the Horizon Award recipients. Not all participants respond to an electronic survey. Some email addresses were disabled and not working, and the Horizon Award Winner was not found on social media; therefore, the survey was not received. Every effort was taken to develop a survey tool that would take less than ten minutes to complete; some participants may have incomplete surveys by not having completed all items or failed to submit the survey. Therefore, data analysis was limited to those fully-completed and submitted response surveys.

Summary

Chapter 3 included explanations of the research design, selection of participants, measurement, and data collection procedures. Finally, the data analysis procedures for each of the twelve research questions were described as well as the limitations of the study. Chapter 4 includes the descriptive statistics and the results of the data analysis and hypothesis testing.

Chapter 4

Results

The purpose of this study was to determine perceptions of Horizon Award recipients regarding of the importance and frequency of cooperating teacher's characteristics (personal attributes, professionalism, teaching/instruction, and cooperating teacher/student teacher relationship). The second purpose of the study was to determine the extent there is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of cooperating teachers' characteristics and perceptions of the frequency cooperating teachers exhibited characteristics. This chapter contains the descriptive statistics and the results of the one-sample *t* tests and Pearson product moment correlation coefficients.

Descriptive Statistics

Five hundred twelve Horizon Award recipients have been recognized since 2003. The Characteristics of Effective Cooperating Teachers as Perceived by Kansas Horizon Award recipients survey link was sent to 623 email addresses. Six hundred twenty-three email addresses were attained by KSDE, of those email addresses, 509 were valid, 114 kicked back as invalid, and 6 opted out of the survey. Results were provided for the Horizon Award recipients surveyed (*N = 139*) in relation to the research questions presented in this study. Demographic information regarding gender, school level student teaching occurred, and current job status was requested as part of the survey. Of the 139 respondents, 138 provided demographic information. These participant demographics are shared in Table 2.

Table 2

Participant Demographics

	n	%
Gender		
Female	106	76.3
Male	32	23.0
Student Teaching School Level		
Elementary	79	57.3
Middle School	20	14.5
High School	39	28.3
Current Employment		
Elementary	62	44.6
Middle School	37	26.6
High School	33	23.7
District Office	0	0.0
Other	6	4.3

Note. No Response = 1

Hypothesis Testing

The emphasis of the study focused on 12 specific research questions. This section provides the research questions with corresponding hypotheses and a description of the analysis conducted for each hypothesis, and the results of the data analysis. A description of the type of test and statistical significance is provided.

RQ1. What are the perceptions of Horizon Award recipients regarding the importance of personal attributes of their cooperating teachers?

H1. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers being patient as being important or very important.

H2. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers being fair as being important or very important.

H3. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers being dependable/reliable as being important or very important.

H4. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers being cooperative as being important or very important.

H5. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers exhibited having a sense of humor as being important or very important.

H6. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers being caring as being important or very important.

H7. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers being respectful as being important or very important.

H8. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers being open-minded as being important or very important.

H9. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers being trustworthy as being important or very important.

H10. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers being organized as being important or very important.

Ten one-sample *t* tests were conducted to test H1-H10. The sample mean for the perceptions of the importance of each of the personal attributes was tested against a null value of 3. The level of significance was set at .05.

The results of each of the one-sample *t* tests that were used to test H1-H10 indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the reference value (3). The test statistic, degrees of freedom, *p* value, sample mean, and sample standard deviation are included in Table 3. H1-H10 were supported. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers being patient, fair, dependable/reliable, cooperative, humorous, caring, respectful, open-minded, trustworthy, and organized as being important or very important.

Table 3

Hypothesis Test Results and Descriptive Statistics H1-H10

Hypothesis	*t*	*df*	*p*	*M*	*SD*
1	34.981	138	.000	4.590	0.536
2	23.925	137	.000	4.406	0.690
3	42.367	137	.000	4.746	0.484
4	39.681	137	.000	4.703	0.504
5	11.866	138	.000	3.842	0.836
6	28.571	138	.000	4.525	0.629
7	42.878	137	.000	4.754	0.480
8	26.013	138	.000	4.432	0.649
9	39.190	138	.000	4.691	0.509
10	19.432	138	.000	4.173	0.711

RQ2. What are the perceptions of Horizon Award recipients regarding the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited the personal attributes?

H11. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited being patient as often or always.

H12. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited being fair as often or always.

H13. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited being dependable/reliable as often or always.

H14. Kansas Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited being cooperative as often or always.

H15. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited having a sense of humor as often or always.

H16. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited being caring as often or always.

H17. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited being respectful as often or always.

H18. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited being open-minded as often or always.

H19. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited being trustworthy as often or always.

H20. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited being organized as often or always.

Ten one-sample *t* tests were conducted to test H11-H20. The sample mean for the perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited each of the personal attributes was tested against a null value of 3. The level of significance was set at .05.

The results of each of the one-sample *t* tests that were used to test H11-H20 indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the reference value (3). The test statistic, degrees of freedom, *p* value, sample mean, and sample standard deviation are included in Table 4. H11-H20 were supported. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited the personal attributes of being patient, fair, dependable/reliable, cooperative, humorous, caring, respectful, open-minded, trustworthy, and organized as being often or always.

Table 4

Hypothesis Test Results and Descriptive Statistics H11-H20

Hypothesis	*t*	*df*	*p*	*M*	*SD*
11	18.426	138	.000	4.273	0.815
12	20.697	138	.000	4.374	0.783
13	21.653	138	.000	4.489	0.811
14	15.891	136	.000	4.328	0.979
15	12.245	138	.000	4.086	1.046
16	19.808	138	.000	4.396	0.831
17	22.394	137	.000	4.514	0.794
18	12.912	138	.000	4.122	1.025
19	23.312	138	.000	4.547	0.782
20	14.410	138	.000	4.194	0.977

RQ3. To what extent is there a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers' personal attributes and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited the personal attributes?

H21. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers being patient and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited being patient.

H22. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers being fair and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited being fair.

H23. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers being dependable/reliable and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited being dependable/reliable.

H24. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers being cooperative and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited being cooperative.

H25. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers exhibited having a sense of humor and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited having a sense of humor.

H26. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers being caring and the perceptions of their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited being caring.

H27. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers being respectful and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited being respectful.

H28. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers being open-minded and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited being open-minded.

H29. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers being trustworthy and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited being trustworthy.

H30. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers being organized and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited being organized.

Ten Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were calculated to index the strength and direction of the relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers' personal attributes and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited the personal attributes. Ten one-sample *t* tests were conducted to test for the statistical significance of the correlation coefficients. The level of significance was set at .05.

Table 5 contains the correlation, degrees of freedom, and *p* value for each of the tests for H21-H30. The results of the hypothesis tests indicated that two correlations were statistically significant. The correlation coefficient ($r = .223$), calculated and tested for H25, provided evidence for a moderately strong positive relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers having a sense of humor and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited having a sense of humor. The correlation coefficient ($r = .355$) calculated and tested for H29 provided evidence for a moderately strong positive relationship between

Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers being trustworthy and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited being trustworthy. H25 and H29 were supported. The other hypotheses were not supported.

Table 5

Correlations and Hypothesis Test Results H21-H30

Hypothesis	*r*	*df*	*p*
21	.059	137	.487
22	.034	136	.693
23	.074	136	.388
24	.104	134	.228
25	.223	137	.008**
26	.140	137	.100
27	.122	135	.155
28	.094	137	.269
29	.355	137	.000***
30	.118	137	.166

Note. †$p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$

RQ4. What are the perceptions of Horizon Award recipients regarding the importance of the professionalism of their cooperating teachers?

H31. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers loving their jobs as being important or very important.

H32. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers exhibiting a positive attitude as being important or very important.

H33. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers exhibiting professionalism as being important or very important.

H34. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers serving as a good role model for them as a prospective teacher as being important or very important.

H35. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers demonstrating knowledge of school policies as being important or very important.

H36. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers establishing working relationships with administrators as being important or very important.

H37. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers establishing positive community relations as being important or very important.

H38. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers having good interpersonal skills as being important or very important.

H39. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers communicating effectively as being important or very important.

H40. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers being recognized by other teachers and administrators as a good faculty member at their school as being important or very important.

Ten one-sample *t* tests were conducted to test H31-H40. The sample mean for the perceptions of the importance of each professionalism characteristic was tested against a null value of 3. The level of significance was set at .05.

The results of each of the one-sample *t* tests that were used to test H31-H40 indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the reference value (3). The test statistic, degrees of freedom, *p* value, sample mean, and sample standard deviation are included in Table 6. H31-H40 were supported. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers loving their jobs, exhibiting a positive attitude, exhibiting professionalism**,** serving as a good role model for them as a prospective teacher, demonstrating knowledge of school policies, establishing working relationships with administrators, establishing positive community relations, having good interpersonal skills, communicating effectively, and being recognized by other teachers and administrators as a good faculty member at their school as being important or very important.

Table 6

Hypothesis Test Results and Descriptive Statistics H31-H40

Hypothesis	*t*	*df*	*p*	*M*	*SD*
31	29.377	138	.000	4.511	0.606
32	41.604	138	.000	4.712	0.485
33	38.137	138	.000	4.691	0.523
34	41.166	138	.000	4.763	0.505
35	21.251	138	.000	4.324	0.734
36	18.481	138	.000	4.187	0.757
37	11.671	138	.000	3.928	0.937
38	30.982	138	.000	4.496	0.569
39	39.190	138	.000	4.691	0.509
40	23.203	138	.000	4.324	0.673

RQ5. What are the perceptions of Horizon Award recipients regarding the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited professionalism?

H41. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited loving their jobs as often or always.

H42. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited a positive attitude as often or always.

H43. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited professionalism as often or always.

H44. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers served as a role model for them as a prospective teacher as often or always.

H45. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers demonstrated knowledge of school policies as often or always.

H46. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited a working relationship with administrators as often or always.

H47. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers established positive community relations as often or always.

H48. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited good interpersonal skills as often or always.

H49. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers communicated effectively as often or always.

H50. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers were recognized by other teachers and administrators as a good faculty member at their school as often or always.

Ten one-sample *t* tests were conducted to test H41-H50. The sample mean for the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited each professionalism characteristic was tested against a null value of 3. The level of significance was set at .05.

For survey question 3, the item that measures the frequency that cooperating teachers established working relationships with administrators was excluded from the data collection. Therefore, the hypothesis test for H46 was not conducted. The results of each of the one-sample *t* tests that were used to test H41-H45 and H47-H50 indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the reference value (3). The test statistic, degrees of freedom, *p* value, sample mean, and sample standard deviation are included in Table 7. H41-H45 and H47-H50 were supported. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited loving their jobs, exhibited a positive attitude, exhibited professionalism**,** served as a good role model for them as a prospective teacher, demonstrated knowledge of school policies, established working relationships with administrators, established positive community relations, exhibited having good interpersonal skills, communicated effectively, and were recognized by other teachers and administrators as a good faculty member at their school as being often or always.

Table 7

Hypothesis Test Results and Descriptive Statistics H41-H45 and H47-H50

Hypothesis	*t*	*df*	*p*	*M*	*SD*
41	18.314	135	.000	4.176	0.749
42	18.609	137	.000	4.188	0.750
43	19.324	137	.000	4.341	0.815
44	17.272	137	.000	4.333	0.907
45	20.134	137	.000	4.377	0.803
46	[a]N/A	[a]N/A	[a]N/A	[a]N/A	[a]N/A
47	11.297	136	.000	4.000	1.036
48	15.432	136	.000	4.212	0.919
49	14.999	137	.000	4.225	0.959
50	15.259	137	.000	4.210	0.932

Note. [a]N/A = data was not available

RQ6. To what extent is there a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers' professionalism and their perceptions of the frequency cooperating teachers exhibited professionalism?

H51. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers loving their jobs and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited loving their jobs.

H52. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers exhibiting a positive attitude and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited a creative attitude.

H53. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers exhibiting professionalism and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited professionalism.

H54. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers serving as a good role model for them as a prospective teacher and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers served as good role model for them as a prospective teacher.

H55. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers demonstrating knowledge of school policies and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited knowledge of school policies.

H56. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers establishing working relationships with administrators and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited working relationships with administrators.

H57. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers establishing positive community relations and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers established positive community relations.

H58. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers exhibited having good interpersonal skills and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited good interpersonal skills.

H59. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers communicating effectively and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited communicating effectively.

H60. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers being recognized by other teachers and administrators as a good faculty member at their school and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers were recognized by other teachers and administrators as a good faculty member at their school.

For survey question 3, the item that measures the frequency that cooperating teachers established working relationships with administrators was excluded from the data collection. Therefore, the hypothesis test for H56 was not conducted. Therefore, nine Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were calculated to index the strength and direction of the relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers' professionalism and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited professionalism. Nine one-sample *t* tests were conducted to test for the statistical significance of the correlation coefficients. The level of significance was set at .05.

Table 8 contains the correlation, degrees of freedom, and *p* value for each of the tests for H51-H55 and H57-H60. The results of the hypothesis tests indicated that four correlations were statistically significant. The correlation coefficient (r = .207) calculated and tested for H51 provided evidence for a moderately strong positive relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their

cooperating teachers loving their jobs and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited loving their jobs. The correlation coefficient (r = .290) calculated and tested for H55 provided evidence for a moderately strong positive relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers demonstrated knowledge of school policies and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers demonstrated knowledge of school policies. The correlation coefficient (r = .295) calculated and tested for H57 provided evidence for a moderately strong positive relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers establishing positive community relations and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers established positive community relations. The correlation coefficient (r = .195) calculated and tested for H60 provided evidence for a moderately strong positive relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers being recognized by other teachers and administrators as a good faculty member at their school and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers were recognized by other teachers and administrators as a good faculty member at their school. The results of the hypothesis tests also indicated that one of the correlations was marginally significant. The correlation coefficient (r = .159) calculated and tested for H54 provided evidence for a moderately strong positive relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers serving as a good role model for them as a prospective teacher and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers served as a good role model for them as a prospective teacher. H51, H54, H55, H57, and H60 were supported. The other hypotheses were not supported.

Table 8

Correlations and Hypothesis Test Results H51-H60

Hypothesis	*r*	*df*	*p*
51	.207	134	.016*
52	.031	136	.720
53	.097	136	.097
54	.159	136	.063†
55	.290	136	.001**
56	[a]N/A	[a]N/A	[a]N/A
57	.295	135	.000***
58	.121	135	.160
59	.114	136	.182
60	.195	136	.022*

Note. [a]N/A = data was not available

†$p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$

RQ7. What are the perceptions of Horizon Award recipients regarding the importance of the instruction characteristics of their cooperating teachers?

H61. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers exhibiting enthusiasm for the subject as being important or very important.

H62. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers demonstrating a thorough knowledge of the subject matter as being important or very important.

H63. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers possessing classroom management skills as being important or very important.

H64. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers enforcing a well-defined discipline policy as being important or very important.

H65. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers teaching effectively in the classroom as being important or very important.

Five one-sample *t* tests were conducted to test H61-H65. The sample mean for the perceptions of the importance of each instruction characteristic was tested against a null value of 3. The level of significance was set at .05.

The results of each of the one-sample *t* tests that were used to test H61-H65 indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the reference value (3). The test statistic, degrees of freedom, *p* value, sample mean, and sample standard deviation are included in Table 9. H61-H65 were supported. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers exhibiting enthusiasm for the subject, demonstrating thorough knowledge of the subject matter, possessing classroom management skills, enforcing a well-defined discipline policy, and teaching effectively in the classroom as being important or very important.

Table 9

Hypothesis Test Results and Descriptive Statistics H61-H65

Hypothesis	*t*	*df*	*p*	*M*	*SD*
61	29.475	137	.000	4.493	0.595
62	28.621	137	.000	4.478	0.607
63	54.792	137	.000	4.833	0.393
64	31.881	137	.000	4.594	0.587
65	45.511	137	.000	4.804	0.466

RQ8. What are the perceptions of Horizon Award recipients regarding the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited the instructional characteristics?

H66. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited enthusiasm for the subject as often or always.

H67. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers demonstrated a thorough knowledge of the subject matter as often or always.

H68. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited classroom management skills as often or always.

H69. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers enforced a well-defined discipline policy as often or always.

H70. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers taught effectively as often or always.

Five one-sample *t* tests were conducted to test H61-H65. The sample mean for the perceptions of the frequency cooperating teachers exhibited the instruction characteristics was tested against a null value of 3. The level of significance was set at .05.

The results of each of the one-sample *t* tests that were used to test H66-H70 indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the reference value (3). The test statistic, degrees of freedom, *p* value, sample mean, and sample standard deviation are included in Table 10. H66-H70 were supported. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited enthusiasm for the subject, demonstrated thorough knowledge of the subject matter, possessed classroom

management skills, enforced a well-defined discipline policy, and taught effectively in the classroom as being often or always.

Table 10

Hypothesis Test Results and Descriptive Statistics H66-H70

Hypothesis	*t*	*df*	*p*	*M*	*SD*
66	18.474	137	.000	4.268	0.806
67	25.542	137	.000	4.514	0.697
68	22.003	137	.000	4.522	0.812
69	18.242	137	.000	4.428	0.919
70	20.682	137	.000	4.493	0.848

RQ9. To what extent is there a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of the instruction characteristics of their cooperating teachers and the perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited the instruction characteristics?

H71. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers exhibiting enthusiasm for the subject and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited enthusiasm for the subject.

H72. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers demonstrating a thorough knowledge of the subject matter and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited a thorough knowledge of the subject matter.

H73. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers possessing classroom management skills and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited classroom management skills.

H74. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers enforcing a well-defined discipline policy and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers enforced a well-defined discipline policy.

H75. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers teaching effectively in the classroom and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited teaching effectively in the classroom.

Five Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were calculated to index the strength and direction of the relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers' instructional characteristics and perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited the instruction characteristics. Five one-sample *t* tests were conducted to test for the statistical significance of the correlation coefficients. The level of significance was set at .05.

Table 11 contains the correlation, degrees of freedom, and *p* value for each of the tests for H71-H75. The results of the hypothesis tests indicated that five correlations were statistically significant. The correlation coefficient ($r = .240$) calculated and tested for H71 provided evidence for a moderately strong positive relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers exhibiting

enthusiasm for the subject and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited enthusiasm for the subject. The correlation coefficient (r = .260) calculated and tested for H72 provided evidence for a moderately strong positive relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers demonstrating a thorough knowledge of the subject matter and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited a thorough knowledge of the subject matter. The correlation coefficient (r = .320) calculated and tested for H73 provided evidence for a moderately strong positive relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers possessing classroom management skills and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited classroom management skills. The correlation coefficient (r = .324) calculated and tested for H74 provided evidence for a moderately strong positive relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers enforcing a well-defined discipline policy and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers enforced a well-defined discipline policy. The correlation coefficient (r = .246) calculated and tested for H75 provided evidence for a moderately strong positive relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers teaching effectively in the classroom and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited teaching effectively in the classroom. H71-H75 were supported.

Table 11

Correlations and Hypothesis Test Results H71-H75

Hypothesis	*r*	*df*	*p*
71	.240	136	.005**
72	.260	136	.002**
73	.320	136	.000***
74	.324	136	.000***
75	.246	136	.004**

Note. †$p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$

RQ10. What are the perceptions of Horizon Award recipients regarding the importance of the cooperating teacher/student teacher relationship?

H76. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers encouraging them as being important or very important.

H77. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers giving them the freedom to try things as being important or very important.

H78. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers turning classes over to them as being important or very important.

H79. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers supporting decisions made by them as being important or very important.

H80. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers helping them plan lessons and activities as being important or very important.

H81. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers routinely observing them as being important or very important.

H82. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers providing constructive feedback to them as being important or very important.

H83. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers providing a variety of experiences as being important or very important.

H84. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers assisting them when needed as being important or very important.

H85. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers treating them as a fellow professional as being important or very important.

H86. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers anticipating their needs as being important or very important.

H87. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers providing clear expectations to them as being important or very important.

H88. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers sharing resources with them as being important or very important.

H89. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers assisting them in finding a job as being important or very important.

Fourteen one-sample *t* tests were conducted to test H76-H89. The sample mean for the perceptions of the importance of each cooperating teacher/student teacher relationship characteristic was tested against a null value of 3. The level of significance was set at .05.

The results of each of the one-sample *t* tests that were used to test H76-H89 indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the reference value (3). The test statistic, degrees of freedom, *p* value, sample mean, and sample standard

deviation are included in Table 12. H76-H89 were supported. Horizon Award recipients perceive the importance of their cooperating teachers encouraging them, giving them freedom to try things, turning classes over to them, supporting decisions made by them, helping them plan lessons and activities, routinely observing them, providing constructive feedback to them, providing a variety of experiences for them, assisting them when needed, treating them as a fellow professional, anticipating their needs, providing clear expectations to them, sharing resources with them, and assisting them in finding a job as being important or very important.

Table 12

Hypothesis Test Results and Descriptive Statistics H76-H89

Hypothesis	*t*	*df*	*p*	*M*	*SD*
76	40.882	137	.000	4.681	0.483
77	32.364	137	.000	4.587	0.576
78	38.972	137	.000	4.710	0.515
79	35.742	137	.000	4.616	0.531
80	17.746	137	.000	4.225	0.811
81	23.436	137	.000	4.362	0.683
82	38.705	137	.000	4.725	0.523
83	28.782	137	.000	4.565	0.639
84	31.675	137	.000	4.587	0.589
85	34.522	137	.000	4.652	0.562
86	15.040	136	.000	4.044	0.812
87	29.618	137	.000	4.529	0.606
88	32.556	136	.000	4.599	0.575
89	4.414	137	.000	3.457	1.215

RQ11. What are the perceptions of Horizon Award recipients regarding the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited the cooperating teacher/student teacher relationship characteristics?

H90. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers encouraged them as often or always.

H91. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers gave them the freedom to try things as often or always.

H92. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers turned classes over to them as often or always.

H93. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers supported decisions made by them as often or always.

H94. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers helped them plan lessons and activities as often or always.

H95. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers routinely observed them as often or always.

H96. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers provided constructive feedback to them as often or always.

H97. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers provided a variety of experiences for them as often or always.

H98. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers assisted them when needed as often or always.

H99. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency of their cooperating teachers treated them as a fellow professional as often or always.

H100. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency of their cooperating teachers anticipated their needs as often or always.

H101. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers provided clear expectations to them as often or always.

H102. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers shared resources with them as often or always.

H103. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency of their cooperating teachers assisted them in finding a job for them as often or always.

Fourteen one-sample *t* tests were conducted to test H90-H103. The sample mean for perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited each cooperating teacher/student teacher relationship characteristics was tested against a null value of 3. The level of significance was set at .05.

The results of each of the one-sample *t* tests that were used to test H90-H102 indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the reference value (3). The results of the one sample *t* test that was used to test H103 indicated a marginally significant difference. The test statistic, degrees of freedom, *p* value, sample mean, and sample standard deviation are included in Table 13. H90-H103 were supported. Horizon Award recipients perceive the frequency their cooperating teachers encouraged them, gave them freedom to try things, turned classes over to them, supported decisions made by them, helped them plan lessons and activities, routinely observed them, provided constructive feedback to them, provided a variety of experiences for them, assisted them when needed, treated them as a fellow professional, anticipated their needs, provided clear expectations to them, shared resources with them, and assisted them in finding a job as being often or always.

Table 13

Hypothesis Test Results and Descriptive Statistics H90-H103

Hypothesis	*t*	*df*	*p*	*M*	*SD*
90	18.244	135	.000***	4.434	0.917
91	16.209	137	.000***	4.377	0.998
92	20.231	136	.000***	4.416	0.819
93	20.916	137	.000***	4.478	0.830
94	7.619	137	.000***	3.783	1.207
95	13.253	137	.000***	4.101	0.976
96	11.708	137	.000***	4.087	1.091
97	13.171	137	.000***	4.159	1.034
98	19.076	137	.000***	4.442	0.888
99	17.071	137	.000***	4.471	1.012
100	8.030	137	.000***	3.804	1.177
101	13.240	137	.000***	4.181	1.048
102	18.988	137	.000***	4.449	0.897
103	1.705	137	.090†	3.225	1.547

Note. †$p < .10$. *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$

RQ12. To what extent is there a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of the cooperating teacher/student teacher relationship and perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited the cooperating teacher/student teacher relationship characteristics?

H104. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers exhibiting encouragement to them and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers encouraged them.

H105. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers giving them the freedom to try things and perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers gave them the freedom to try things.

H106. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers turning classes over to them and the perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers turned classes over to them.

H107. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers supporting decisions made by them and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers supported decisions made by them.

H108. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers helping them plan lessons and activities and their perceptions of cooperating teachers exhibiting helping them plan lessons and activities and the perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers helped them plan.

H109. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers routinely observing them and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers routinely observed them.

H110. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers providing constructive feedback to them and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers provided constructive feedback to them.

H111. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers providing a variety of experiences for them and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers provided a variety of experiences for them.

H112. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers assisting them when needed and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers assisted them when needed.

H113. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers treating them as a fellow professional and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers treated them as a fellow professional.

H114. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers anticipating their needs and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers anticipated their needs.

H115. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers providing clear expectations to them and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers provided clear expectations to them.

H116. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers sharing resources with them and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers shared resources with them.

H117. There is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers assisting them in finding a job and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers assisted them in finding a job.

Fourteen Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were calculated to index the strength and direction of the relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of the cooperating teacher/student teacher relationship and perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited each of the cooperating teacher/student teacher relationship characteristics. Fourteen one-sample *t* tests were conducted to test for the statistical significance of the correlation coefficients. The level of significance was set at .05.

Table 14 contains the correlation, degrees of freedom, and *p* value for each of the tests for H104-H117. The results of the hypothesis tests indicated that eight correlations were statistically significant. The correlation coefficient ($r = .209$) calculated and tested for H105 provided evidence for a moderately strong positive relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers giving them the freedom to try things and perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers gave them the freedom to try things. The correlation coefficient ($r = .304$) calculated and tested for H107 provided evidence for a moderately strong positive relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers supporting decisions made by them and their perceptions of the

frequency their cooperating teachers supported decisions made by them. The correlation coefficient (r = .252) calculated and tested for H108 provided evidence for a moderately strong positive relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers helping them plan lessons and activities and their perceptions of cooperating teachers exhibiting helping them plan lessons and activities and the perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers helped them plan. The correlation coefficient (r = .284) calculated and tested for H109 provided evidence for a moderately strong positive relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers routinely observing them and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers routinely observed them. The correlation coefficient (r = .216) calculated and tested for H111 provided evidence for a moderately strong positive relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers providing a variety of experiences for them and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers provided a variety of experiences for them. The correlation coefficient (r = .256) calculated and tested for H114 provided evidence for a moderately strong positive relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers anticipating their needs and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers anticipated their needs. The correlation coefficient (r = .239) calculated and tested for H115 provided evidence for a moderately strong positive relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers providing clear expectations to them and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers provided clear expectations to them. The correlation

coefficient (r = .430) calculated and tested for H117 provided evidence for a moderately strong positive relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers assisting them in finding a job and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers assisted them in finding a job. The results of the hypothesis tests also indicated that one of the correlations was marginally significant. The correlation coefficient (r = .150) calculated and tested for H106 provided evidence for a moderately strong positive relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers turning classes over to them and the perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers turned classes over to them. The results of the hypothesis tests also indicated that one of the correlations was marginally significant. The correlation coefficient (r = .145) calculated and tested for H110 provided evidence for a moderately strong positive relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers providing constructive feedback to them and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers provided constructive feedback to them. The results of the hypothesis tests also indicated that one of the correlations was marginally significant. The correlation coefficient (r = .156) calculated and tested for H112 provided evidence for a moderately strong positive relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers assisting them when needed and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers assisted them when needed. The results of the hypothesis tests also indicated that one of the correlations was marginally significant. The correlation coefficient (r = .162) calculated and tested for H113 provided evidence for a moderately strong positive relationship

between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers treating them as a fellow professional and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers treated them as a fellow professional. H105-H115 and H117 were supported. The other hypotheses were not supported.

Table 14

Correlations and Hypothesis Test Results H104-H117

Hypothesis	*r*	*df*	*p*
104	.051	134	.552
105	.209	136	.014**
106	.150	135	.080†
107	.304	136	.000***
108	.252	136	.003**
109	.284	136	.001**
110	.145	136	.091†
111	.216	136	.011*
112	.156	136	.067†
113	.162	136	.058†
114	.256	135	.003**
115	.239	136	.005**
116	.135	135	.116
117	.430	136	.000***

Note. [a]N/A = data was not available

†$p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Summary

Chapter 4 included descriptive statistics and hypothesis testing related to characteristics of effective cooperating teachers as perceived by Kansas Horizon Award recipients. Results regarding relationships between the importance of cooperating teacher characteristics and how often those characteristics were exhibited by the cooperating teacher were provided. Participant demographics related to gender, school level student teaching occurred, and current employment status were also provided. Finally, results of the statistical analyses using *t*-test and Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were presented. Chapter 5 includes a summary of the study, findings related to the literature, and the conclusions.

Chapter 5

Interpretation and Recommendations

A challenge often faced by district and building leaders is how to identify and select the most effective and qualified cooperating teachers. Student teaching is structured to provide an opportunity for the pre-service teacher to learn with a cooperating teacher in the field with the purpose of preparing the student teacher to become an effective and independent teacher. Chapter 5 includes a study summary, findings related to the literature, and the conclusions.

Study Summary

Before educational leaders can select and retain the best cooperating teachers for pre-service teachers, they must know the characteristics needed to identify an effective and qualified cooperating teacher. The following section includes a summary of the key components of the study. An overview of the problem, which focused on Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of cooperating teacher's characteristics and the frequency the cooperating teacher exhibited each characteristic is presented. Also, the purpose statement and research questions, a review of the methodology, and major findings are included.

Overview of the problem. University supervisors, district leaders, and building principals are responsible for establishing the criteria for selecting and recruiting cooperating teachers. Because the cooperating teacher plays a critical role in the success of the pre-service teacher's student teaching experience, it is important to select the highest quality and qualified cooperating teachers. Universities lack consistency in the process of placement of pre-service teachers with cooperating teachers (Greenberg et al.,

2014; Zeichner, 2006). Direction or guidelines given to district-level leadership vary depending on the university requesting placement (D. Marx, personal communication, April 12, 2017). General universal guidelines require cooperating teachers to have taught three or more years in the profession, at the time of selection, be in a teaching position of the same subject as the endorsement being sought by the pre-service student (Wilson, & Floden, 2003). To increase the quality of the student teaching experience, universities and their public-school partners should play an active role in identifying qualified cooperating teachers by collecting meaningful information allowing the programs to confirm the skills of each cooperating teacher, rather than blindly leaving the selection in the hands of district and building leaders (Rickenbrode et al., 2018).

Purpose statement and research questions. Student teaching is structured to provide an opportunity for the pre-service teacher to learn with a cooperating teacher in the field with the purpose of preparing to become an effective and independent teacher. The first purpose of this study was to determine Horizon Award recipient perceptions of the importance of cooperating teacher's characteristics (personal attributes, professionalism, teaching/instruction, and cooperating teacher/student teacher relationship) and the frequency the cooperating teacher exhibited each characteristic. The second purpose of the study was to determine the extent there is a relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of cooperating teachers' characteristics and their characteristics of the frequency cooperating teachers exhibited the characteristics. Twelve research questions were posed, and 117 hypothesis were tested to address the purposes of the study.

Review of the methodology. A quantitative descriptive research design using survey data was used in this study. The population utilized in this study included all Horizon Award recipients from 2003 to 2018. The survey utilized in this study was adapted from Epps's (2010) cooperating teacher effectiveness study. The variables of interest were Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teacher's characteristics (personal attributes, professionalism, teaching/instruction, and cooperating teacher/student teacher relationship) and Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the frequency the cooperating teacher exhibited the characteristics. Multiple one-sample *t* tests and Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were conducted to address the research questions.

Major findings. After receiving 139 responses from the 504 Horizon Award recipients surveyed, the statistical analysis was conducted to address the RQs. RQ1-RQ3 focused on Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of all personal attributes of their cooperating teacher. Specifically, the findings related to RQ1 indicated personal attributes (humorous, trustworthy, patient, fair, dependable/reliable, cooperative, caring, open-minded, and organized) to be important or very important characteristics of cooperating teachers. The findings related to RQ2 indicated that the Horizon Award recipients indicated that their cooperating teachers exhibited these personal attributes during the student teaching internship often or always. The findings related to RQ3 provided evidence for a moderately strong positive relationship between Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of two of their cooperating teachers' personal attributes and their perceptions of the frequency their cooperating teachers exhibited each of those two attributes: having a sense of humor and being trustworthy.

RQ4-RQ6 focused on Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of their cooperating teacher's professionalism and loving their jobs, exhibiting a positive attitude, exhibiting professionalism**,** serving as a good role model for them as a prospective teacher, demonstrating knowledge of school policies, establishing working relationships with administrators, establishing positive community relations, having good interpersonal skills, communicating effectively, and being recognized by other teachers and administrators as a good faculty member at their school. Specifically, the findings related to RQ4 indicated the importance of all professional characteristics as being important or very important. The results of the data analysis for RQ5 indicated that cooperating teachers were exhibiting all the professionalism characteristics except established working relationships with administrators often or always. The item that measures the frequency that cooperating teachers established working relationships with administrators was excluded from the data collection. Therefore, the hypothesis test was not conducted. The findings related to RQ6 indicated a moderately strong positive relationship between the importance of and the frequency the cooperating teacher exhibited the following professionalism characteristics: loving their jobs, knowledge of school policy, establishing positive community relations, being recognized by other teachers and administrators as a good faculty member at their school. Though not statistically significant, a moderately strong positive relationship between the perceptions of the importance of and the frequency the cooperating teacher exhibited serving as a good role model was noted. There was no relationship between perceptions of the importance of and the frequency the cooperating teacher exhibited the remaining professionalism characteristics.

RQ7-RQ9 focused on Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of teaching and instruction (enthusiasm for the subject, thorough knowledge of the subject matter, classroom management skills, a well-defined discipline policy, taught effectively in the classroom) of their cooperating teacher. Specifically, the findings related to RQ7 indicated the perceptions of the importance of teaching and instruction characteristics as being important. The results of the data analysis of RQ8 indicated that their cooperating teachers exhibited each teaching and instructional characteristic often or always. The findings related to RQ9 indicated a moderately strong positive relationship between the perceptions of the importance of and the frequency the cooperating teacher exhibited all the teaching and instruction characteristics.

RQ10-RQ12 focused on Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of cooperating teacher and student teacher relationships (encouraged me, gave me freedom to try things, turned classes over to me, supported decisions made by me, helped me plan lessons and activities, routinely observed me, provided constructive feedback to me, provided a variety of experiences, assisted me when needed, treated me as a fellow professional, anticipated my needs, provided clear expectations, shared resources, assisted me in finding a job). Specifically, the findings related to RQ10 indicated the importance of all cooperating teacher and student teacher relationship characteristics as being important or very important. The results of the data analysis for RQ11 indicated perceptions of the frequency of their cooperating teachers exhibiting all of these characteristics; encouraged them, gave them freedom to try things, turned classes over to them, supported decisions made by them, helped them plan lessons and activities, routinely observed them, provided constructive feedback to them, provided a variety of experiences for them,

assisted them when needed, treated them as a fellow professional, anticipated their needs, provided clear expectations to them, shared resources with them, and with the exception of assisting them in finding a job. The data analysis for RQ12 did indicate the relationship between the importance of the characteristic as perceived by the award recipient and the frequency the award recipients cooperating teacher exhibited this characteristic as moderately strong in the areas of encouraged me, gave me freedom to try things, anticipated my needs, provided clear expectations, and shared resources.

Findings Related to the Literature

The current research explored Horizon Award recipient perceptions of the importance of cooperating teacher's characteristics (personal attributes, professionalism, teaching/instruction, and cooperating teacher/student teacher relationship) and perceptions of the frequency the cooperating teacher exhibited each characteristic. Little research existed regarding the relationship between the characteristics and the frequency those behaviors were exhibited by effective cooperating teachers. However, there is a breadth of research of perceptions of important characteristics of effective cooperating teachers (Blair et al, 1984; Connor & Killmer, 1995; Copeland, 1977; Cunningham & Allington, 1999; Epps, 2010; Hamilton, 1984; Kasperbauer& Roberts, 2007; Killian, & Wilkins, 2009; Lubell et al, 2017; Levine, 2006; Osunde, 1996; Pauli, 2006; Paulson, 2014; Platz, 1994; Roberts, 2006, 2009; Roberts & Dyer, 2004).

Kansas Horizon Award recipients perceived all personal attributes (humorous, trustworthy, patient, fair, dependable/reliable, cooperative, caring, open-minded, and organized) to be important or very important characteristics of cooperating teachers. Horizon award recipients also indicated that their cooperating teachers exhibited these

personal attributes during the student teaching internship often or always. There was a moderately strong positive relationship between the importance of the cooperating teacher having a sense of humor and the cooperating teacher exhibiting a sense of humor. There was also a moderately strong positive relationship between the importance of the cooperating teacher being trustworthy and the cooperating teacher exhibiting trustworthy behavior. The current findings related to personal characteristics either supported or were in contrast to previous research. The results of the current study were in contrast to the findings of Osunde (1996) who indicated a sense of humor was the least important personal characteristic for effective cooperating teachers to exhibit. The findings from the current study support the findings of Roberts (2006, 2009), Connor and Killmer (1995), Osunde (1996), Roberts and Dyer (2004), and Epps (2010) who identified being trustworthy and caring as important characteristics when selecting cooperating teachers. When developing a model of an effective cooperating teacher, Epps (2010) and Roberts (2009) identified being patient and dependable/reliable as the most important personal characteristics of effective cooperating teachers, which is supported by the findings of the current study. This study indicated organizational skills to be important or very important. Organizational skills and actions were supported and found as a trait defining effective cooperating teachers by Platz (1994), Connor and Killmer (1995), and Osunde (1996). The NCTQ (2018) indicated collaborative cooperating teachers to be most effective. However, the findings of the current study were in contrast to Roberts (2006) who listed organized as an unimportant quality for an effective cooperating teacher to have.

Next, the results of this study identified that Kansas Horizon Award recipients perceived all professional characteristics of effective cooperating teachers (loved his/her job, positive attitude, professionalism, a good role model, knowledge of school policies, working relationships with administrators, positive community relations, good interpersonal skills, communicated effectively, recognized by other teachers and administrators as a good faculty member at their school) as important or very important. Horizon award recipients also indicated that their cooperating teachers exhibited these professional characteristics during the student teaching internship often or always. The findings related to the professional characteristics were either supported or in contrast to past research. Loved his/her job, having a positive attitude, having knowledge of school policies and having working relationships with administrators were not characteristics evidenced to be important in any study. Professionalism was identified as being the most important characteristic in several studies and were supported by the findings of the current study. Professionalism was determined as an effective characteristic (Epps, 2010; NCTQ, 2018; Roberts, 2006) and was found to be not important by Roberts and Dyer (2004). Cooperating teachers being good role models to student teachers supported past studies (Epps, 2010; Lubell et al. 2017; Paulson, 2014). Not supported by the findings of the current study's findings, Connor and Killmer's (2005) study identified modeling best practice as unimportant to student teachers. The findings of the current study did not support Roberts (2006) who identified having good community relations and professionalism as unimportant. The current findings support effective communication as one of the most common characteristics of an effective cooperating teacher (Connor & Killmer, 1995; Killian, & Wilkins, 2009; Osunde, 1996; Roberts & Dyer, 2004, 2006).

The current study's findings support Paulson's findings in the areas of being a good role model, being recognized by other teachers, and being a good collaborator.

The results of the current study related Kansas Horizon Award recipient's perceptions of teaching and instruction (enthusiasm for the subject, thorough knowledge of the subject matter, classroom management skills, a well-defined discipline policy, taught effectively in the classroom) to be important or very important characteristics of cooperating teachers. Horizon award recipients also indicated that their cooperating teachers exhibited these teaching and instruction characteristics during the student teaching internship often or always. The findings of the current study related to personal characteristics either supported or were in contrast to previous research. The findings of this study support Osunde's (1996) results on the importance of cooperating teachers having enthusiasm. Several studies identified knowledge of subject matter as most impactful qualities identified in effective cooperating teachers (Lubell et al., 2017; Osunde, 1996; Paulson, 2014; Roberts & Dyer, 2004). Maintaining a positive classroom environment and is on the top of the list for effective cooperating teacher skills according to Killmer (1995), Platz (1994), and NCTQ (2018) and these findings are supported by the findings of the current study. The results of this study supported Osunde (1996) and Killian and Wilkins (2009) who found the most effective cooperating teachers addressed behaviors and corrected problems showing good behavior management skills. The findings of the current study did not support Epps (2010) who found classroom management and a well-defined discipline policy to be the least observed behaviors in the teaching and instruction model. The findings of this study support the findings of Epps (2010) and NCTQ (2018) in the area of teaching and instruction specifically teaching

effectively in the classroom, to be one of the most important skills an effective cooperating teacher can exhibit.

The current study indicated that Kansas Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of cooperating teacher and student teacher relationships (encouraged me, gave me freedom to try things, turned classes over to me, supported decisions made by me, helped me plan lessons and activities, routinely observed me, provided constructive feedback to me, provided a variety of experiences, assisted me when needed, treated me as a fellow professional, anticipated my needs, provided clear expectations, shared resources, assisted me in finding a job) to be important or very important characteristics of cooperating teachers. Horizon Award recipients also indicated that their cooperating teachers exhibited these cooperating teacher and student teacher relationship characteristics during the student teaching internship often or always. The results of the current study did not support Kasperbauer and Roberts (2007) who found the relationship between cooperating teacher and student teacher to be the least important of all characteristics exhibited by effective cooperating teachers. Kasperbauer and Roberts (2007) found that both student teachers and cooperating teachers rated the relationship between cooperating and student teachers as least important. Five studies (Connor & Killmer, 1995' Epps, 2010; Kasperbauer & Roberts, 2007; Pangle, 2004; Roberts & Dyer, 2004) were supported by the findings of the current study in which, student teachers identified being allowed the freedom to try new things as a most important characteristic for an effective cooperating teacher. Student teachers found having a cooperating teacher that could give up control and turn the classroom over to them as being effective (Epps, 2010; Killian, & Wilkins, 2009; Paulson, 2014; Roberts, 2006). In the relationship

construct, the findings related to assisting student teacher with planning and instruction supported three studies (Pangle, 2004; Paulson, 2014; Roberts & Dyer, 2004) and was in contrast to Kasperbauer and Roberts (2007) and Epps (2010). Willingness to work with student teachers is one of six important characteristics identified by Platz's (1994) study. The findings of the current study supported five studies in confirming that effective cooperating teachers who observe, provide feedback, and have good communication skills are the most effective (Connor & Killmer, 1995; Epps, 2010; Killian, & Wilkins,2009); NCTQ, 2018; Pangle, 2004; Platz, 1994; Roberts, 2006). However, the findings of this study were in contrast to two studies and rated constructive feedback and routinely observing student teachers as unimportant (Kasperbauer & Roberts, 2007; Osunde, 1996). Several studies were supported by the finding of this study that sharing resources and supporting decisions made by student teachers are characteristics of effective cooperating teachers (Connor & Killmer, 1995; Kasperbauer & Roberts, 2007; Epps, 2010; Paulson, 2014; NCTQ, 2018). The results of this study were in contrast to Roberts (2007) as his study listed freedom to try new things as unimportant. The findings of the current study supported Epps (2010) who concluded assisting in finding a job were the least important of all characteristics.

Conclusions

This section summarizes conclusions drawn from the study of Horizon Award recipients' perceptions of the importance of cooperating teachers' characteristics and perceptions of the frequency cooperating teachers exhibited characteristics. Implications for action are included as well as recommendations for future research. Finally, concluding remarks are also provided in this section.

Implications for action. The findings of this study provided many implications for action, particularly for universities and school districts. A need exists for university and district leaders to determine and establish a clear process and plan for the selection of cooperating teachers. Tailored student teaching internship processes should be collectively agreed upon and clearly communicated prior to the partnership between the university and district.

Results from the study could be utilized in the selection of cooperating teachers based on cooperating teacher's characteristics (personal attributes, professionalism, teaching/instruction, and cooperating teacher/student teacher relationship). University and school leaders could establish a checklist of the important characteristics of effective cooperating teachers for university and district leaders, who are responsible for selecting of cooperating teachers, to use when determining who should be placed in a cooperating teacher role. District leaders should collectively establish guidelines for their district related to the selection, placement, and professional development of cooperating teachers based on the perceptions of effective characteristics of cooperating teachers. Next, based on those guidelines a mandatory professional development plan should be established. Required professional development sessions specifically created for cooperating teachers should be planned and scheduled before, during, and after the student teaching internship. The sessions should have a focus on reinforcing those effective qualities, mentoring, communication, expectations, and feedback. After that, meetings for pre-service and cooperating teachers should be scheduled before, during, and after the student teaching internship for both cooperating teacher and pre-service teacher to attend. These steps should be determined and clearly communicated between district and university leaders

before the selection and might better establish a process allowing university leaders, district leaders, pre-service teachers, and cooperating teachers to understand the desired characteristics better. University leaders should require pre-service teachers and cooperating teachers to participate in a course clearly outlining the expectations of the student teaching internship experience and how to clearly communicate their needs and how to clearly give feedback based on the expectations predetermined guidelines.

Recommendations for future research. The main purpose of this study was to analyze the perceptions of Horizon Award recipients regarding effective characteristics of cooperating teachers. This study was intended to assist university and district leaders in determining the effective characteristics of cooperating teachers resulting in setting guidelines for the selection and placement of effective cooperating teachers. Researchers in other states could replicate this study with first-year teachers who are award recipients or current pre-service teachers during their internships to determine if the results of this study would be similar.

Additional research could be conducted to evaluate the survey items to determine if scores could be calculated for the importance of the personal attributes, professionalism, teaching/instruction, and cooperating teacher/student teacher relationship. The validity and reliability of the scores could be examined. Similarly, the frequency the characteristics were exhibited items could be evaluated for the validity and reliability of a scale score measurement. Data from the current study could be supplemented by additional administrations of the survey to increase the sample size.

The current research only included a quantitative design. Therefore, qualitative research could be conducted to determine what other cooperating teacher characteristics

or behaviors that student teachers consider to be important or effective in the student teaching internship process. Additionally, the perceptions of student teachers could be compared to those of the cooperating teachers and university supervisors.

Further study could be conducted to determine whether the relationship between the pre-service teacher and cooperating teacher continued after the student teaching experience. The relationships between cooperating teachers evolve and change before, during, and after the student teaching internship. The cooperating teacher and pre-service teacher could be surveyed before, during, and after the student teaching experience to determine if a change occurred over time.

Other areas for continued research are to survey other stakeholders such as cooperating teachers, university leaders, and building leaders. A survey could be designed to determine perceptions of an effective cooperating. Additionally, student teacher and cooperating teacher feedback could be collected during or directly concluding the student teaching internship to determine the characteristics of an effective cooperating teacher.

Concluding remarks. The selection of cooperating teachers has long been a challenge for district and university leaders. As past research has indicated the teacher is the single most important indicator of an effective learning environment (Copeland, 1977; Cunningham & Allington, 1999), the cooperating teacher is the single most important factor in the student teaching experience according to pre-service teachers (Connor & Killmer, 1995). Now having this insight, district and university leaders can utilize the effective characteristics of cooperating teachers when setting guidelines for the selection and placement of effective cooperating teachers and providing professional

development to ensure effective cooperating teachers are selected and supported throughout the process.

References

Angus, D. (2001). *Professionalism and the public good: A brief history of teacher certification.* Retrieved from http://edex.s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/publication/pdfs/angus_7.pdf

Baratz-Snowden, J. (1990, August/September). Research news and comments: The NBPTS begins its research and development program. *Educational Researcher, 19*(6), 19-24. Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ417593)

Blair, T. R., David, D., & Bacharach, N. (1984). *Clinical indicators of effective cooperating teachers.* Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED263064.pdf

Burke, P., & Krey, R. (2005). *Supervision: A guide to instructional leadership* (2nd ed.). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas Publisher.

Carnegie Foundation Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). *A nation prepared*: *Teachers for the 21st century*. Report of the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED 268120)

Cochran-Smith, M. (1991). Reinventing student teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 42*, 104-118. doi:10.1177/002248719104200204.

Coleman, E. (1945). The supervisory visit. *Educational Leadership*, *2*(4), 164–167. Retrieved from http://www.ascd.org/ASCD/pdf/journals/ed_lead/el_194501_coleman.pdf

Connor, K., & Killmer, N. (1995, October). *Evaluation of cooperating teacher effectiveness*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Education Research Association, Chicago, IL. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED 394 950)

Copeland, W. D. (1977). Some of the factors related to student teacher classroom performance following microteaching. *American Educational Research Journal, 4*(2), 147-157. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312014002147

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation. (2016). *History of CAEP*. Retrieved from http://www.ncate.org/about/history

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative & quantitative approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications,

Cunningham, P. M., & Allington, R. L. (1999). *Classrooms that work: They can all read and write*. New York, NY: Addison-Wesley Educational Publishers.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Baratz-Snowden, J. (2005). A *good teacher in every classroom: Preparing highly qualified teachers our children deserve*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Dede, C. (2009). *Comparing frameworks for "21st century skills."* Retrieved from http://www.watertown.k12.ma.us/dept/ed_tech/research/pdf/ChrisDede.pdf

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York, NY: Macmillan.

Dewey, J. (1981). *The philosophy of John Dewey* (J. McDermott, Ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Edwards, J. R. (2009). *E. E. Hirsch Jr.: The twentieth century's liberal conservative educator*. Retrieved from http://www.visionandvalues.org/docs/Edwards_Hirsch_Twentieth_Century_s_Lieral_Conservitave_Educator.pdf

Elliot, E. (1996). What performance-based standards mean for teacher preparation. *Educational Leadership, 53*(4), 57-58. Retrieved from http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational_leadership/mar96/vol53/num06/What_Performance-Based_Standards_Mean_for_Teacher_Preparation.aspx

Epps, R. B. (2010). *Cooperating teacher effectiveness as perceived by student teachers and cooperating teachers in Ohio agricultural education.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3429655)

Giordano, G. (2004). *Wartime schools: How World War II changed American education*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Goldhammer, R. (1969). *Clinical supervision: Special methods for the supervision of teachers*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Greenberg, J., McKee, A., & Walsh, K. (2013). *Teacher prep preview: Review of the nations teacher preparation programs*. Retrieved from https://www.nctq.org/dmsView/Teacher_Prep_Review_2013_Report

Greenberg, J., Putman, H., & Walsh, K. (2014). *Training our future teachers: Classroom management*. Retrieved from https://www.nctq.org/dmsView/Future_Teachers_Classroom_Management_NC_Report

Hamilton, G. J. (1984). *Actual and ideal roles functions of elementary cooperating teachers as perceived by university supervisors, student teachers, cooperating teachers, and principals*. (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 8504671)

Harlin, J. F., Edwards, M. C., & Briers, G. E. (2002). A comparison of student teachers' perceptions of important elements of the student teaching experience before and after an 11-week field experience. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 43*(3), 72-83. Retrieved from https://pdfs.semanticsholar.org/89aa/d00b1c4cf71852b692d700a0382472adede.pdf

Heise, M. M. (1994). *Goals 2000:* Educate America Act: The federalization and legalization of educational policy. *Fordham Law Review, 63*, 345. Retrieved from http://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/flr/vol63/iss2/2

Henry, M. A., & Weber, A., (2010). *Supervising student teachers*. New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield Education. Retrieved from https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=VZPCAAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PR5&dq=Henry+Weber+2010+student+teaching&ots=zTlGADfFE6&sig=gX_VaPIXH7Fc2opbEHHhv_7i8Us#v=onepage&q=Henry%20Weber%202010%20student%20teaching&f=true

Hinsdale, B. A. (1898). *Horace Mann and the Common School revival in the United States*. New York, NY: C. Scribner's Sons

History.com Editors. (2010). *G.I. Bill*. Retrieved from http://www.history.com/topics/world-war-ii/gi-bill

Holmes Group. (1986). *Tomorrows teachers*: *A report of the Holmes Group*. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED270454)

Hosford, P. L. (1984). *Using what we know about teaching*. Retrieved from https://books.google.com/books?id=hUCcAAAAMAAJ.

Hunter, M. (1973). *Appraising the instructional process*. Paper presented at Annual Conference of California Advisory Council of Educational Research (25th, November 29, 1973) Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED139792)

Kanigel, R. (2005). *The one best way: Frederick Winslow Taylor and the enigma of efficiency.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Kansas State Department of Education (2016). *Kansas Horizon Award Program*. Retrieved from http://www.ksde.org/Agency/Fiscal-and-AdministrativeServiecs/Communications-and-Recognition-Programs/Kansas-Horizon-AwardProgram

Kansas State Department of Education (2018). *Kansas K-12 Report Generator*. Retrieved from https://datacentral.ksde.org/report_gen.aspx

Kasperbauer, H., & Roberts, T., (2007). *Changes in student teacher perceptions of the student teacher-cooperating teacher relationship throughout the student teaching semester*. Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ840065)

Katz, L. (1974). Issues and problems in teacher education. In B. Spodek (Ed.), *Teacher education of the teacher, by the teacher, for the child* (pp. 55- 66). Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Killian, J. E., & Wilkins, E. A. (2009). Characteristics of highly effective cooperating teachers: A study of their backgrounds and preparation. *Action in Teacher Education, 30*(4), 67-83. ISSN: 0162-6620

Kramer, P. (2003). The ABC's of professionalism [Electronic version]. *Kappa Delta Pi Record, 40*(1). 22-25. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ787753.pdf

Leedy, P. D., & Ormrod, J. E. (2010). *Practical research: Planning and design* (9th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall

Levine, A. (September 2006). *Educating school teachers.* Washington, DC: The Education Schools Project.

Lingwall, J. (2014). *An Economic History of Compulsory Attendance and Child Labor Laws in the United States, 1810, 1926.* Retrieved from https://www.cmu.edu/tepper/programs/phd/program/assets/dissertations/2014-joint-phd-program-economics-and-public-policy-lingwall-dissertation.pdf

Lubell, S., Drake, G., & Putman, H. (May 2017). *Landscapes in teacher prep: Undergraduate secondary.* National Council on Teacher Quality. Retrieved from https://www.nctq.org/dmsView/Landscapes_-_2017_UG_Secondary

Lunenburg, F. C., & Irby, B. J. (2008). *Writing a successful thesis or dissertation: Tips and strategies for students in the social and behavioral sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Marzano, R. J., Frontier, T., & Livingston, D. (2011). *Effective supervision: Supporting the art and science of teaching*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

McIntyre, D. J., & Byrd, D. M. (1998). *Strategies for career-long teacher education.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Melchoir, W. (1950). *Instructional supervision: A guide to modern practice*. Boston, MA: Heath.

National Center for Teacher Quality. (2016, December). *Teacher prep review: Undergraduate elementary education*. Retrieved from https://www.nctq.org/publications/Teacher-Prep-Review:-UndergraduateElementary-Education

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2008). *Professional standards for the accreditation of teacher preparation institutions.* Retrieved from http://www.ncate.org/~/media/Files/caep/accreditation-resources/ncate-standards-2008.pdf?la=en

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (1991). *Toward high and rigorous standards for the teaching profession. Initial policies and perspectives of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.* (3rd ed.). Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED337440)

Okafor, P. (2012). *Leadership in instructional supervision.* Retrieved from http://patrick okafor.com/files/ClinicalSupervision.pdf

Office of Special Education Programs. (1999) *Twenty-five years of progress in educating children with disabilities through IDEA*. Retrieved from https://www2.ed.gov/policy/speced/leg/idea/history.pdf

Osunde, E. (1996). The effect on student teachers of the teaching behaviors of cooperating teachers. *Education, 116*(4), 1-7. Retrieved from EBSCOhost http://web.a.ebscohost.com.bakeru.idm.oclc.org/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=2&sid=3d4cfaf7-5875-4b19-a810-baa9eddd9000%40sessionmgr4006

Pajak, E. (2001). Clinical supervision in a standards-based environment*: Opportunities and challenges*. *Journal of Teacher Education, 52*(3), 233-43. Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ625732)

Pangle, M. A. (2004). *Student teachers' perceptions of cooperating teachers* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 3158445)

Pauli, C. (2006). *Pre-Service teacher dispositions: A preliminary investigation of the perceptions of student teachers, university supervisors, and cooperating teaches after the student teaching experience*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 3223878)

Paulson, D. M. (2014). *Perceptions of cooperating teachers concerning the student teaching field experience.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1258&context=etd

Phipps, D. G. (1966). A challenge for the supervisor. *Educational Leadership, 23*(8). 630-633. Retrieved from http://www.ascd.org/ASCD/pdf/journals/ed_lead/el_196605_phipps.pdf

Platz, D. (1994). Criteria for selecting cooperating teachers: Views of pre-student teachers, student teachers, and cooperating teachers. *Education, 115*(2), 1- 7. Retrieved from bakeru.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=9502235050&site=ehost-live.

Pomerance, L., Greenberg, J., & Walsh, K. (2016). *Learning about learning*: *What every new teacher needs to know.* Retrieved from https://www.nctq.org/dmsView/Learning_About_Learning_Report

Quirk, T. J., Written, B. J., & Weinberg, S. F. (1972). *A critical review of research related to the National Teacher Examinations*. Retrieved from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/j.2333-8504.1972.tb00440.x

Ravitch, D. (2003). *A brief history of teacher professionalism.* White House Conference on Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers. Retrieved from https://www2.ed.gov/print/admins/tchrqual/learn/preparingteachersconference/ravitch.html

Ravitch, D. (2007). *Edspeak: A glossary of education terms, phrases, buzzwords, and jargon*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Reese, W. J. (2011). *America's public schools.* Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Rickenbrode, R., Drake, G., Pomerance, L., & Walsh, K. (2018). *Teacher prep review*. Retrieved from https://www.nctq.org/publications/2018-Teacher-Prep-Review

Roberts, T. G. (2006). Developing a model of cooperating teacher effectiveness. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 47*(3) 1-13. Retrieved from http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.494.8987&rep1&type=pdfR

Roberts, T. G., & Dyer, J. E. (2004). Characteristics of effective agriculture teachers. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 45*(4), 82-95.doi:10.5032/jae.2004.04082

Roberts, T., Greiman, B., Murphy, T., Ricketts, J., & Harlin, J. (2009). Changes in student teachers' intention to teach during student teaching. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 50*(4), 134-145. Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ871231)

Roth, D., & Swail, S. (2000). *Certification and teacher preparation in the United States*. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED450082)

Schleicher, A. (2012), *Preparing teachers and developing school leaders for the 21st Century: Lessons from around the world*, Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264174559-en.

Summary of the Improving America's Schools Act. *Education Week.* (November 9, 1994). Retrieved from https://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/1994/11/09/10asacht.h14.html

Sutcher, L., Darling-Hammond, L., & Carver-Thomas, D. (2016). *Coming crisis in teaching Teachers: Supply, demand, and shortages in the U.S.* (Research Brief). Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute. Retrieved from https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/A_Coming_Crisis_in_Teaching_BRIEF.pdf

Sniegoski, S. (1988). *The department of education (know your government).* New York, NY: Chelsea House.

Swearingen, M. (1946). Looking at supervision. *Educational Leadership, 3*(4), 146–151. Retrieved from http://www.ascd.org/ASCD/pdf/journals/ed_lead/ed_194601_swearingen.pdf

Taylor, F. W. (1911). *The principles of scientific management*. Reprinted 2007, Sioux Falls, SD: NuVision. Retrieved from https://archive.org/details/principlesofscie00taylrich

Tracy, S. (1995, May/June). How historical concepts of supervision relate to supervisory practices today. *The Clearing House, 68*(5), 320–324. Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ506363)

Triano, S. L. (2000). Categorical eligibility for special education: The enshrinement of the medical model in disability Policy. *Disability Studies Quarterly, 20*(4). Retrieved from http://dsq-sds.org/article/download/263/276

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services. (2010). *Thirty-five years of progress in educating children with disabilities through IDEA*. Retrieved from https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/osers/idea35/history/idea-35-history.pdf

Voskuil, S. J. (1999) *A Nation at Risk: Commission members' perceptions and appraisals fifteen years later* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 9929170)

Wang, J., Lin, E., Spalding, E., Klecka, C. L., & Odell, S. J. (2011). Quality teaching and teacher education: A kaleidoscope of notions. *Journal of Teacher Education, 62*(4), 331-338. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487111409551

Wilson, A. J., (1986). *Historical issues of validity and validation: The National Teacher Examinations.* Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED270503).

Wilson, S., & Floden, R. (2003). *Creating effective teachers: Concise answers for hard questions. An addendum to the report "Teacher preparation research: Current knowledge, gaps, and recommendations."* Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED476366)

Zeichner, K. (2006). Studying teacher education programs: Enriching and enlarging the inquiry. In C. F. Conrad & R. C. Serlin. (Eds.), *The Sage handbook for research in education*. (pp. 79-94). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications

Appendices

Appendix A: Characteristics of Effective Cooperating Teachers Survey

Characteristics of Effective Cooperating Teachers as Perceived by Kansas Horizon Award Winners

Part I: Characteristics of the Cooperating Teacher

1. **Personal Attributes and Characteristics**

Please check your response to the following statements regarding the characteristics you feel are important for a cooperating teacher and how often the characteristic was demonstrated by your cooperating teacher.

How important is the characteristic?

	Unimportant	Of Little Importance	Moderately Important	Important	Very Important
Patient	○	○	○	○	○
Fair	○	○	○	○	○
Dependable/reliable	○	○	○	○	○
Cooperative	○	○	○	○	○
Sense of Humor	○	○	○	○	○
Caring	○	○	○	○	○
Respectful	○	○	○	○	○
Open-minded	○	○	○	○	○
Trustworthy	○	○	○	○	○
Organized	○	○	○	○	○

2. How often did your cooperating teacher exhibit the characteristics?

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
Patient	○	○	○	○	○
Fair	○	○	○	○	○
Dependable/reliable	○	○	○	○	○
Cooperative	○	○	○	○	○
Sense of humor	○	○	○	○	○
Caring	○	○	○	○	○
Respectful	○	○	○	○	○
Open-minded	○	○	○	○	○
Trustworthy	○	○	○	○	○
Organized	○	○	○	○	○

3. **Professionalism**

Please check your response to the following statements regarding what characteristics you feel are important for a cooperating teacher and how often the characteristics was demonstrated by your cooperating teacher.

How important is the characteristic?

	Unimportant	Of Little Importance	Moderately Important	Important	Very Important
Loved his/her job	○	○	○	○	○
Exhibited a positive attitude	○	○	○	○	○
Exhibited professionalism	○	○	○	○	○
Served as a good role model for me as a prospective teacher	○	○	○	○	○
Demonstrated knowledge of school policies	○	○	○	○	○
Established working relationships with administrators	○	○	○	○	○
Established positive community relations	○	○	○	○	○
Had good interpersonal skills	○	○	○	○	○
Communicated effectively	○	○	○	○	○
Recognized by other teachers and administrators as a good faculty member at their school.	○	○	○	○	○

4. How often did your cooperating teacher exhibit the characteristic?

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
Loved his/her job					
Exhibited a positive attitude					
Exhibited professionalism					
Served as a good role model for me as a prospective teacher					
Demonstrated knowledge of school policies					
Established positive community relations					
Had good interpersonal skills					
Communicated effectively					
Recognized by other teachers and administrators as good faculty member at their school					

5. **Teaching/Instruction**

Please check your response to the following statements regarding what characteristics you feel are important for a cooperating teacher and how often the characteristic was demonstrated by your cooperating teacher.

How important is the characteristic?

	Unimportant	Of Little Importance	Moderately Important	Important	Very Important
Exhibited enthusiasm for subject					
Demonstrated thorough knowledge of the subject matter					
Possessed classroom management skills					
Enforced a well-defined discipline policy					
Taught effectively in the classroom					

6. How often did your cooperating teacher exhibit the characteristic?

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
Exhibited enthusiasm for subject	○	○	○	○	○
Demonstrated thorough knowledge of the subject matter	○	○	○	○	○
Possessed classroom management skills	○	○	○	○	○
Enforced a well-defined discipline policy	○	○	○	○	○
Taught effectively in the classroom	○	○	○	○	○

5

7. **Cooperating Teacher/Student Teacher Relationship**

Please check your response to the following statements regarding what characteriscs you feel are important for a cooperating teacher and how often the characteristic was demonstrated by your cooperating teacher.

How important is the characteristic?

	Unimportant	Of Little Importance	Moderately Important	Important	Very Important
Encouraged me	○	○	○	○	○
Gave me freedom to try things	○	○	○	○	○
Turned classes over to me	○	○	○	○	○
Supported decisions made by me	○	○	○	○	○
Helped me plan lessons and activities	○	○	○	○	○
Routinely observed me	○	○	○	○	○
Provided constructive feedback to me	○	○	○	○	○
Provided a variety of experiences for me	○	○	○	○	○
Assisted me when needed	○	○	○	○	○
Treated me as a fellow professional	○	○	○	○	○
Anticipated my needs	○	○	○	○	○
Provided clear expectations to me	○	○	○	○	○
Shared resources with me	○	○	○	○	○
Assisted me in finding a job	○	○	○	○	○

8. How often did your cooperating teacher exhibit the characteristic?

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
Encouraged me	○	○	○	○	○
Gave me freedom to try things	○	○	○	○	○
Turned classes over to me	○	○	○	○	○
Supported decisions made by me	○	○	○	○	○
Helped me plan lessons and activities	○	○	○	○	○
Routinely observed me	○	○	○	○	○
Provided constructive feedback to me	○	○	○	○	○
Provided a variety of experiences for me	○	○	○	○	○
Assisted me when needed	○	○	○	○	○
Treated me as a fellow professional	○	○	○	○	○
Anticipated my needs	○	○	○	○	○
Provided clear expectations to me	○	○	○	○	○
Shared resources with me	○	○	○	○	○
Assisted me in finding a job	○	○	○	○	○

9. **Part II: Demographics**

What is your gender

10. At what level did you student teach?

11. At what level are you currently working?

Appendix B: Permission to use Characteristics of Cooperating Teacher Survey

Ms. Gerber,

I am so sorry that I just realized you have written me before making this request. Of course you can use and modify the survey as you see fit. Best of luck! I look forward to seeing your results.

Rebekah

Sent from my iPhone

ER

Epps, Rebekah <rebekah.epps@baker.edu>

LG

Lana M Gerber

Dear Dr. Epps,

I am an Ed.D. candidate at Baker University. The purpose of this email is to request permission to use and modify your survey "Characteristics of Cooperating Teachers as Perceived by Student Teachers" in my research. Below is the purpose of my study.
The purpose of my study is to determine to what extent:

- Is there a relationship between Kansas Horizon Award winners' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers' personal attributes and characteristics and perceptions of cooperating teacher exhibiting personal attributes and characteristics to the success of their student teaching experience?
- Is there a relationship between Kansas Horizon Award winners' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers' professionalism and perceptions of cooperating teacher exhibiting professionalism to the success of their student teaching experience?
- Is there a relationship between Kansas Horizon Award winners' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers' teaching/instruction and perceptions of cooperating teacher exhibiting teaching/instruction to the success of their student teaching experience?
- Is there a relationship between Kansas Horizon Award winners' perceptions of the importance of their cooperating teachers' relationship with student teacher and perceptions of cooperating teacher exhibiting relationship with student teacher to the success of their student teaching experience?
- Any of the above relationships were different between males and females and elementary and secondary winners.

I hope you consider granting me permission to use and modify your survey. If you are interested, I can share the results of my study with you. Thank you for your time and consideration.
**On a personal note we have family that live in Buckner and Louisville and will be in Kentucky for spring break.

Sincerely,

Lana M. Gerber

Appendix C: Instructional Review Board (IRB) Request

BAKER UNIVERSITY

IRB Request

Date 1/8/2018

IRB Protocol Number _____ (IRB use only)

I. Research Investigator(s) (students must list faculty sponsor)

Department(s) Graduate School of Education

	Name	Signature	
1.	Lana Gerber	gerberl@turnerusd202.org	Principal Investigator
2.	Dr. Susan Rogers	Susan K Rogers Digitally signed by Susan K Rogers Date: 2018.01.08 15:53:54 -06'00'	☑ Check if faculty sponsor
3.	Dr. Margaret Waterman	Margaret Waterman Digitally signed by Margaret Waterman Date: 2018.01.08 14:59:37 -06'00'	☐ Check if faculty sponsor
4.			☐ Check if faculty sponsor

Principal investigator contact information

Phone 913-206-2564

Email gerberl82@gmail.com

Address 1751 NW 38th street
Apt. 300
Kansas City MO 64116

Note: When submitting your finalized, signed form to the IRB, please ensure that you cc all investigators and faculty sponsors using their official Baker University (or respective organization's) email addresses.

Faculty sponsor contact information

Phone 785-230-2801

Email Susan.Rogers@baker.edu

Expected Category of Review: ☐ Exempt ☑ Expedited ☐ Full ☐ Renewal

II. Protocol Title

Kansas Horizon Award Winner's Perceptions of Effective Cooperating Teachers

III. Summary:

The following questions must be answered. Be specific about exactly what participants will experience and about the protections that have been included to safeguard participants from harm.

A. In a sentence or two, please describe the background and purpose of the research.

Since 2003, the State of Kansas has recognized exemplary first-year teachers with the Kansas Cable Telecommunications Horizon Award (Kansas Horizon Award). Per KSDE (2016), the Kansas Horizon Award is sponsored by the KSDE. The mission of the Kansas Horizon Award program is to "recognize exemplary first-year teachers who perform in a way that distinguished them as outstanding" (KSDE, 2016). Each school district in the State of Kansas can nominate one elementary and one secondary classroom teacher each year that results in 32 award recipients annually. Since the program's inception, there have been approximately 448 award recipients.

B. Briefly describe each condition, manipulation, or archival data set to be included within the study.

There will be no conditions and/or manipulations as part of this study.

IV. Protocol Details

A. What measures or observations will be taken in the study? If any questionnaire or other instruments are used, provide a brief description and attach a copy.

The Cooperating Teacher Effectiveness survey will be used to gather the necessary responses for this study. The tool was created by Rebekah Barnes Epps and adapted by the researcher with support and input from University supervisors.

**A copy of the survey is attached

B. Will the subjects encounter the risk of psychological, social, physical, or legal risk? If so, please describe the nature of the risk and any measures designed to mitigate that risk.

Subjects will not encounter any physiological, social, physical or legal risks in taking this survey.

C. Will any stress to subjects be involved? If so, please describe.

Subjects will not experience any stress because of his/her participation in this survey.

D. Will the subjects be deceived or misled in any way? If so, include an outline or script of the debriefing.

Subjects will not be deceived or misled in any way in this study/survey.

E. Will there be a request for information which subjects might consider to be personal or sensitive? If so, please include a description.

No personal or sensitive information will be requested or collected in this survey.

F. Will the subjects be presented with materials which might be considered to be offensive, threatening, or degrading? If so, please describe.

Subjects will not be presented with material which might be offensive, threatening, or degrading.

G. Approximately how much time will be demanded of each subject?

The characteristics of effective cooperating teacher's survey will demand approximately 15 minutes of time for each subject.

H. Who will be the subjects in this study? How will they be solicited or contacted? Provide an outline or script of the information which will be provided to subjects prior to their volunteering to participate. Include a copy of any written solicitation as well as an outline of any oral solicitation.

The subjects of this study include all Kansas Horizon Award winners from 2003-2017. The Kansas Horizon Award winners with current active e-mail accounts included in the KSDE 2015-2017 Kansas Exemplary Educator Network (KEEB) survey will be contacted via e-mail. A solicitation letter explaining the study and details regarding data collection will be provided to each Kansas Horizon Award winner.

**Copy of solicitation letter attached

I. What steps will be taken to insure that each subject's participation is voluntary? What if any inducements will be offered to the subjects for their participation?

The solicitation letter clearly communicates to all participants that their participation is voluntary. All responses will be collected electronically. There will be no inducements.

J. How will you insure that the subjects give their consent prior to participating? Will a written consent form be used? If so, include the form. If not, explain why not.

Each participant will receive a participation letter with an explanation of their consent upon completion of the survey. The survey will be completed in an electronic format therefore, written consent is not necessary as completion and submission of the survey will provide assurance of consent.

K. Will any aspect of the data be made a part of any permanent record that can be identified with the subject? If so, please explain the necessity.

The survey will be administered through an electronic survey system, Survey Monkey. Therefore, the subjects cannot be identified nor, will a permanent record of their indentation be kept or accessible.

L. Will the fact that a subject did or did not participate in a specific experiment or study be made part of any permanent record available to a supervisor, teacher, or employer? If so, explain.

The subject's participation will not be made part of any permanent record or available to any supervisor, teacher, or employer.

M. What steps will be taken to insure the confidentiality of the data? Where will it be stored? How long will it be stored? What will be done with the data after the study is completed?

The survey is being administered electronically. The survey and data will be stored on my password protected Survey Monkey account. The data will be stored for a period of five years. After five years the data will be destroyed/deleted.

N. If there are any risks involved in the study, are there any offsetting benefits that might accrue to either the subjects or society?

There are no risks or offsetting benefits involved in this study.

O. Will any data from files or archival data be used? If so, please describe.

No archival data will be used. Data from Survey Monkey will be downloaded and imported into IBM® SPSS® Statistics Faculty Pack for Windows.

Appendix D: Teacher Instructional Review Board (IRB) Approval

BAKER UNIVERSITY
Own Confidence

Baker University Institutional Review Board

January 12th, 2018

Dear Lana Gerber and Susan Rogers,

The Baker University IRB has reviewed your project application and approved this project under Expedited Status Review. As described, the project complies with all the requirements and policies established by the University for protection of human subjects in research. Unless renewed, approval lapses one year after approval date.

Please be aware of the following:

1. Any significant change in the research protocol as described should be reviewed by this Committee prior to altering the project.
2. Notify the IRB about any new investigators not named in original application.
3. When signed consent documents are required, the primary investigator must retain the signed consent documents of the research activity.
4. If this is a funded project, keep a copy of this approval letter with your proposal/grant file.
5. If the results of the research are used to prepare papers for publication or oral presentation at professional conferences, manuscripts or abstracts are requested for IRB as part of the project record.

Please inform this Committee or myself when this project is terminated or completed. As noted above, you must also provide IRB with an annual status report and receive approval for maintaining your status. If you have any questions, please contact me at npoell@bakeru.edu or 785.594.4582.

Sincerely,

Nathan Poell, MA
Chair, Baker University IRB

Baker University IRB Committee
Scott Crenshaw
Erin Morris, PhD
Jamin Perry, PhD
Susan Rogers, PhD

Appendix E: Survey Email to Horizon Award Recipients

Dear _____:

You have been selected to participate in a study of Horizon Award Winners and their perceptions of their cooperating teachers during student teaching. In this study, the characteristics of effective cooperating teachers will be studied. Additionally, the study seeks to determine how often those characteristics were demonstrated by your cooperating teacher.

I appreciate your participation in this study. To obtain a valid measurement, please complete found by clicking on the link at the end of this email by February 15, 2018. Your participation in this research is voluntary and you may choose to withdraw at any time without penalty or repercussion. You may choose not to answer some or all of the questions. There are no risks from your participation and no direct benefit from your participation is expected. There is no cost to you except your time. The survey will take about ten minutes for you to complete.
You may be assured of complete confidentiality. Your name will never be used. Under no circumstances will individual data be shared or reported.

If you have any questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant, contact me (include your information). Should you have any other questions, please contace me (gerberl82@gmail.com or 913-206-2564) or my major advisor, Dr. Susan Rogers (srogers@bakeru.edu or 785-230-2801. Thank you for your time and cooperation.

https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/HB9YMJV

Sincerely,

Lana Gerber
Baker University Doctoral Candidate