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OPEN SECTION
What characterises a good practicum in teacher education?

Marit Ulvik & Kari Smith*

Abstract
Practice teaching is regarded as a key component of teacher education and often highly valued by student teachers, even if the aims of field experiences vary from context to context. This article takes a closer look at the practicum in a one-year postgraduate teacher education programme (PGCE) in Norway by listening to the voices of student teachers, school-based mentors and university-based supervisors. The study aims to obtain a deeper understanding of how the practicum is understood and whether the various stakeholders in the same context share a common view of the practicum.

Keywords: practicum, secondary school, teacher training or teacher education

1. Introduction
Practice teaching constitutes an important part of teacher education (Wilson, 2006) and is highly valued by student teachers (Beck & Kosnik, 2002). However, the aim of the practicum varies, depending on the view of teacher education which can be seen as cultural practices that serve local needs (Blömeke & Paine, 2008; Stephens, Tønnessen, & Kyriacou, 2004; Uljens, 2002). The literature differentiates between education that is mainly directed towards predefined skills or education built on the idea of “Bildung” (Blömeke & Paine, 2008, Stephens et al., 2004). The first view, which emphasises measurable standards for teaching, is more common in Anglo-American countries. Teacher education becomes teacher training, and a good teacher is someone who masters certain technical skills (Stephens et al., 2004). Consequently, practice tends to be highly valued and the education (training) often puts practical experience in the centre, as for example in England. Teacher education aimed at “Bildung”, which has been the tradition in Germany and in the Nordic countries, including Norway (Blömeke & Paine, 2008; White Paper 11, 2008-2009), is based on scholarship and disciplinary knowledge. A good teacher is viewed as a professional who makes independent decisions grounded on a high level of reflection (Blömeke & Paine, 2008; Stephens et al., 2004). This kind of teacher education could be described as more theory-based. What is emphasised in the practicum will, as a result of the different views, vary from training in practical skills to critical discussions and moral inquiry (ibid.). The first model prepares students for teaching in the current context, which
might appear to be especially relevant in the short term. The other model prepares student teachers for the future by providing a critical perspective; however, it can be perceived to be distant from the present reality. The different views and the range of views between these two extremes make a comparison between various systems across national borders important and can shed new light on national systems (Blömeke & Paine, 2008). Moreover, when comparing Norwegian and English teacher education, Stephens et al. (2004) emphasise that the two countries can learn from each other as both systems entail advantages and disadvantages. Yet it is worth mentioning that various traditions can make communication challenging as translations of terms may conceal differences (Uljens, 2007).

The current article focuses on the practicum in a one-year postgraduate teacher education course (PGCE) in Norway and adds a Norwegian voice to the debate on how to organise a high-quality practicum. The emphasis on “Bildung” in Norwegian teacher education (LK06; White Paper, 11, 2008–2009; Lørvie, 2001) has recently been challenged by a more performance-oriented pedagogy, which seems to be a global trend (Barrett, 2009; Bergem, 2009; Day, 2007; Hargreaves & Goodson, 2006; Lindquist & Nordänger, 2006; Ulvik, 2009). International readers may be unfamiliar with the “Bildung” concept and a brief explanation is thus provided, albeit without going deeply into this complex term. The German notion relates to the verb “bilden” which means to form or shape, and can be understood as the forming of an individual’s abilities and talents (Sæverot, 2010). The term also incorporates “Bild” – a picture, an image. Initially, the individual should become an Imago Dei, an image of God. Later on, “Bildung” referred to humanity as the ultimate aim of education, initiated through the interplay between culture and the individual’s contribution – an understanding upon which this article is based. Bildung is not about self-realisation; it is about fostering humanity and making the world a better place. While formal education is something a person has, “Bildung” is about who people are, and influences how they use the education they have received.

The current study builds on a previous study examining student teachers’ views of the mentoring part of practice teaching (Ulvik, Krüger, Madsen, Moe & Strømman, 2005). The study revealed that student teachers tend to understand mentoring as something they acquire rather than something in which they participate. Further, their answers indicate that student teachers have individual needs for mentoring and that mentors have different perceptions of their mentoring role. These varieties in opinions and needs, as well as the tension between the “Bildung” tradition and a more market-oriented approach to teaching, makes it relevant to ask if stakeholders within the same context share a common view of the practicum. While the first study focused on mentoring from the student teachers’ perspective, the intention of this study is to receive a broader view of what different stakeholders regard as a good practice placement, in which mentoring forms only one part. Simply put, the research question is: What characterises a good practice situation? The article discusses how
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student teachers, school-based mentors and university-based supervisors describe a good practicum, and it aims to identify the different aspects valued by each of the three parties involved.

2. Background

The research literature clearly shows that teachers matter (Hattie, 2003; Day, Stobart, Sammons, & Kington, 2006; Teachers Matter, 2005). However, there is less agreement about how best to prepare teachers (Blömeke & Pain, 2008). What kind of knowledge is required to teach well and where do teachers-to-be learn this knowledge? These questions are not easy to answer because it is not obvious what teachers need to know, as good teaching is something normative. To decide on the best way to learn to teach, it is first necessary to indentify teachers’ professional knowledge.

2.1. Teachers’ professional knowledge

Part of the problem in adequately preparing student teachers is that teachers constantly face unique situations, and need to be educated for an unknown future. Here, the concepts of episteme, techné and phronesis, drawn from Aristotle, can be useful. Episteme is general knowledge, or knowing that and why, here used synonymously with theoretical knowledge, and does not vary with time or space (Eisner, 2002; Flyvbjerg, 2006). This kind of knowledge is sometimes experienced as holding limited value in the classroom (Eisner, 2002). It has to be translated into the unique context. Yet theoretical knowledge is useful for enabling people to go beyond their habitual behaviour and taking a critical view of practice in the search for alternatives and new thoughts (Brunstad, 2007). Theoretical knowledge is the kind of knowledge that universities traditionally emphasise. Techné is about knowing how, or productive knowledge (Flyvbjerg, 2006), and refers to skills that are taught in practical situations (Brunstad, 2009). Episteme and techné provide guidelines for actions, but to act adequately phronesis is also needed (ibid.). Phronesis, or practical wisdom, developed through practice and in the interplay of episteme and techné, is drawn upon in situations where neither tradition nor habits guide the action. Phronesis is the artistry of the moment (ibid.). The aim is to do what is right which requires ethical considerations. Consequently, teachers have to make decisions in light of the current situation, and without any grand theory to support them. Phronesis thus connects practical and theoretical knowledge in action and is, in this way, similar to an artist’s performance. Eisner (2002), for example, compares teaching with playing in a jazz quartet, knowing when to come in and take the lead and when to bow out and improvise. It is impossible to follow detailed given rules. However, there are frameworks and norms which have become part of musicians’ (or teachers’) tacit knowledge or practical wisdom.

Lacking integration between the different kinds of knowledge, practice teaching (knowing how) and university coursework (knowing that) is a common criticism of teacher education (Sim, 2006; Wilson, 2006). It is often claimed that teacher educa-
tation needs to strive to become more relevant both to student teachers and the schools in which they will work. Further, the impact of teacher education seems to be limited and tends to have a relatively weak influence on teachers’ practice (Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005; Lunenberg, Korthagen & Swennen, 2007; Wilson, 2006). Moreover, there are complaints by newly qualified teachers and school administrators about the irrelevance of teacher preparation (Korthagen, Loughran & Russell, 2006). There could be several reasons for this poor impact. The “washing-out” effect discussed by Zeichner and Tabachnick in 1981 still seems to be accurate, meaning that what students achieve from their education vanishes during the first year of teaching. Teachers often comply with tradition and fall into the pattern of what other teachers at the school do (Flores & Day, 2006). Due to previous experiences, often deeply rooted after many years in school, novice teachers tend to have their own theories about teaching (Timperley, 2010). In addition, what they have learned during their education is not always supported by the schools (Achinstein, 2006). Even so, teachers with teacher education are more satisfied than those without (Darling-Hammond et al., 2002) and more content with their education in retrospect (Beck & Kosnik, 2009; SINTEF, 2006), so it seems that the preparation of teachers does play a role after all.

To improve teacher education it is important to listen to those who are affected by it, which in this article is done by examining the practicum from different perspectives. In the practicum, the various parts of teachers’ knowledge have to be combined, constituting the reason for choosing groups from both practice and from the more theoretical field. The three chosen groups are those which are most directly influenced by the practicum and those which constitute the traditional practice triad (Wilson, 2006): student teachers, school-based mentors and university-based supervisors.

2.2. Why do student teachers need the practicum?

The main objective of the practicum is to provide student teachers with authentic hands-on experience in teaching. This is needed to develop their teaching skills and to start collecting experiences to enrich their professional wisdom (phronesis). It is not enough to read about teaching or to observe others teach, something students have done for years. They have to practice themselves because practical knowledge and wisdom are held by the individual and cannot easily be transmitted from person to person. Student teachers need techné (knowing how) and by connecting the skills of teaching to episteme (knowing that), through reflection, they will gradually start developing phronesis (practical wisdom). However, to reach beyond their current personal level it is useful to be guided by someone who is more experienced. There are limits to how useful a student teacher’s internal reflection is in understanding personal reasoning (Penglington, 2008).

Dewey (1904) presents two models of practice experiences: the apprentice model and the laboratory model, which can be interpreted as complementary. In the first model, the mentor constitutes a model to imitate, and teaching becomes more like
What characterises a good practicum in teacher education?

training. Therefore, it is crucial to have excellent teachers as mentors. In the second model, student teachers are guided through observation, interpretation and classroom analyses aimed at fostering growth and the capacity to develop personal professional wisdom. In this model, students need a variety of experiences and mentors who are able to conduct dialogues that promote reflection. The last model has more in common with the idea of “Bildung” than the training model.

An important role of the practicum is to provide a supported entry to the profession. The factor with the strongest impact on retention seems to be the quality of the first teaching experiences (Rots et al., 2007) and what student teachers experience in their practicum creates their view of the profession (Korthagen et al., 2006). It is therefore essential that student teachers are offered quality practice placements.

In order to learn from field experience it is necessary to look back at it and reconstruct it through interaction between the individual, objects and other persons (Dewey, 1938). In this way, the experience can prepare the individual for the future. Systematic reflection in dialogues with peers, mentors and supervisors prepares student teachers for the real and complex classroom and provides future teachers with tools for developing confidence to act professionally in unique situations.

Brunstad (2007) regards the ability to learn from one’s own and others’ experiences as a means of developing phronesis (practical wisdom). Yet it takes time and time pressure seems to cause teachers to fall back into traditional teaching patterns (Flores & Day, 2006). Buchman (1987) discriminates between “folkways of teaching” and “teaching expertise”. The folkways describe normative teaching and require no explanation. Teaching expertise, on the other hand, includes judgements, the testing of consequences and less typical modes of practice (ibid.). To act habitually is easy, and that is the pitfall with techné. On the other hand, automatically handling basic teaching skills allows more time to improvise and be creative (Brunstad, 2007; Smith & Ulvik, 2010). Neither the folkway nor the method of trial and error explains the whys and hows of teaching, and they do not prepare teachers to deal with the unexpected. To do that, teachers should be able to judge, prioritise and make their own decisions appropriate to specific situations and contexts (Buchman, 1987). Biesta (2007) points to the non-causal nature of educational interaction that makes it impossible to prepare future teachers fully for all the challenges they will meet during their careers. They need tools for further professional development and an awareness of personal beliefs as points of departure for judgements and prioritising.

If teacher education encourages teachers to develop only by building on their own experience, they might build on assumptions that are never questioned. What currently exists might be reproduced (Smeyers & Burbules, 2006) in contexts where teacher education is too practically oriented and does not leave room for theory (episteme) to bring the hands-on experiences to a higher cognitive level (Smith, 2009).
2.3. What do we know from research about the practicum?

Researchers have already identified some components of a good practice placement that point beyond the training aspect (Beck & Kosnik, 2002; LaBoskey & Richert, 2002). Special focus is placed on the climate, the mentors and the fact that teacher education, including the practicum, is experienced as being coherent. In the following paragraphs, these issues are developed further.

Student teachers want “to survive” in the classroom and to receive a positive assessment of their teaching (Beck & Kosnik, 2002). As a result, a good relationship with the mentor is a main priority (ibid.; LaBoskey & Richert, 2002). Student teachers need emotional support and a practicum environment in which they feel safe and able to take risks (Zeichner, 2002). However, to discover something new there should be a fine balance between support and challenges. Zeichner (2002) claims that “cooperating teachers are key participants in determining the quality of learning for student teachers” (p. 59). This implies that mentors are the most significant contributors to learning and development. He states that there is a need to transform experiences in the practicum into professional understanding to develop a professional identity. Structured reflection triggers this transformation (Korthagen & Vasalos, 2005). An important mentoring skill is therefore the “ability to recognize and promote the development of core qualities” (ibid., p. 59) and mentors thus need special training to learn to supervise reflection.

Researchers from the Netherlands, Australia and the USA talk about the power of “modelling” (Korthagen, Loughran and Russell, 2006; LaBoskey & Richert, 2002; Loughran, 2006; Loughran & Berry, 2005; Lunenberg, Korthagen & Swennen, 2007; Wilson, 2006). This means that teacher educators need to demonstrate as well as explain (both the apprentice and the reflection model). Student teachers want feedback from their mentors, but feedback from a teacher with poor practical abilities has limited value, according to Beck & Kosnik (2002). Graham (2006) describes two extreme kinds of mentors: the maestro and the mentor. The maestro is a good teacher who wants the students to imitate his or her teaching and who is not interested in transforming practice (the apprentice model). The focus is superficial and mainly on observable aspects of teaching. The act of teaching becomes the display of a set of predefined skills. However, the mentor gives more dialogic feedback and provides students with examples, but student teachers are not told to imitate the mentor. In other words, a good teacher is not necessarily a good mentor. With a qualified mentor, students are encouraged to master practical skills and, in addition, to take risks and they may develop beyond their mentor’s level. With a maestro, the mentees learn to master the tradition. One could say that maestros encourage knowing how, whereas mentors also encourage reasoning.

Moreover, student teachers want their practicum to be integrated with the campus programme (Beck & Kosnik, 2002). In a situation where students try to combine theory and practice (knowing that, why and how), they might find it confusing to meet con-
flicting expectations from mentors in school and mentors from the university, which could be interpreted as a conflict between practical and theoretical knowledge. This conflict seems to be a common criticism of teacher education (Lunenberg, Korthagen and Swennen, 2007). Graham (2006) claims that the quality of communication and shared understanding of goals among all parties involved seem to be the main criteria for a successful practicum experience. During the practicum, student teachers start to develop their professional identity and to see themselves as members of the teaching profession. To develop this identity, ten Dam and Blom (2006) emphasise the impact of participating in social and cultural practices. This view supports the idea of experiencing the comprehensive teacher role.

Another characteristic of a good practicum is identified by Sim (2006) who found that tutorials are important for student teachers’ practicum experiences. The learning outcome of the practicum is enhanced if student teachers work in pairs or in clusters (Beck and Kosnik, 2002). Korthagen, Loughran and Russell (2006) claim that student teachers who work with peers are prepared to include peer-supported learning in their future careers.

The role of university-based supervisors seems to change from context to context. Some will describe their role as distant and with little impact, while others will defend their role in the practicum (Wilson, 2006). However, it is unclear who the supervisors are. In some contexts, they are hired just to supervise, in others such as in Norway they are full-time members of a faculty and employed based on their academic qualifications, which at the university level is a PHD. University-based supervisors seem to provide more general support and an important role is to reframe traditional conceptions (Le Cornu, 2009). This could be a challenge for Norwegian supervisors who observe student teacher teaching over about two lessons. Moreover, they do not necessarily have a background as teachers and therefore need to be informed about the field of practice.

In summary, the literature suggests various characteristics of what creates a good practicum, related to the aims and the kind of knowledge the practicum should promote. Previous research emphasises mentors as key participants, while the role of supervisors from the university seems to be vague. Further, the literature underlines the value of modelling and to experience the comprehensive teacher role. This study examines the practical component of a teacher education programme in a Norwegian context concerning these aspects.

3. The study

3.1. Context

The current study was conducted in 2007 in a one-year postgraduate secondary school teacher education programme (PGCE) at the University of Bergen, Norway. The students already had a university degree (mostly a master’s degree) and represented a
range of disciplines. Secondary school teacher education in Norway is subject-matter-oriented and has a broader perspective on teaching which corresponds with the idea of “Bildung”. All students are prepared to teach two different school subjects, and pedagogical themes are not reduced to measurable outcomes. Throughout the year, the students have two seven-week practicum experiences, during each of which the students have to teach 60 hours. The first period usually takes place in lower secondary school, the next in upper secondary school, and the student teachers practice teaching their two different subjects each period. They work in pairs in one of the subjects and usually have at least two mentors at the school. The PGCE follows a national curriculum plan (Rammeplan, 2003), currently under revision, in which there are only specified quantitative requirements, such as the number of teaching hours. The national curriculum does not provide guidelines for school-based mentors and university-based supervisors on which teaching competencies the students are to achieve. The university has worked out a set of aims for the practicum of which the mentors are informed, but these have not been sufficiently clear to serve as guidelines for mentors and supervisors. Accordingly, mentors can largely do as they like. It is difficult to find practice placements for all students and, as a result, no special criteria or education for mentors were, at that time, required by the university. In 2007, when this study was conducted, the practicum co-ordinator at the university recruited the mentors by contacting schools in the region and asking if they would accept student teachers. The headmaster or a delegated authority selected the mentors, often more out of convenience than competence. Because of this system, the group of mentors changed frequently. Within the group of about 160 mentors at that time, about 10% had a mentor education (offered by the university, but participation was voluntary). During each practice period, the students were visited twice by university-based supervisors. This triad model with student teachers, school-based mentors and university-based supervisors is probably not unusual in teacher education (Wilson, 2006).

Mentoring in Norway has been strongly influenced by Lauvås and Handal (2002) who emphasise the idea of action and reflection (Dewey, 1938; Schön, 1991). According to this model, it is important that the mentor is competent as a mentor and collaborator and makes students reflect on a variety of experiences. Skagen (2000) has presented an alternative model, more like apprenticeship learning. This model also emphasises that the mentor should be a good teacher able to demonstrate good teaching practices and able to articulate choices made during teaching, as well as describing the student teacher’s teaching. Moreover, Skagen (2000) claims that this does not make students copycats, but provides them with alternatives. Teacher education in Norway includes elements from both traditions.

Within Norwegian teacher education there has been a tension between practice and theory about the ownership of the practicum. Traditionally, the theoretical point of view has dominated, especially in secondary school teacher education. Student teachers seem to go to schools to apply theory and are visited by supervisors from the
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Institutions, who are regarded as experts. In recent years, there has been a tendency in Norway, as in other countries, to move from a theoretical to a more practical view of teacher education and from research-based to more school-based education. As part of this idea, partner schools have started to emerge. The intention is to connect practical and theoretical knowledge in a better way and to address the problem of the insufficient integration between the two. A partner school model had, however, not been implemented at the time of the current study, although this has now changed.

3.2. Methodology and analysis

The data were collected from the three different groups of the practice triad (students, mentors, supervisors) connected to the same programme. The three groups were asked to respond in writing to one open-ended question: How would you describe a good practicum? This was done in order to elicit the respondents’ personal opinions without any explicit or implicit bias rooted in the researchers’ formation of more structured questions. A disadvantage of this approach is that the respondents may have interpreted the term “good” differently, although the researchers wanted the respondents to present their views of a “good practicum”. The question was posed just after a practice period when all parties involved summed up their practice experiences as mentees, mentors or supervisors. Learning more about how different parties value field experience is seen as a first step towards a deeper understanding of how the practicum is perceived. The question was sent as an e-mail message to mentors in schools and supervisors at the university. Some demographic information such as gender, type of school and if they had undertaken mentor education was also collected. The reason for sending the question by email was that there were no fixed meeting points for the school-based mentors in the teacher education programme. The contact between the school and university was mainly electronic, apart from the supervisors’ visits to school. Due to the organisation of teacher education at the university, the university-based supervisors work in four different faculties and do not meet frequently. Some mentors and supervisors answered by e-mail and others by regular mail. The student teachers wrote their responses in the first seminar after the practicum when the practice experience was still fresh in their minds. Two of four groups responded after their first practicum, and the other two groups responded after a practicum in the second term. The students had about 15 minutes to respond to the question. The response rate was low among school-based mentors, with only 30 (18%) responding. Out of these, about half were educated mentors, which represents almost all of the educated mentors in the programme, who constitute the core group of mentors. Thirty student teachers answered after the first term and 25 after the second term, which gives a response rate of 80%. Only six university-based teacher educators answered (25%). Based on the low response rates from the mentors and supervisors, it is impossible to make any generalisations, a limitation of the study of which the researchers are fully aware. Still, we believe we can identify differences and
similarities among the three groups that can help us gain an impression of various views of practicum with regard to the training or “Bildung” model in teacher education in the local context.

The parties concerned received information about the study and volunteered to participate, and they were informed that their responses would be handled with confidentiality. The responses were analysed and discussed in a group consisting of members of the three participating groups (who did not participate in the study) representing different institutions. The same group had co-operated in the previous study about mentoring (Ulvik et al., 2005). The responses were categorised through a moderation. In the process, the group was conscious about the small scale of the study.

3.3. Findings

In what follows, the findings are presented for each group of participants separately and illustrated by some quotes.

When the student teachers (N = 30/25; first-term respondents/second-term respondents) were asked to describe a good practicum, most of them started to describe their own mentors. They also emphasised the value of getting an opportunity to try out something new and to be included in the school environment. These were the central themes mentioned.

The students (25/24) seemed to agree that a good practicum primarily depended on the school-based mentors. They emphasised the importance of a good relationship, which means that mentors have time and engagement, understand the student teacher’s situation and are easy to collaborate with. These student teachers also value mentors who share experiences, give constructive feedback, both praise and criticism, and listen to the students. In a practicum, student teachers want diverse challenges and they prefer to meet different kinds of pupils. None of the student teachers mentioned the importance of mentors being subject-matter experts; nor did they focus on formal mentor knowledge.

According to about half the students (13/12), a good practicum offers opportunities for trying out new ideas. They wanted to be in a situation that is safe enough to take risks. The students emphasised freedom to try out their own ideas, to be allowed to be independent and to make plans for more than a few lessons. While some students emphasised freedom, others wanted a balance between support and freedom. Although students wanted to try out “something”, it was not explicit what that “something” might be.

For some students (13/8), an important element of a good practicum was to feel included in the school environment. Students wanted to be warmly welcomed by the staff and meet a friendly administration team. The students asked for a clear framework and guidelines and a well-structured practicum. They wanted to get keys, textbooks and a place to sit to prepare their lessons. The students wanted to be recognised as teachers and to learn about every aspect of being a teacher. At the same time, much of the focus seemed to be on their teaching.
The data indicate a development from the first to the second placement. In the first practicum, the most important aspects tended to be the relationship with the mentor, feeling welcomed and being included in the school culture. In the second period, student teachers seemed to put more emphasis on the quality of mentoring, for example that the mentor facilitated reflection. The reason could be that they are more confident in the last term because they have acquired some experience and the challenges of upper secondary school are more closely linked to the subject than to discipline problems and classroom management. In the first term, more students tended to want to experience the whole school. This was not mentioned in the second term. A likely explanation is that in upper secondary school teachers define themselves as subject specialists; in lower secondary school, they are more like general teachers.

The following two quotes illustrate the students’ views and the difference between the first and second practicums:

A good school-based mentor is very important. You should get a feeling of being welcomed among the other teachers and in the classes where you are going to teach. Practical issues like getting keys, having a place to sit and having textbooks means a lot. The feeling of being included in every aspect of being a teacher, for example, to know a little about pupils with special needs, is crucial (student teacher, 1st practicum).

The practicum should give the student the space and opportunity to learn from experience and to trigger personal reflection. The condition for growing as a teacher is, however, qualified feedback from the mentor (student teacher, 2nd practicum).

In the first term, the student teachers tend to focus on practical issues, while in the second term they link their experiences more to a theoretical perspective.

The school-based mentors (N = 30) mentioned a number of aspects that describe a good practicum. Most of them stressed a good relationship with the students (20). Both the student teachers and mentors seemed to agree on the importance of a good climate to enhance learning and development.

While the student teachers had demands regarding the mentors, about half of the mentors (14) expressed demands of the students. They wanted interested and motivated students who want to try out different methods, students who are well qualified in their teaching subject and focus on the pupils. They emphasised teaching skills and tended to regard students as someone more or less like educated teachers. The student teachers were expected to know something about the curriculum and the school, communicate well with pupils and be able to take the initiative. The practicum was not seen as an education but more like a training arena.

However, the educated mentors expressed demands of themselves as well:

The student teacher and the mentor are both responsible for developing a good practicum, but an experienced mentor is, after all, the leader.
Mentors with an education in mentoring (15) differed from the other mentors by seeing themselves as responsible teacher educators.

Nine of the school-based mentors pointed to the fact that student teachers should have a realistic picture of the school. Only five mentioned reflection. None of the mentors mentioned supervisors from the university. They only mentioned the university when it came to practical circumstances like getting information. This could be a consequence of the relatively loose contact between the school and the university.

Among the school-based mentors, three different views of the practicum were salient: 1) a good practicum depends on the student teacher; 2) the mentor holds the main responsibility for the practice situation; and 3) the practicum is a mutual responsibility. The following quotes illustrate different views:

Student teachers should have time enough to teach, seek advice and be mentored so that troubling features of their teaching can be reduced.

A good practice situation depends on close and good co-operation between the mentor and the student teacher.

Some mentors saw the practicum as training, where students should practice what is learned and be corrected by the expert, namely, a skilled-based approach. Others saw it more as a place for professional development, involving interaction between the student teacher and mentor, namely, both a skill-oriented and a more “Bildung”-oriented approach.

The small number of members of the third group, the university-based supervisors, makes it difficult to draw any conclusions, but it is worth noting that all informants in this group mentioned reflection, which indicates reflection is a central characteristic they are looking for in student teachers. One could ask, however, if supervisors are less concerned with teaching skills and value theory (episteme) even in the field of practice.

However, even within this small group there was disagreement about perceptions of the practicum, as the following two quotes illustrate:

I don't share the opinion that it's important for student teachers to experience all parts of what's going on in schools, including the problematic sides.

Student teachers should experience as much as possible of the school’s entire activity and not just isolated lessons.

The first quote is from a subject didactics supervisor and the second is from a pedagogue (general didactics). The difference illustrates the well-known tension between the two fields, something that is likely to have consequences for organisation of the practicum and the expectations of the student teachers who get conflicting messages.

To sum up: The student teachers emphasise the quality of the mentor, they want to be able to try out their ideas and to be included in the school environment. Their
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responses indicate some development throughout the two practice periods. The school-based mentors underlined the relationships with the student teachers. Yet their view on the practicum as training or education seems to differ, depending on their own preparation as mentors. The university-based supervisors agreed upon the value of reflection, but disagreed about the focus of the practicum, subject-matter teaching or a more holistic teaching experience.

4. Discussion

In the discussion part we first address the aim of the practicum and then what constitutes a good practicum from the different participating groups’ perspectives. The discussion relates to previous research as well as to the findings of the study.

4.1. The aim of the practicum

In their practicums, student teachers want to practice teaching and experience how it really feels to be a teacher. They want to try out their own ideas, but it is unclear if the ideas evolve from something they have learned in their coursework at the university, figured out by themselves or learned from their years as pupils in schools. The mentors also underline that student teachers need to try things out by themselves and make autonomous decisions. Experience is supposed to nurture further growth (Dewey, 1938), but if students are only allowed to try out what they already know and believe in, they reconfirm their own thoughts and teacher education is in danger of becoming a closed circle, which Buchman (1987) warns against. The result might be an education with a limited impact. Student teachers have to meet challenges to learn something new, and to go beyond their current level of competence (Vygotsky, 1986). However, it is hard work to change old beliefs and habits (Dewey, 1933). When people practice what they know and master the situation as it is by following tradition, they feel safe and comfortable. To break with tradition and to meet future challenges, where tradition does not present clear answers, student teachers have to take what Schön (1991) calls a cognitive risk and learn from others, such as mentors, peers and from the literature. Loughran (2006) claims that student teachers need to unlearn so they can relearn. A good practicum is accordingly a place where student teachers are challenged. However, in order to encounter challenges students also need to experience a mastery of teaching and feel they are supported (Ulvik, Smith & Helleve, 2009).

The practicum in the current programme seems to emphasise individual teaching, which corresponds with previous research on newly qualified teachers in Norway. The research indicates they are not prepared for the comprehensive teacher role and to be part of a working community (Ulvik, Smith & Helleve, 2009). To focus on the student teachers’ own teaching corresponds, furthermore, with the tradition in upper secondary school, with limited co-operation among teachers, and the kind of jobs these teachers are most likely to be offered. The disadvantage of this individual
focus is that teacher education does not provide an overview of the comprehensive role of teachers, or experiences of co-operation.

What constitutes a good practicum depends on the aims of teacher education. One aim is that student teachers develop a professional identity (Zeichner, 2002) and acquire tools for their ongoing development (Korthagen and Vasalos, 2005; Smith, 2007). To develop as professional teachers, it is important to reflect as well as to act. People reflect on their actions, but to learn student teachers need to engage in a systematic reflection. Most student teachers and school-based mentors did not mention reflection in the current study. It appears that techné (practical skills reflecting the training part of teacher education) is emphasised. Student teachers want to know what works and what does not. However, a deep and systematic reflection is necessary to understand why things happen, find adequate solutions to problems, cope with the unexpected in a professional way, and give reasons for their actions. In a hectic situation, they search for a “quick fix” and need to have a reason to reflect in a more systematic way. A good mentor encourages such reflection (Korthagen & Vasalos, 2005). It is surprising that reflection is not more emphasised in a context so heavily influenced by the idea of action and reflection (Lauvås & Handal, 2002) as in the Norwegian context.

4.2. A good practicum

Both the student teachers and mentors emphasised the importance of a good relationship where the student teacher and the mentor are professionally engaged, and where the student teachers experience a supportive environment that promotes risk taking. The student teachers find some support in a stimulating and inclusive environment, but it is mainly the local mentors who provide them with necessary support in the way they organise the practicum and in their feedback. This stresses how important mentors are, as pointed out by several researchers (Graham, 2006; Korthagen & Vasalos, 2005; Zeichner, 2002). Consequently, it gives rise to a concern that most mentors are not educated for the role and are chosen somewhat randomly. In a good practicum, which contributes to reflection as a tool for continuing professional development, the mentor is crucial. However, mentors will have a greater impact if their work is supported by a collaborative school environment (Wang et al., 2008). Therefore, we argue, it is necessary with both a qualified mentor and a supportive environment.

While researchers talk about the power of modelling (e.g., Korthagen & Swennen, 2007; Loughran, 2006; Lunenberg, Wilson, 2006), this aspect is almost absent in our study. The student teachers appreciate mentors who share their experiences, but it seems that they talk about what they do more than showing it. In the literature about modelling, it is emphasised that teacher educators need to demonstrate as well as explain. Observation is supposed to be part of the practicum in the Norwegian context; the student teachers observe both the mentor’s teaching and the teaching done
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by their fellow student teachers. To show and tell provides access to experiences and make them transparent. However, its importance is not evident in the current study. Student teachers are often eager to practice themselves after having observed teachers for many years. The danger is that they teach as they have been taught and do not develop their own professional judgements, a danger that could be exacerbated if they are not exposed to alternative teaching by teacher educators from the university (the supervisors).

Moreover, the data reveal a difference in the views of the mentors with and without a mentor education. Only those with a mentor education place demands on themselves and expressed that they were aware of their impact on the student teachers’ practice experiences. This indicates that, as associate teacher educators, mentors should be given adequate preparation to enhance the quality of teacher education. In the literature, we find that mentors seem to lack recognition in the professional community (Zeichner, 2002). If they are not valued and considered responsible and capable collaborators, they may not be aware of their importance in teacher education, as Zeichner (2002) points out. He also reminds us that learning to be a mentor is a complex and demanding process. Mentors are supposed to guide others in their learning and development, which is not easy if they are not conscious learners themselves. They need more than practical skills. A good teacher is not necessarily a good mentor (Bullough, 2005; Jones, 2010). To mentor in the profession is something other than teaching a subject. Mentoring is not about making teaching manageable for the teacher, but to improve teaching and learning for the benefit of the pupil (Timperley, 2010, Jones, 2010).

None of the participants mentioned the university-based supervisors as part of a good practicum, even though they spend much time visiting their student teachers. Their role in the practice situation seems to be vague and should be questioned. Wilson (2006) proposes changing the role of the university-based supervisors. Based on her own research, she recommends that they should mentor the mentors in school and collaborate with them. The programme in which this study took place has recently started a pilot project with partnerships between the school and the university and among schools. These partnerships offer meeting places and opportunities to interact in new ways and to connect the university coursework to the practicum.

4.3. Weaknesses of the current programme

There seems to be weak collaboration between the school and the university in the programme this study was based on. The two arenas appear like two different worlds. The different kinds of knowledge, episteme (theoretical) and techné (practical), do not interact to enhance an in-depth reflection and the development of phronesis (practical wisdom). Theoretical and practical knowledge are two different perspectives that complement each other. The first author concluded in her PHD thesis that to connect the two fields the practicum should be more theoretical, involving educated mentors
who are able to discuss teaching in theoretical terms, while the theoretical part (the university coursework) should be more practical by modelling and relating theory to examples (Ulvik, 2009). Co-operation between the school and the university, inside the school, and between peers, may be underdeveloped in the programme, resulting in limited learning opportunities and in student teachers who are not offered sufficient opportunities to learn from others.

It seems risky that a good practicum should depend on the mentor to such a degree as indicated in this study. Yet it would also be a concern if a good practicum were defined only by the university-based teacher educators because they do not know enough about everyday life in the classroom, especially, as is the case in Norway, when they are primarily employed based on academic qualifications. Co-operation between the school and the university, and among mentors, secures the quality of the practicum. It appears that encouraging greater co-operation between the university and schools, such as in the partnership models used in the current teacher education programme, is a good place to start.

There is a possible discrepancy between what we know from research about developing a professional identity and student teachers’ needs in the Norwegian context. Student teachers do not ask for more reflection. They primarily want to practice and to receive feedback in a supportive environment. They tend to ask for techné, tradition and predefined knowledge. There are many possible reasons for this, such as the way teacher education is organised, the lack of integration between the practicum and university coursework, or the lack of mentors who support professional development. This needs to be investigated further. Student teachers want to practice but, to reflect, they need something to reflect on. They need a perspective before having a meta-perspective (Ulvik, 2007). To have practice experiences before learning theory, instead of the other way round, might be a way to make this happen.

5. Conclusion
The study aimed to learn more about what the different parties in the practice triad of students, mentors and supervisors regard as a good practicum. The parties involved agreed on several points, such as the importance of quality mentoring (perhaps feedback is a more suitable expression), autonomy and responsibility given to student teachers, diverse experiences, to feel included in the school environment, to experience the comprehensive role of a teacher and to have a structured practicum. What happens among the different participants within the schools (students and their school-based mentors) seems to be the most important.

However, what a good practicum means depends on the aims of field experiences. In this study, elements of two different views of the practicum emerged. The practicum can be considered as a training arena where student teachers need to feel safe and supported, and can practice what they have learned. In this case, theory comes before practice, and there is a limited interplay between the two fields. This may lead to main-
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taining tradition. Students’ beliefs are not challenged and they are not encouraged to rethink and reflect in depth. This view emphasises techné. Conversely, the practicum can be viewed as part of an education where teachers-to-be develop a professional identity and are provided with tools for their continuous professional development. In this case, the mentors are supportive collaborators and discussion partners, and there is collaboration and a balanced responsibility among all parties. The student teachers are challenged; they learn to reflect and co-operate. This “Bildung”-oriented model may strengthen the development of phronesis.

With the first model, novices are likely to experience success for a short time, which makes it an easy route to follow. Moreover, the model corresponds to the future job that many Norwegian university educated teachers are offered, especially in upper secondary school. At the time of the study, newly qualified teachers were simply “thrown in the deep end” and had to manage by themselves. A recent development came in 2010 in Norway when it was decided that all new teachers have the right to be mentored during their first year of teaching (White Paper 11, 2008-2009). The “Bildung” model provides future teachers with tools for their further professional growth. This model depends on mentors who know how to support reflection and on schools that value a reflective teacher.

The teacher education programme in which this study was conducted is in a process of change but, before that can be completed, the parties need to develop better collaboration. They need to figure out the role of the university-based supervisors and to strengthen the role of mentors in schools, provide them with mentor education and recognise their contribution to field experiences and as models for teachers-to-be. The revised programme is built around partner schools, but still with theory and practice in the same order. We hope that a partnership model will empower the student teachers in a better way when they enter the profession. The aim of the current study was to examine views on the practicum held by various parties in the practicum triad. The findings suggest that changes need to be made; however, to make changes it is necessary to first define the goals, and then to look for the methods.

Marit Ulvik (PhD) is an Assistant Professor at the Department of Teacher Education, University of Bergen, Norway. Her research interests include teacher education and newly qualified teachers, as well as teachers’ professional development.
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