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ABSTRACT

This study investigated the opinions of collaborative relationships of pre-service and cooperating teachers during the internship semester. The primary purpose of the study was to determine if purposefully pairing pre-service and cooperating teachers with similar personality traits improved the opinions of collaboration. Using the method of purposeful pairing and a randomly assigned comparison group, the quality of opinions of collaboration were analyzed.

Prior to the main study, a pilot study used the Opinions of Collaborative Relationships Survey (OCRS) was created by the researcher. The pilot study involved 50 participants who were randomly assigned for a practicum placement. Twenty-five of the participants were pre-service teachers. The remaining half of the participants were cooperating teachers with whom the pre-service teachers were paired. Psychometric analysis indicated the OCRS to be reliable (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.95) and valid. Two factors were extracted using exploratory factor analysis. The two factors that were extracted were: I) components of collaboration; and II) future use of strategies learned.

In the final study, the Opinions of Collaborative Relationships Survey (OCRS) and the True Colors personality assessment were administered. This study involved 66 participants that consisted of 32 pre-service and 34 cooperating teachers. Thirty-two participants were purposefully paired based on dominant personality type (blue, gold, green, orange). The remaining 34 participants were randomly assigned. A confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted to determine the accuracy of the instrument’s factor structure and found that the two-factor solution can be retained.
There were two key findings from this study. The first key finding was there was no significant interaction found between method of pairing (purposeful, random), teacher classification (pre-service, cooperating), and dominant personality type (blue, gold, green, orange) on opinions of collaboration. However, there was a significant difference found between opinions of collaboration between classification of teachers.

The second key finding from this study was the vastly different opinions of collaboration between classification of teachers. Cooperating teachers consistently rated opinions of collaboration for this study lower than pre-service teachers. Specifically, a significant difference was found between pre-service and cooperating teachers related to the internship being a positive experience and future use of strategies learned during the semester.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background

The student teaching or internship semester of a teacher education program marks the passage from college experience to professional practice for excited and anxious pre-service teachers. Many pre-service teachers do not realize that they are about to embark on one of the most challenging learning experiences of their lives. They must learn how to act like a teacher, as well as learn how to share another teacher’s space and domain. According to Valencia, Martin, Place, and Grossman (2009), the internship semester is the most important aspect of the pre-service teacher’s training. The goal during internship is for pre-service teachers to learn how to teach effectively under the supervision of experienced veteran teachers while moving towards professional independence. This semester represents the culmination of their academic and professional training, during which they will implement strategies learned from previous practicum experiences, education courses, and seminars. Research indicates that each of these previous experiences shape pre-service teachers’ views of the classroom (Ediger, 2009).

According to the Alabama State Department of Education (2005), pre-service teachers seeking an elementary education degree (K-6), are required to complete an internship in a public school. The internship consists of a 16-week period when the candidates will teach for 20 full days, with 10 of those days being consecutive. During this time, the pre-service teachers are expected to develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn regardless of background. In Alabama, to help support the aforementioned abilities, pre-service teachers are guided by two essential individuals during the internship
experience – a university supervisor and a cooperating teacher. The university supervisor’s primary responsibility is to provide the pre-service teacher with feedback on a regular basis about teaching and classroom operations. The cooperating teacher serves as a role model and guides the intern through the daily responsibilities related to managing a classroom. Additionally, the state also mandates that higher education institutions partner with public schools to place pre-service teachers with cooperating teachers who will provide supportive classroom environments.

**Statement of Problem**

There is a need for determining the most effective method for pairing pre-service and cooperating teachers during the internship semester. Research on the internship experience indicates that conflicts commonly arise between the cooperating and pre-service teachers when they have contradictory personalities and beliefs about the ways in which students learn (Croker, 1999; Kasperbauer & Roberts, 2007; Nguyen, 2009; Rajuan et al., 2007; Smith, 2005; Valencia et al., 2009; Weisner & Salkeld, 2004; Wilson, 1996). Unresolved conflict is the main reason for failed internship semesters (Tripp & Eick, 2008). With this awareness, there is hope that teacher education institutions in conjunction with public school systems can collaborate to make purposeful placements that will result in effective and successful collaborative partnerships during the internship semester.

**Significance of the Problem**

Given the highly interactive and social nature of becoming a teacher, specifically during the internship semester, this phase demands interpersonal skills that many pre-service teachers have not yet acquired or fully cultivated. Smith (2005) has suggested that pre-service teachers in a community of practice must learn how to communicate with cooperating teachers using
dialogue that is appropriate for discussing teaching, learning, and planning. Often pre-service teachers possess the qualities of good teachers, yet they lack the maturity to relate to cooperating teachers who have differing personalities in a professional manner (Henry, Beasley, & Brighton, 2002).

These collaboration skills are essential as pre-service and cooperating teachers plan lessons, discuss strategies, and reflect on teaching performances. One of the most difficult tasks that a pre-service teacher will be faced with is how to respect the cooperating teacher’s suggestions, while also expressing their own creativity and decision-making skills. Learning to strike a balance between acknowledging the cooperating teacher’s ideas and exerting creativity and decision-making autonomy is difficult because both parties have unique perspectives on classroom management, ways in which students learn, and the role each member plays in this required and lengthy partnership (Croker, 1999). Consequently, these relationships can be quite contentious and result in negative experiences for both parties. A supportive internship where both parties have similar personalities and work ethics provides an environment in which pre-service teachers can mature professionally by trying new ideas, learning from knowledgeable experts, and taking risks despite the possibility of failure (Glenn, 2006).

**Purpose of the Study**

The primary purpose of this study was to determine if purposefully pairing pre-service and cooperating teachers with similar personality traits improves the opinions of collaboration during the internship semester. Using this method of purposeful pairing and a randomly assigned comparison group, the quality of opinions of collaboration during the internship semester can be analyzed. The results of this study add to the body of existing knowledge pertaining to the selection process of the cooperating teachers, the need for successful
collaboration between the pre-service and cooperating teachers, the conflicts that could arise during these relationships, and the careful consideration needed when pairing these individuals. The results of this study inform public school administrators that select cooperating teachers, the coordinators of field experiences at teacher education institutions that pair the teachers, cooperating teachers who host pre-service teachers during internship, and pre-service teachers who are about to embark on the most important semester of their program.

**Research Questions**

The following are a list of research questions for this study:

1. Is there an interaction effect between method of pairing (purposeful, random) and classification (pre-service, cooperating teacher) on opinions of collaboration;

2. Is there an interaction effect between method of pairing (purposeful, random) and dominant personality type (blue, gold, green, orange) on opinions of collaboration;

3. Are the responses to individual items on the survey dependent on the method of pairing (purposeful, random);

4. Are the responses to individual items on the survey dependent on the classification (pre-service, cooperating) of the teachers; and

5. Are the responses to individual items on the survey dependent on the dominant personality type (blue, gold, green, orange)?
Limitations

Although this study revealed key findings related to collaboration during the internship semester, there were limitations that should be noted that could affect the generalizability. Prior to the internship semester, the OCRS was created by the researcher and administered to participants. There were disadvantages to using this type of survey instrument. One disadvantage was the inability for pre-service and cooperating teachers to explain or clarify their responses because they were rating their opinions on a Likert scale (Babbie, 1990; Fink, 2009). Pre-service and cooperating teachers could have also responded to the survey in a socially desirable way (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007). Pre-service teachers could have felt that their responses would impact their final grade for the internship semester. The True Colors personality assessment was also completed by pre-service and cooperating teachers prior to the internship semester. A disadvantage of using this type of assessment was that participants were self-reporting their perceptions of their personality traits. In addition, participants were required to rank their personality traits in order from most relative to least relative. This type of ranking forced participants to make a choice among similar traits (Lowery, 1999). This may have forced participants to choose inaccurate personality characteristics.

The sampling size and population for this study could also be a limitation. The participants for this study consisted of an entire population of elementary pre-service teachers entering internship during the spring 2012 semester from a local teaching institution. These participants were a convenient sample (Fink, 2009). In addition, all of the pre-service teachers were enrolled in the same teaching institution and were all
elementary education majors. These participant characteristics could affect the generalizability of the study’s findings (Fink, 2009).

During the study, another limitation was identified. Due to the nature of randomly assigning the participants who were not purposefully paired, it was possible that randomly paired partners could have been randomly assigned a partner with the same dominant personality type. Therefore, a pre-service and cooperating teacher who were randomly assigned could have had matching dominant personality types which could present problems with the generalizability of the study.

**Assumptions**

The following are a list of assumptions for this study:

1. The pre-service and cooperating teachers are willing to participate in the study;
2. The pre-service and cooperating teachers’ responses on the True Colors personality assessment are valid and reliable;
3. The pre-service and cooperating teachers’ responses to the items on the OCRS are valid and reliable;
4. Conflicting personalities between pre-service and cooperating teachers can hinder opinions of collaboration; and
5. Partnerships comprised of participants with matching dominant personality types will report enhanced opinions of collaboration.

**Definition of Terms**

Several key terms must be defined in order to fully understand the language and frameworks related to this study.
Collaboration is a style of direct interaction between at least two co-equal parties voluntarily engaged in shared decision making as they work toward a common goal. Collaboration is voluntary, equal value, shared goal, shared responsibility for key decisions, shared accountability for outcomes, shared resources, and has emergent properties (Friend & Cook, 1992).

Communities of practice are groups of people who share a common concern or a passion for something they do and learn how to do it better as they interact regularly (Wenger, 2006).

Cooperating teacher is a P-12 faculty member who supervises pre-service teachers. They must be accomplished school professionals who are properly certificated for their present assignment, hold at least a master’s degree, have at least three years of educational experience in their field of specialization, and are currently teaching classes in the pre-service teachers’ area of specialization. The cooperating teacher shall provide regular and continuing support for pre-service teachers through such processes as observation, conferencing, group discussion, email, and the use of other technology (Alabama State Department of Education, 2005).

Internship is the full-time experience of a pre-service teacher in public schools, culminating in the assumption of responsibility for the teaching role. During this experience the candidate is under the supervision of personnel from a public school system and the candidate’s institution of higher education. Pre-service teachers are immersed in the community of practice and are provided opportunities to develop and demonstrate competence in the professional roles for which they are preparing (Alabama State Department of Education, 2005).

Personality Type refers to an individual’s characteristic patterns of thought, emotion, and behavior, together with the psychological mechanisms, hidden or not, behind those patterns.
(Funder, 2007). This is also referred to as psychological type, temperament, or learning/cognitive style (Bernard, Cingerman, & Gilbride, 2011).

*Pre-service teacher* is a candidate that is enrolled in an initial certification program at an accredited institution of higher education, which provides academic and professional preparation (Alabama State Department of Education, 2005).

*Purposeful pairing* during internship is making intentional placement decisions, specifically matching pre-service and cooperating teachers based on primary personality temperaments (Tripp & Eick, 2008).

**Summary**

Chapter I provided an overview of the main study by discussing the background, statement of the problem, significance of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions, limitations, assumptions, and definition of terms. Chapter II will provide a review of the current literature concerning collaborative relationships during internship. Chapter III will discuss an initial pilot study that was used to form the main study and then will lead into a description of the methodology and survey research design. Chapter IV presents the analysis of data for the study. Finally, Chapter V discusses findings, conclusions and recommendations.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The student teaching experience is the most significant component of the teacher education program (DelGesso & Smith, 1993). Therefore it is critical for this experience to be explored to determine what promotes successful experiences, as well as the obstacles that can lead to ineffective internships (Hsu, 2005). The information uncovered through this research can be used to determine the most appropriate methods for pairing pre-service and cooperating teachers that can enhance the collaboration during internship (Gardiner & Robinson, 2009). This chapter will review the literature pertaining to collaborative relationships during the internship semester and is divided into the following seven sections: (a) significance of the internship experience, (b) Situated Learning Theory, (c) True Colors Personality Theory, (d) personality type and teacher effectiveness, (e) role of the cooperating teacher, (f) role of supportive collaboration during internship, (g) tensions during internship, and (h) purposeful pairing of cooperating and pre-service teachers.

Significance of the Internship Experience

Teacher education programs consider the internship semester to be of the utmost importance for pre-service teachers. This experience is created by a network of individuals traditionally consisting of the pre-service teacher, cooperating teacher, and university supervisor. In a study conducted by Valencia et al. (2009), pre-service teachers were interviewed and observed during the internship semester. The researchers found that each member of the triad played a significant role in the continually changing balance of power throughout the semester. Each member’s awareness of this balance paradigm promoted collaboration as the university
supervisor supported the pre-service and cooperating teachers as they began shifting between learner and teacher. The members of this triad must work together effectively in order for a quality internship semester (Marlow, 2009).

The experiences gained during this semester will have an influence over the educational development of the pre-service teacher and are an integral part of the teacher education program (Feiman-Nemser & Buchmann, 1987; Marquez-Lopez, 2006). Kasperbauer and Roberts (2007) surveyed 33 pre-service teachers three times throughout the internship semester to determine critical behaviors of cooperating teachers. The pre-service teachers were surveyed the first day of internship, the mid-point week during internship, and the final day of the internship semester. The researchers found that pre-service teachers rated cooperating teachers supporting decisions made by the intern, allowing the intern freedom to try new strategies, and treating interns as a fellow professional as the most important components in the educational development of the pre-service teacher. Although pre-service teachers are able to develop when given the freedom to try new strategies, research has also shown that cooperating teachers’ behaviors and strategies also have an influence on pre-service teachers’ educational development. A study conducted by Gold (1996) revealed that pre-service teachers undergo an imprinting process during the internship experience. This imprinting process occurs when a cooperating teacher embeds their self-perceptions and behaviors within the pre-service teachers, influencing their future careers as educators.

Teacher education programs should assist pre-service teachers in gaining knowledge, beliefs, and strategies that will enable them to succeed in their future classrooms. Borko and Mayfield (1995) observed and interviewed four pre-service teachers throughout their internship semester. The researchers found that all of the pre-service teachers had a strong desire to gain
knowledge from their cooperating teachers and believed that they could only learn by doing. However, the results of the study indicated that the cooperating teacher’s degree of willingness to allow the pre-service teacher freedom in the classroom directly impacted the knowledge gained by the intern. Similarly, Slick (1998) found that learning could only take place during the internship semester when the cooperating teacher served as a strong role model and afforded the intern opportunities to teach thus acquiring new skills and strategies. Valencia et al. (2009) stressed that the goal of the internship experience was for pre-service teachers to leave the semester with the confidence to implement the strategies learned in their future classrooms.

Most pre-service teachers eagerly anticipate the internship semester. During this experience, they look forward to implementing research-based strategies learned during methods courses, seminars, field experiences, and observations as well as applying new instructional techniques with the support of an experienced teacher in a real-world setting (Slick, 1998). A study conducted by Feiman-Nemser and Buchmann (1987) revealed the importance of helping pre-service teachers transition from the university setting to the elementary classroom setting.

Ediger (2009) stressed the important role of university supervisors and cooperating teachers as they were responsible for scaffolding pre-service teachers as they implemented strategies learned during coursework in the classroom. In the same way, Kasperbauer and Roberts (2007) found that allowing pre-service teachers the opportunity to practice strategies in the classroom directly impacted the way in which the interns viewed themselves as future educators. If pre-service teachers were not given the opportunity to implement these strategies during their internship experience, they would never actually implement the strategies in their own classrooms (Kasperbauer & Roberts, 2007). Similarly, Munby and Russell (1994) found that pre-service teachers enter the internship semester expecting to implement all of the
techniques learned during methods courses. Further, pre-service teachers reported that the internship semester was the most beneficial experience during the teacher education program. DelGesso and Smith (1993) surveyed 110 pre-service teachers during the internship semester and found that implementing theories learned during coursework enabled them to develop teaching skills. Likewise, the research of Guyton and McIntyre (1990) indicated that the guidance pre-service teachers received during the internship semester was the most important component in learning how to become an effective teacher. Glenn (2006) found that the quality of the internship determines the success of a pre-service teacher. Furthermore, this experience can impact whether pre-service teachers remain in the teaching profession and how they perceive themselves as educators (Borko & Mayfield, 1995; Kasperbauer & Roberts, 2007).

**Situated Learning Theory**

Lave and Wenger’s (1991) Situated Learning Theory explains that learners must take part in a community of practitioners in order for mastery of the tool or trade to occur. The Situated Learning Theory explores the connection between learning and the social environment in which it takes place. This theory is applicable to effective practicum and internship placements because pre-service teachers discover teaching strategies interacting in a variety of classroom settings (Smith, 2005). This theory can also be used to analyze the opinions of the complex social interactions between pre-service and cooperating teachers as learning occurs (Gardiner & Robinson, 2009). Four key components that make up the Situated Learning Theory are legitimate peripheral participation, complex social interactions, participation in authentic tasks, and communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Table 1 shows summarizes the four key components of the Situated Learning Theory.
Table 1

*Four Key Components of Situated Learning Theory (Lave & Wenger, 1991)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legitimate Peripheral Participation</td>
<td>The process of transitioning from novice to practicing member of the community and must be achieved for learning to take place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex Social Interactions</td>
<td>Interactions that take place between the pre-service and cooperating teachers as they establish their roles in this newfound partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Authentic Tasks</td>
<td>Shared responsibilities and understandings regarding what the pre-service teachers are expected to do in the community of practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities of Practice</td>
<td>Members of a community of practice have a common concern or passion and share knowledge as they interact on a regular basis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legitimate Peripheral Participation**

According to Lave and Wenger (1991), learning only takes place in a situated context through a process called legitimate peripheral participation. Legitimate peripheral participation is the process of transitioning from novice to practicing member of the community and must be achieved for learning to take place. This transitioning process can be observed as pre-service teachers begin with minimal duties in the classroom and progress to assuming full responsibility of the classroom (Parks, 2009).

There are four phases that a pre-service teacher must transition through to become a full member of a community of practice (Dennen & Burner, 2008). These phases include peripheral, inbound, insider, and outbound. The peripheral phase is where a novice participates with the community but is not yet a member of the community. This phase can be observed in the initial
internship experience as pre-service teachers observe or assist cooperating teachers with menial tasks. During this time, the pre-service teacher is simply learning how the community functions and determining what skills he may be able to contribute to the community (Sutherland, 2009).

The second phase of legitimate peripheral participation is the inbound phase. During this phase, it is apparent that the novice is becoming a fully participating member of the community of practice. This phase can be observed as pre-service teachers begin to assume classroom responsibilities such as planning and teaching assigned subjects and working cooperatively with cooperating teachers through shared planning. During the inbound phase, pre-service and cooperating teachers begin to negotiate power, personality, and philosophical differences (Gardiner & Robinson, 2009). Next, the novice teacher becomes an insider or a fully participating member of the community. During this phase, the pre-service teacher takes full responsibility of the classroom. This phase also requires pre-service and cooperating teachers to reflect upon and compare their own teaching preferences (Jacobs & Yendol-Hoppey, 2010). The final phase of legitimate peripheral participation is the outbound phase. During this phase, the novice is preparing to leave the community of learners and gradually begins to release the classroom duties back to the cooperating teacher.

**Complex Social Interactions**

Complex social interactions, the second key component of Situated Learning Theory, take place between pre-service and cooperating teachers as they establish their roles in this newfound partnership, specifically during the inbound and insider phases. The expert is expected to assess the novice teacher’s performance level and then encourage or scaffold them until they are able to independently complete the tasks within the authentic placement (Gardiner & Robinson, 2009). Lave and Wenger (1991) have explained that although the cooperating and
pre-service teachers are collaborating, it does not guarantee that it will result in meaningful learning. The shifting of roles between learner and teacher must take place in order for the partnership to succeed (Smith, 2005).

As the pre-service teacher moves from the peripheral phase to the inbound phase, he is moving towards a more empowering position (Lave & Wenger, 1991). This transfer of power can result in tension between the partners unless negotiated in an effective manner. The pre-service teacher may not transition fully through legitimate peripheral participation unless the cooperating teacher is willing to release some of the power he encompasses. According to Lave and Wenger (1991), if novices are not allowed access for involvement, they will not ever become a fully participating member of the community of practice.

**Participation in Authentic Tasks**

Lave and Wenger (1991) also believe that learning takes place when students are participating in authentic tasks. Authentic tasks, the third pillar of the Situated Learning Theory are shared responsibilities and understandings regarding what they are expected to do in the community of practice. When pre-service teachers are actively engaged in preparing lesson plans, maintaining classroom management, and teaching lessons, they are learning problem-solving strategies in an authentic environment. Pre-service teachers will not implement newly-acquired teaching methods in their own classrooms unless they are given opportunities to experiment with them during internship (Borko & Mayfield, 1995). Similarly, Stalmeijer, Dolmans, Wolfhagen, and Scherpbier (2009) found that practice in authentic settings reinforced modeling, coaching, scaffolding, articulation, reflection, and exploration in constructing new knowledge. Teaching institutions must provide pre-service teachers the opportunity to perform real tasks in genuine settings in order to combine theory and practice (Dennen & Burner, 2007).
Communities of Practice

The fourth pillar of the Situated Learning Theory involves students working in communities of practice. Members of a community of practice have a common concern or passion and share knowledge as they interact on a regular basis (Wenger, 2006). Members of communities of practice not only include the expert that is expected to scaffold a novice, but other novice teachers as well. The interactions between other pre-service teachers allow for discussions and reflections to enhance learning (Lave & Wenger, 1991).

A community of practice consists of three components: mutual engagement, a joint enterprise, and a shared repertoire (Wenger, 1998; Parks, 2009). Mutual engagement interactions could involve both parties requesting feedback and agreement upon instructional decisions. Joint work entails shared responsibility for developing lessons and teaching strategies. The shared repertoire component requires both parties to use common language thereby cultivating a professional relationship. Immersion within a community of practice assists pre-service teachers to become “inbound” or an active participant within the community of practice (Dennen & Burner, 2007; Wenger, 1998). As pre-service teachers practice and gain confidence in the classroom, they are acquiring the skills they need in order to contribute to the community of practice (Kasperbauer & Roberts, 2007). Teacher preparation institutions must consider the characteristics of a community of practice to help ensure a positive internship experience (Sutherland, 2009). One of the characteristics that could be taken into consideration for a positive internship experience is the pairing of similar personality types.
True Colors Personality Theory

Studying and identifying personality types began with Hippocrates in 460 B.C. During this time, Hippocrates characterized personalities into four categories. These categories included Phlegmatic, Choleric, Melancholic, and Sanguine (Merenda, 1999). Similarly, psychologist Carl Jung identified four types of functions in which humans operated. These functions consisted of feeling, thinking, sensation, and intuition (Jung, 1989). After studying Jung’s research, Katherine Briggs and her daughter Isabel Myers created the Myers/Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) in the 1950s. This indicator identified 16 personality types (Briggs-Myers, 1990). Then in the 1960s, psychologist David Keirsey reverted back to identifying four personality types. These types included Appollonian, Promethean, Epimethean, and Dionysian (Keirsey & Bates, 1984). Using research from the previous personality theories, Don Lowery created a personality temperament model entitled True Colors in 1978. This model was created in an attempt to simplify the MBTI (True Colors International, 2011). Table 2 shows the correlation of personality types by theorist.

Table 2

Correlation of Personality Types by Theorist (Lowry, 1989)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theorist</th>
<th>Personality Type</th>
<th>Personality Type</th>
<th>Personality Type</th>
<th>Personality Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hippocrates</td>
<td>Melancholic</td>
<td>Choleric</td>
<td>Phlegmatic</td>
<td>Sanguine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jung</td>
<td>Feeling</td>
<td>Thinking</td>
<td>Sensation</td>
<td>Intuition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myers-Briggs</td>
<td>ENJ INFJ</td>
<td>ENTJ, INTJ</td>
<td>ESTJ, ISTJ</td>
<td>ESFP, ISFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENFP, INFP</td>
<td>ENTP, INTP</td>
<td>ESFJ, ISFJ</td>
<td>ESTP, ISTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keirsey</td>
<td>Apollonian</td>
<td>Promethean</td>
<td>Epimethean</td>
<td>Dionysian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowery</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation of Myers-Briggs personality types: (E) Extraversion, (I) Introversion, (S) Sensing, (N) Intuition, (T) Thinking, (F) Feeling, (J) Judging, or (P) Perceiving
Lowery identified four colors to explain unique personality characteristics. These colors included blue, gold, green, and orange. According to Lowery (1989), the four colors used in True Colors are the foundation for every type of personality temperament. Lowery created four playing cards containing each color’s unique characteristics. Participants were asked to sort the cards in order from the card that best related to them to the card that least related to them. Therefore, the True Colors personality assessment assigned each participant a color spectrum of all four colors in order from one’s dominant personality temperament down to the color that is considered the least like the person. Table 3 shows the True Colors personality type characteristics.

Table 3

**True Colors Personality Type Characteristics (True Colors International, 2009)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Friendly, helpful, compassionate, considerate, cooperative, emotional, imaginative, and affectionate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Problem-solvers, independent, tenacious, self-assured, witty, logical, and creative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>Prepared, reliable, on-time, appropriate, and follows rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Active, take charge, competitive, negotiator, spontaneous, performer, and multi-tasker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lowery explains that True Colors should not be used as a tool to stereotype, label, or box people in, rather a tool that indicates commonalities and differences. The True Colors Theory acknowledges that all individuals are made up of unique combinations of all four colors (Lowery, 1989). The individual’s dominant personality color represents activities or operations with which the individual is the most comfortable (Bryce, 2000). The next color in the individual’s spectrum is also very telling because it could be as evident as the individual’s dominant color. The third ranked color in an individual’s spectrum indicates characteristics that
might not be as evident or useful to an individual. Finally, the fourth ranked color indicates characteristics that would be considered foreign or uncomfortable to the individual.

According to Lowery (1989), the True Colors Theory enables one to become aware of the similarities and differences of all individuals. This new awareness allows for understanding and appreciation of other people, as well as strategies for communicating with others, and ways to encourage and support individuals of different personality temperaments. Ineffective collaboration can occur between individuals if they are not aware of how to communicate in a way that is acceptable to both parties (Lowery, 1989).

**Personality Type and Teacher Effectiveness**

Various personality studies have been conducted to identify consistent personality types of an effective teacher. According to Fairhurst (1995), it is imperative for teachers to be aware of their own specific personality types. This knowledge enables teachers to distinguish the differences between their own personality type and that of their students. Rushton, Morgan, and Richard (2007) conducted a study in which effective teachers were selected in the state of Florida and expected to lead professional development seminars, model teaching practices, and serve as coaches for other teachers. The effective teachers were selected by superintendents and school administrators using a pre-determined criteria. For this study, Rushton et al. (2007) administered the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) to 58 effective teachers hoping to determine what personality characteristics effective teachers portrayed. The results of the study indicated that the majority of effective teachers exhibited the E, N, and P traits. According to MBTI, the E trait represents extraverted individuals whose characteristics include ease with meeting new people and being active. The N characteristic stands for intuition. Intuition characteristics consist of viewing the world as having numerous possibilities and not being
intimidated by what the future may hold. Finally, the P characteristic represents perceiving. Perceiving characteristics include being flexible and adaptable in all situations. The E, N, and P characteristics correlated with blue and green colors in the True Colors Theory.

According to Decker and Rimm-Kaufman (2008), personality traits can be a predictor of future success for pre-service teachers. These researchers conducted a study analyzing the personality traits of 432 pre-service teachers using the NEO (neuroticism, extraversion, and openness) Five-Factor Inventory. The results of this study indicated that effective pre-service teachers possessed personality qualities of extraversion, openness, and agreeableness. Similarly, Ripski, LoCasale-Crouch, and Decker (2011) used the NEO Five-Factor Inventory to determine personality types and quality of teaching skills of 67 pre-service teachers. The results indicated that effective pre-service teachers scored high in the extraversion, openness, agreeableness, and conscientiousness characteristics.

Ayan and Kocacik (2010) administered a job satisfaction and personality scale to 1,036 teachers in public schools in Australia. The results indicated that teachers with extrovert personality types appeared to be more satisfied with their jobs. These extrovert teachers possessed the qualities of being determined and flexible, resulting in a greater degree of job satisfaction. Watts, Cage, Batley, and Davis (2011) used the 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF) and principal ratings to identify effective teachers. The results indicated that teachers who viewed themselves as impatient, tense, and having high energy were scored higher by their school administrators than teachers that perceived themselves as composed, laid back, and patient.
Role of the Cooperating Teacher

Pre-service teachers indicated that having an effective cooperating teacher was one of the most important aspects of the internship experience (Guyton, 1989). Harlin, Edwards, and Briers (2002) conducted a study where pre-service teachers rated their cooperating teachers and found that the support of the cooperating teacher was more important than any other factor during the internship semester. Woolley (1997) conducted a study over seven semesters to determine pre-service teachers’ opinions of cooperating teachers. The pre-service teachers completed a six question open-ended survey at the conclusion of the internship semester and consistently rated feedback given by the cooperating teacher as the most important component of an effective internship experience.

The cooperating teacher plays a significant role in the triad that also includes the pre-service teacher and university supervisor. Cooperating teachers are considered practical and professional mentors, given that they spend a large amount of time interacting and communicating with pre-service teachers. In fact, pre-service teachers rate the support and encouragement of cooperating teachers as more influential upon the quality of the internship than feedback from the university supervisor. Borko and Mayfield (1995) found that pre-service teachers viewed the university supervisor as an evaluator whereas the cooperating teacher was perceived as the guide. Connor and Killmer (1995) conducted a study over three semesters surveying 307 pre-service teachers. The pre-service teachers rated the feedback from the cooperating teacher and the freedom to implement new teaching strategies as the most valuable elements of the semester. DelGesso and Smith (1993) found that pre-service teachers were particularly grateful for the relationships they shared with their cooperating teachers. Glenn (2006) interviewed and observed two pre-service teachers who reported they had exceptional
internship experiences. The results of the study indicated that both of the cooperating teachers, although very different in personality types and teaching strategies, guided the pre-service teachers and allowed them independence in the classroom. Kasperbauer and Roberts (2007) administered a questionnaire to 33 pre-service teachers during the internship semester. The questionnaire consisted of four themes including teaching and instruction, professionalism, collaborative relationships, and personal characteristics. The results of the study indicated that the collaborative relationship between the pre-service and cooperating teacher impacted whether the pre-service teacher would remain in the teaching profession.

The cooperating teacher fulfills many roles including counselor, expert teacher, evaluator, and even parent. These mentors must be willing to invest large amounts of time as they collaborate with pre-service teachers about instructional strategies, lesson planning, and feedback on observed lessons (Siebert, Clark, Kilbridge, & Peterson, 2006). However, this relationship can be mutually beneficial because cooperating teachers are likely to modify, improve, and gain new teaching strategies from pre-service teachers in addition to evaluating their own strengths and weaknesses (Spencer, 2008).

**Giver of Information**

Traditionally, the cooperating teacher is seen as the giver of information. This occurs as this mentor models effective instructional strategies for the pre-service teacher and offers information about the school’s culture and climate. Hertzog, Pensavalle, and Lemlech, (2000) administered a questionnaire to pre-service and cooperating teachers for 12 semesters. The results of the study indicated that pre-service teachers depended on the cooperating teachers to model effective classroom and teaching strategies. Similarly, Tripp and Eick (2008) found that pre-service teachers wanted to see cooperating teachers model lessons and give ongoing
feedback. According to Drafall and Grant (1994), cooperating teachers must be able to communicate in a manner that pre-service teachers can comprehend. They are also responsible for providing ongoing and appropriate feedback about lesson plans, instructional strategies, and observed lessons (Melser, 2004). These ongoing discussions provide opportunities for cooperating teachers to guide pre-service teachers as they explain, defend, and reflect upon their own methods of instruction. Feiman-Nemser and Beasley (1997) have suggested that one-on-one conferences between the pre-service and cooperating teacher are the most important instructional factor during the internship experience. In the same way, Wilson and Saleh (2000) indicated that cooperating teachers who work closely with university supervisors may begin to share the same teaching philosophy with the university supervisor which will ultimately benefit pre-service teachers.

**Receiver of Information**

Often cooperating teachers assume the role of information recipient as they allow pre-service teachers to implement new strategies, discuss and explain new ideas, and reflect upon their own teaching practices. Johnston, Duvernoy, McGill, and Will (1996) interviewed effective cooperating teachers and found that they considered themselves learners when hosting a pre-service teacher. They expressed that mentoring a pre-service teacher allowed them the opportunity to learn. Similarly, Wilson (1996) found that cooperating teachers felt as if they learned more from the pre-service teachers than the pre-service teachers actually learned from them. The cooperating teachers viewed the internship experience as a form of professional development. Cooperating teachers must also be willing to explain why they teach a certain way without becoming defensive when their methods are questioned by pre-service teachers (Lamy, 2002). Rajuan, Beijaard, and Verloop (2007) conducted a four-year study and interviewed 40
cooperating and pre-service teachers. The researchers found that pre-service teachers wanted to be placed with cooperating teachers that were open to new ideas and strategies of teaching and afforded them the freedom to try new ideas in the classroom. This study suggested that allowing both the pre-service and cooperating teacher to reflect on teaching successes and dilemmas promoted learning for both teachers. Glenn (2006) found that pre-service teachers preferred cooperating teachers that were willing to release classroom responsibilities gradually so that novice teachers could assume a leadership role.

Cooperating teachers must be intuitive about when pre-service teachers are ready to progress from the position of assistant to instructional leader. Specifically, a cooperating teacher should have an accurate assessment of the pre-service teacher’s areas of strength and growth (Smith, 2007). Cooperating teachers can have a considerable impact on the development of future teachers in the areas of management, organization, and communication, thus impacting multitudes of students (Nguyen, 2009).

The Role of Supportive Collaborations During Internship

Another key component for an effective internship is the collaboration between the cooperating and pre-service teacher. According to Madigan and Schroth-Cavatalo (2011), educational collaboration consists of the following five elements: planning time, similar levels of content knowledge, shared philosophy, common goals, and trust and respect. A positive team-teaching approach between the pre-service and cooperating teacher creates a sense of professional development for both educators. Chamberlin (1999) videotaped and analyzed pre-service and cooperating teachers’ discussions about the pre-service teacher’s teaching performances. Reflective supervision or continuous conversations between the pre-service and cooperating teacher about teaching promoted a trusting and professional relationship between the
partners (Chamberlin, 1999). When cooperating teachers implemented reflective supervision, it had a positive influence on pre-service teachers’ motivation, belief in themselves, and professionalism (Chamberlin, 1999).

Liliane and Colette (2009) found that pre-service teachers contributed to meaningful discussions about teaching, when they felt safe and secure in knowing the cooperating teacher respected and valued their opinions. This sense of trust was established when cooperating teachers were open to having their own teaching practices questioned or even altered as professional collaboration and discussions occurred between the teachers. This mutual sense of respect and responsibility in the classroom is imperative for collaboration to be effective.

Scantlebury, Gallo-Fox, and Wassell (2006) conducted ethnographic research analyzing co-teaching between pre-service and cooperating teachers. The researchers found that effective collaboration occurred during the internship semester when there was ongoing dialogue about shared practices in an environment of mutual respect. This effective collaboration allowed both teachers to have a shared responsibility when meeting their students’ needs. According to Scantlebury et al. (2006), when collaboration does not occur, conflicting goals can be set for students. Similarly, Glenn (2006) interviewed pre-service and cooperating teacher pairs and found that when they collaborated, pre-service teachers had opportunities to try new strategies. This sense of freedom enabled the pre-service teachers to foster a meaningful relationship with the cooperating teacher.

Sharing ideas forces both parties to consider new teaching approaches and negotiate strategies that they feel will benefit their students (Smith, 2007). Both teachers gain from this type of relationship because they are shifting roles from novice to expert. They must be able to have meaningful conversations about education and encourage each other to implement new
ideas (Smith, 2007). During these shared planning sessions, both teachers should feel comfortable discussing anecdotal notes, offering suggestions, and demonstrating or even challenging instructional techniques (Nguyen, 2009). Similarly, Smith (2005) conducted a four-year ethnographic study observing pre-service and cooperating teachers and found that pre-service teachers only learned the skills necessary for effective communication skills if they were able to communicate on a consistent basis with a supportive cooperating teacher. These discussions, if approached in a professional and respectful manner, led to new knowledge and enhanced collaboration (Ediger, 1994). This type of communication requires a tolerance for new ideas (Liliane & Colette, 2009).

Cooperating teachers should also communicate respectfully when providing feedback to pre-service teachers. Wilkins-Canter (2010) analyzed journals kept by pre-service teachers on the amount of quality feedback they received from their cooperating teacher and found that pre-service teachers desired feedback from cooperating teachers and rated constructive criticism as a critical aspect of their internship experience. In addition, the researchers also found that although cooperating teachers were willing to give feedback, few had ever been trained in how to do so. Wilkins-Canter (2010) stressed the importance of cooperating teachers offering feedback that is consistent and when there is another opportunity for the discussed skills to be practiced again. Similarly, DelGesso and Smith (1993) found that pre-service teachers felt that support through constructive feedback helped promote an effective collaborative relationship with their cooperating teachers. This type of collaboration was created when cooperating and pre-service teachers viewed each other as colleagues that had valuable information to share (Scantlebury et al., 2007). This shared collaboration develops a supportive environment in which pre-service teachers feel free to experiment with new teaching strategies, knowing that they are safe to make
mistakes (Johnston et al., 1996; Kasperbauer & Roberts, 2007). Nguyen (2009) observed pre-service and cooperating teachers during conferences and found that a supportive environment was only achieved through teamwork, flexibility, dedication, and mutual respect.

**Tensions During Internship**

Cooperating and pre-service teachers’ awareness of possible conflicts is another key component of an effective internship. According to Tripp and Eick (2008), unresolved conflict between a pre-service and cooperating teacher leads to most failed internship semesters. Rarely do cooperating teachers receive training from teaching institutions about how to successfully supervise and mentor pre-service teachers (Wilson & Saleh, 2000). They may rely on their own internship experience as a model or employ techniques of supervision that they feel are most appropriate. Cooperating teachers may not realize that without an effective collaborative relationship with their pre-service teachers, they are failing to maximize the actual learning that could take place (Spencer, 2008).

**Finding the Balance of Power**

When pre-service and cooperating teachers are paired during internship, they experience a “honeymoon period” in which they must get to know one another. This period of time for getting acquainted can be rather uncomfortable and challenging at times for both teachers. Hsu (2009) administered a questionnaire to 40 pre-service teachers during the internship semester and found that many pre-service teachers entered the final semester lacking professional experience in dealing with demands such as classroom management, collaboration with school personnel, and confidence, which resulted in a difficult transition into internship. The results from the study also indicated that many pre-service teachers decided to mimic their cooperating teachers’ style of teaching instead of implementing newly learned ideas to avoid any disapproval from the
mentor teachers. DelGesso and Smith (1993) surveyed 110 elementary pre-service and cooperating teachers during the internship semester and found that many cooperating teachers felt as if pre-service teachers entered the internship experience with unrealistic expectations. The cooperating teachers also noted the lack of knowledge pertaining to management tasks such as recording grades and taking attendance.

Difficult social interactions can occur when the cooperating and pre-service teachers realize they have different expectations for the internship. Rajuan et al. (2007) led focus groups including pre-service and cooperating teachers and noted that tensions occurred when the internship had progressed and the pre-service teacher began taking over more control of the classroom. This increased responsibility allowed the pre-service teacher to make decisions with which the cooperating teacher may not agree. Similarly, Liliane and Colette (2009) found that during these tense moments, both teachers must be prepared to professionally defend their reasoning for specific practices.

Successful pre-service teachers are fully aware of the distribution of power between themselves and the cooperating teachers. However, other pre-service teachers are oblivious to this dynamic of power, and can begin internship with challenges. Smith (2007) analyzed the conversations between pre-service and cooperating teachers during the internship semester and found that both cooperating and pre-service teachers felt they were not prepared for the straightforward conversations and negotiations that must take place for effective shared planning. This power struggle between the cooperating and pre-service teacher can lead to an ineffective internship experience for both parties. Scantlebury et al. (2006) found that pre-service teachers lost respect for cooperating teachers that were unprepared for the following day’s instruction or exhibited unprofessional conduct. Since pre-service teachers enter the classroom with a low
status, it is the responsibility of the cooperating teachers to make these initial exchanges a comfortable experience for both parties (Smith, 2005).

**Difference in Philosophical Beliefs about Learning**

During this time, if the pair perceives themselves to have conflicting opinions about teaching, this can make for a long and awkward experience for both teachers. Kasperbauer and Roberts (2007) found that this conflict became evident as the pre-service and cooperating teacher discussed lesson planning and ways in which classroom routines were handled. If conflict occurs, it is imperative that the pair make a conscious decision to value each other’s contributions and be willing to try new strategies, even though they might not always agree (Nguyen, 2009). If this sense of respect is not established, the pre-service teacher may not feel as if the feedback from the cooperating is beneficial (Borko & Mayfield, 1995). One of the most challenging tasks that a pre-service teacher will face is learning how to adhere to instructions from the cooperating teacher, yet carve out their own sense of identity as a professional (Schon, 1987). Pre-service teachers may feel discouraged when they feel as if the cooperating teacher’s philosophical beliefs about learning conflict with the strategies taught at the intern’s teaching institution (Croker, 2009).

**Complications of Hosting a Pre-service Teacher**

Cooperating teachers should acknowledge the possible complications they may encounter when hosting a pre-service teacher. According to DelGesso and Smith (1993), many cooperating teachers felt unprepared for and anxious about the internship semester due to the lack of information from the teaching institution. Other complications reported by cooperating teachers included: interruption of instruction, teacher displacement, disruption of classroom routine, teacher isolation, and shifting of the cooperating teachers’ time and energy (Wilson, 1996).
Similarly, Spencer (2007) surveyed 181 cooperating teachers to determine the opinions of the internship experience. Cooperating teachers reported poor communication, limited knowledge of university requirements, interrupted instruction, displacement of control, and inexperience of the pre-service teachers as challenges.

Some cooperating teachers are willing for pre-service teachers to teach in their classrooms, but might not take the time to contribute to lesson planning due to time constraints or lack of interest. Gardiner and Robinson (2009) found that many pre-service teachers reported that cooperating teachers were not involved in lesson plan development and many times feedback from the cooperating teacher was unclear or inexplicit. Cooperating teachers who were apprehensive about turning over the responsibility of their classrooms sometimes felt as if the role of the pre-service teacher was to simply to mimic their methods of teaching (Liliane & Colette, 2009). This approach can create frustrations for pre-service teachers who feel they have limited freedom to explore new teaching strategies (Valencia et al., 2009; Smith, 2005).

According to Hastings (2004), many cooperating teachers experienced feelings of guilt, disappointment, frustration, and anxiety when balancing the many duties that are required of them. These feelings of guilt caused the cooperating teacher to be reluctant to hand over their classroom to a novice teacher (Rajuan et al., 2007). Cooperating teachers could incorrectly infer that merely hosting the pre-service teacher in their classrooms is sufficient for learning to take place, as opposed to offering supportive collaboration (Wilkins-Canter, 2010).

Time for Collaboration and Communication

Another possible source of tension is the time necessary for effective collaboration and communication (Gardiner & Robinson, 2009). Cooperating teachers do not consider their feedback significant and typically are willing to answer questions only in passing. However,
pre-service teachers view feedback as a critical component to their professional development. One of the most commonly reported problems from pre-service teachers is the lack of specific feedback and communication from their cooperating teachers. Borko and Mayfield (1995) found that rarely do formal conferences between the pre-service and cooperating teacher take place on a consistent basis, if at all. They also found that the amount of feedback from the cooperating teacher depended upon the role in which the cooperating teacher saw herself. If the cooperating teacher perceived themselves as the giver of information, then the conferences were more consistent and meaningful. On the other hand, if the cooperating teacher viewed themselves as only providing a practicum opportunity for the pre-service teacher, there appeared to be less communication between the pair. Wilkins-Canter (1997) interviewed six pairs of pre-service and cooperating teachers during the internship semester. Many pre-service teachers felt they were not offered constructive feedback pertaining to their teaching performances because many of the cooperating teachers left the classroom while the intern was teaching. Therefore, they were not able to give specific suggestions about the teaching performance. Unfortunately, many pre-service teachers reported that when they were able to talk to their cooperating teachers, the conversations were incidental and frequently about personal matters (DelGesso & Smith, 1993). Hsu (2009) found that pre-service teachers were more likely to communicate with a fellow intern rather than try to speak with the cooperating teacher.

Anxiety about Evaluations

Some cooperating teachers experience tension when they are required to evaluate the pre-service teacher. Siebert et al. (2006) conducted case study research on three pre-service and cooperating teachers during the internship semester. Cooperating teachers reported feeling frustrated when evaluating pre-service teachers that were unwilling or could not learn new
strategies. Cooperating teachers also reported uneasiness about mentoring a student that had problems with areas in which the cooperating teacher never struggled. These evaluations force the cooperating teacher to identify areas of growth for the pre-service teacher. These conversations, although uncomfortable at times, can enable pre-service teachers to become reflective thinkers and planners. To ensure that effective collaboration can occur, cooperating teachers cannot avoid providing constructive criticism because they fear an uncomfortable conversation with pre-service teachers. Gardiner and Robinson (2009) found that many cooperating teachers avoided challenging conversations with pre-service teachers if they felt it would offend them. Glenn (2006) found that if mentors were anxious about giving honest feedback, ultimately the relationship between the cooperating and pre-service teacher suffered. In addition, the pre-service teacher will not progress without specific direction. According to Liliane and Colette (2009), tensions commonly arise when both the cooperating and pre-service teachers are put in the position to defending their teaching practices and beliefs. Often, pre-service teachers may periodically feel stifled and unable to develop professionally because they do not have opportunities to apply their own teaching practices and beliefs. Pre-service teachers realize that the cooperating teachers can impact their final internship grade and write letters of recommendations for future employment. This could cause them to be less willing to challenge cooperating teachers’ suggestions regarding lesson topics, pedagogy, or classroom management strategies. Therefore, pre-service teachers may be apprehensive about trying new strategies or methods that they know the cooperating teachers do not approve of or use regularly in their classrooms (Croker, 1999; Weisner & Salkeld, 2004; Wilson, 1996). According to Valencia et al. (2009), some pre-service teachers are accustomed to portraying the relationship as effective, when in truth, the relationship was unproductive.
Purposeful Pairing of Cooperating and Pre-Service Teachers

The process by which pre-service and cooperating teachers are assigned is a component of the internship experience. During this task, educational institutions may pair pre-service and cooperating teachers by purposeful pairing or random assignment (Kitchell & Torres, 2007). Since internship is such a pivotal part of teacher preparation, pairing a cooperating teacher whose personality conflicts with that of the pre-service teacher can make for an unpleasant semester (Tilema, 2009). There is not an extensive amount of current literature pertaining to this topic and this indicates that few teaching institutions have explored purposeful pairing during the internship (Slick, 1998).

Random Assignment

Teaching institutions typically assign pre-service teachers to internship placements based on factors such as proximity and availability. However, this method of pairing can be considered random (with regard to personality type or philosophy) and may not lead to meaningful learning (Gardiner & Robinson, 2009). Careful consideration should be used when determining how the pre-service and cooperating teachers are paired because these placements can be the difference between effective or ineffective internship experiences (Hsu, 2005).

Given the importance of a successful internship, it is critical that cooperating and pre-service teachers communicate and correspond with one another in appropriate and clear ways (Johnston et al., 1996). During random assignment personality styles and philosophical beliefs are not taken into consideration. The quality of these experiences can have an emotional effect on the cooperating teacher as well as the pre-service teacher. Hastings (2004) interviewed 20 cooperating teachers to determine their opinions of the internship semester and found that many cooperating teachers reported various feelings of guilt, frustrations, sympathy, disappointment,
and satisfaction throughout the semester. Byler and Byler (1984) indicated that the morale of the pre-service teacher was linked to the morale of the cooperating teacher. When pre-service teachers enter a new classroom they must learn how to effectively communicate with the teacher and adhere to their expectations. Marquez-Lopez (2006) interviewed three pre-service teachers during the internship semester and found that pre-service teachers must learn how to communicate with their cooperating teacher and learn how the classrooms and daily routines are organized. Conflicts may arise when cooperating and pre-service teachers have differing opinions on educational topics (Liliane & Colette, 2009) and preferences for educational strategies can lead to resistance from both teachers (Croker, 1999). When differences of opinions occur, often a pre-service teacher veers away from implementing the progressive strategies learned during coursework and begins to use the cooperating teacher’s instructional strategies to prevent conflict (Hsu, 2005; Nguyen, 2009). Montgomery (2000) found that if pre-service and cooperating teachers have conflicting opinions, the pre-service teacher will not have a successful experience.

**Purposeful Pairing**

Pushkin (2001) has explained that if this relationship is to whether the numerous demands required of both teachers, it seems feasible for these partners to be purposefully paired based on similar personality traits prior to internship and not left to random chance. He explains that when effective cooperating teachers are identified, the next important step is to purposefully pair them with pre-service teachers. The intentional pairing of teachers with similar beliefs may enhance collaboration and create an environment in which pre-service teachers feel supported in developing their own teaching habits. Parks (2009) conducted a case study analyzing three pre-service teachers’ opinions of collaboration during the internship semester. The pre-service
teachers reported that they felt that being paired with a cooperating teacher with similar characteristics would enhance collaboration. Similarly, Rajuan et al. (2007) found that pre-service and cooperating teaching pairs that possessed similar personality characteristics were able to develop a closer personal relationship. The pre-service teachers reported that these personal relationships allowed them to be more confident in their teaching abilities. Tripp and Eick (2008) found that pre-service teachers desired to be paired with cooperating teachers that supported their teaching styles, rather than conflicted with them. This support enabled the pre-service teachers to analyze their beliefs about teaching in a non-threatening environment (Tillema, 2009).

Pairing pre-service and cooperating teachers purposefully based on personality type could help build essential collaborative relationships. Kitchel and Torres (2007) conducted a study of cooperating and pre-service teachers that were purposefully paired and found that when the pair perceived themselves as similar, they were more satisfied with the collaborative relationship. Liliane and Colette (2009) found that in order for knowledge to be shared, cooperating and pre-service teachers should agree on teaching strategies and ways in which students learn. When pre-service teachers felt that their cooperating teachers cared about them personally, they felt as if they were part of a learning environment (Wilson, 1996). Croker (1999) has recommended matching pre-service teachers with compatible cooperating teachers based on factors such as temperaments, personality styles, and flexibility. Purposeful pairing according to personality similarities should enhance the ability for pre-service teachers to feel secure in their relationships with their cooperating teachers. The cooperating teachers had more influence over the pre-service teachers when their outlooks about teaching were similar (Tripp & Eick, 2008). Hertzog
et al. (2000) found that conflicts of personality contributed to problems in teaching relationships and classroom management, thus underscoring the need for purposeful pairing.

**Summary**

The first section of this chapter highlighted the importance of the internship semester and the impact that this experience can have on the future of the pre-service teacher. This experience helps shape how pre-service teacher perceives themselves as professionals. Ultimately, this semester could determine whether they will remain in the teaching profession at all.

The Situated Learning Theory was also explained and validated for use as a framework for this study. This theory, created by Lave and Wenger (1991) explains how learning takes place in an authentic environment. These theorists explain that learning must take place in a community of practitioners in order for the mastery of the tool or trade to occur.

Dominant personality temperaments and the True Colors Personality Theory were also discussed. This section gives details pertaining to the creation of the personality assessment written by Lowery (1978). In addition, the four main dominant personality types: blue, gold, green, and orange and the characteristics of each style were explained.

The next section discussed the importance of the role of the cooperating teacher. Many interns report that the support of the cooperating teacher is more significant than that of the university supervisor. The cooperating teacher serves as both the giver and receiver of information throughout this collaborative relationship. This mentor teacher must be willing to exchange roles from teacher to learner during the internship semester.

The importance of supportive collaboration throughout the internship experience was discussed next. Effective collaboration is necessary for learning to take place for both teachers. This collaboration begins with mutual respect and responsibility from each partner. Tensions
during internship were also discussed. These tensions include balance of power, differences in philosophical beliefs, complications of hosting a pre-service teacher, time for collaboration and communication, and anxiety about evaluations. According to the research, unresolved conflict can lead to a failed internship semester.

Finally, the last section explained the methods of random and purposeful pairing of pre-service and cooperating teachers. Many times teaching institutions randomly assign these pairs based on availability and proximity. However, research indicates that careful consideration should be taken when pairing these individuals to enhance effective collaboration.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of the methodology. The purpose of this study was to determine whether pairing pre-service and cooperating teachers with similar personality traits improved opinions of collaboration during the internship semester. The first section will describe a pilot study related to the proposed research. This chapter will include the following sections: instrumentation, data collection, sample, research questions and data analysis.

Pilot Study – Creation of the OCRS

The Opinions of Collaborative Relationships Survey (OCRS) was created by the researcher during a pilot study to measure the opinions of collaborative relationships between cooperating and pre-service teachers during a practicum placement (see Appendix A). The survey was designed to reflect current research pertaining to collaborative partnerships. This section will include a description of the participants, methodology, and results.

Madigan and Schroth-Cavatalo (2011) found that five goals should be implemented to create successful collaborative teaching relationships during any practicum placement including internship. These goals consisted of shared planning, comparable content knowledge, shared philosophies, mutual goals, and trust and respect. These goals were used as a guide in developing the 16 OCRS survey items. Table 4 shows the goals for collaborative relationships and the coordinating OCRS survey items.
Table 4

**OCRS Survey Items and Goals for Collaborative Relationships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals for Collaborative Relationships</th>
<th>Survey Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1: Shared Planning</td>
<td>1, 12, 15, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2: Comparable Content Knowledge</td>
<td>2, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 3: Shared Philosophies</td>
<td>9, 11, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 4: Mutual Goals</td>
<td>4, 6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 5: Trust and Respect</td>
<td>3, 5, 8, 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey format used a 4-point Likert scale (1 – strongly disagree, 2 – disagree, 3 – agree, 4 – strongly agree). Two descriptor items related to teacher status (cooperating or pre-service teacher) and grade level taught (K-2 or 3-5) were also included in the survey. After IRB approval was obtained, surveys were administered to 50 participants at the conclusion of the practicum. The participants consisted of 25 pre-service and 25 cooperating teachers that were paired for an eight-week practicum.

**Results**

The original survey of 16 items was used for the pilot study. The instrument had a reliability coefficient using Cronbach’s alpha of .959 and item-to-total correlations from .403 to .895. The standard error of measurement was found to be 1.88.

The survey responses were subjected to an exploratory factor analysis using principal components analysis with a varimax rotation. Of the 16 factors, there were two factors extracted with an eigenvalue of 1.00 or greater. The first factor explained 65% of the variance with two factors explaining 73% of the variance. The scree plot, found in Figure 1, verifies the extraction of two factors.
After examining the principal components solution, a two-factor solution was retained which provided the best simple structure. The loadings were above .675, which presented evidence to the construct validity for the instrument. The underlying dimensions identified by each factor were as follows: I) future use of strategies, and II) components of collaboration.

Both $t$-test and chi-square analyses were completed for hypothesis one. A significance level of .05 was used for each analysis. A $t$-test was performed and found a significant difference between pre-service and cooperating teachers’ opinions of collaborative relationships during practicum placement, $t(43) = -2.417, p = .020$. Table 5 shows the means and standard deviations by status.
Table 5

Means and Standard Deviations by Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pre-service</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>53.3200</td>
<td>11.10075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooperating</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>59.7000</td>
<td>4.41409</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further analysis was done using chi-square to determine if there were any relationships between pre-service and cooperating teachers and the individual items. There was a significant relationship found in item 3 \( \chi^2 (3, N = 45) = 20.057, p < .001 \). Item 5 was also found to have a significant relationship, \( \chi^2 (3, N = 45) = 8.405, p = .038 \). Item 11 had a significant relationship, \( \chi^2 (3, N = 45) = 9.213, p = .027 \). Item 16 was also found to have a significant relationship between pre-service and cooperating teachers’ perspectives, \( \chi^2 (3, N = 45) = 7.949, p = .047 \).

However, due to missing cells in the same items 3, 5, 11, and 16, the categories of strongly disagree and disagree were collapsed to represent a disagreement category and the categories of agree and strongly agree were collapsed to represent an agreement category. After collapsing, item 3 (sharing confidential information) was the only item found to have a significant relationship between the pre-service and cooperating teachers, \( \chi^2 (1, N = 45) = 14.625, p < .001 \).

Both t-test and chi-square analysis were attempted to determine if there were differences in opinions of collaboration between participants placed in grade-levels kindergarten through second grade and third through fifth grade (hypothesis two). Unfortunately, the t-test and chi-square analysis could not be computed because at least one of the groups was empty. For this particular semester, all of the students were placed in grades three through five for this practicum. Therefore, there were no students placed in kindergarten through second grades preventing data from being collected for the t-test and chi-square analysis. All 50 participants
were included in grade levels 3-5. The mean for this group was 56.16 and the standard deviation was 9.27.

**Instrumentation**

There were two instruments used in this study. The first instrument was a personality assessment for the purposeful pairing of cooperating and pre-service teachers. The second instrument was the OCRS that was used to measure the opinions of collaborative relationships during the internship semester.

**True Colors Personality Assessment**

After extensive research, the True Colors personality assessment was selected for convenience, reliability and validity (Whichard, 2006). Miscisin (2008) transformed the True Colors Personality Inventory, originally created by Lowery (1989), to an online format that allowed the results to be displayed accurately and efficiently (see Appendix B). This free online tool can be completed in approximately 10 minutes on any computer with Internet access, which was important for cooperating and pre-service teachers with limited time. The assessment was also free of charge and the results were displayed in approximately 30 seconds. Participants were required to rank five sets of personality traits in order from most relative to least relative (example: devoted, traditional, daring, curious), forcing a choice among sometimes similar traits (Lowery, 1989).

Whichard (2006) conducted exploratory reliability and validity research on the True Colors personality assessment. Using a test-retest format, the reliability coefficient was found to be .94. Content validity was measured against the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) and the Dominance, Influence, Steadiness, and Conscientiousness assessment (DISC) and the correlation coefficients were found to be significant at the .05 significance level.
True Colors is comparable to the MBTI but uses four personality types instead of 16 (Honaker, 2003; Tripp & Eick, 2008). Additionally, Honaker (2003) found that personality types remained consistent across time and gender. Therefore, this instrument seemed appropriate for the scope of this study.

**Opinions of Collaborative Relationships Survey (OCRS)**

The second instrument used for this study was the Opinions of Collaborative Relationships Survey (OCRS) that was created by the researcher during the initial pilot study. During the pilot study, the OCRS was administered at the conclusion of an 8-week practicum setting. For this study, the OCRS was administered at the conclusion of a 16-week internship. The original survey items from the pilot study were also used for this study. This survey instrument has a reliability coefficient using Cronbach’s alpha of .959.

**Data Collection**

The True Colors personality assessment was administered the semester immediately prior to internship. The pre-service teachers completed the True Colors personality assessment during a methods course seminar in a computer lab on campus at the university they attended. The cooperating teachers completed the True Colors personality assessment in their respective school libraries at a time deemed appropriate by the school principal. Participants self-reported the personality characteristics that they felt were the most descriptive of themselves. Each participant’s name was included on the personality assessments’ results. This information enabled the researcher to purposefully and randomly assign pairs for the internship semester. All information remained confidential throughout the duration of the study.

Using the results of the True Colors personality assessment, half of the pre-service teachers were paired with cooperating teachers with the same dominant personality type. If the
results of the personality assessment revealed a predominant color for the majority of the participants, the second dominant color was used to purposefully pair the subjects. However, if a participant’s results revealed a tie for the dominant color (blue and green), the first color in alphabetical order (blue) was used as the dominant color. The teachers that were purposefully paired were paired solely on personality type with no regard to content knowledge, teacher effectiveness, or years of experience. The remaining pre-service teachers were randomly assigned to cooperating teachers by names being drawn out of a hat. Due to the nature of randomly assigning the remaining partners, it was possible for randomly paired partners to have had matching dominant personality types.

The OCRS was administered during the last week of the internship semester. The pre-service teachers completed the OCRS on campus during the final internship seminar hosted by the College of Education. The cooperating teachers completed the OCRS in their respective school libraries at a time deemed appropriate by the school principal. The elementary program coordinator and chair of the Human and Animal Subjects Research Committee administered both sets of surveys. This helped promote reliability since the researcher was a former professor of the pre-service teachers and some of the cooperating teachers who completed the surveys. The surveys were coded according to personality type (blue, green, gold, or orange) and method of pairing (purposeful or random) as shown in Table 6. The survey data were collected and stored in a locked filing cabinet until used for data analysis.
Table 6

*Coding Key for OCRS Survey Data Collection*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BP</td>
<td>Blue dominant personality type and purposefully paired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Blue dominant personality type and randomly assigned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRP</td>
<td>Green dominant personality type and purposefully paired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRR</td>
<td>Green dominant personality type and randomly assigned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOP</td>
<td>Gold dominant personality type and purposefully paired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOR</td>
<td>Gold dominant personality type and randomly assigned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP</td>
<td>Orange dominant personality type and purposefully paired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Orange dominant personality type and randomly assigned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sample**

There were 66 participants in this study, 32 pre-service and 34 cooperating teachers. This was a convenient sample and included an entire population of elementary education students completing their internships in the spring 2012 semester. The cooperating teachers with whom the pre-service teachers were paired worked in eight local public elementary schools in close proximity to the university. There were two fewer pre-service teachers than cooperating teachers because they were removed from placements during the internship semester. The remaining two cooperating teachers requested to remain in the study. Although the sample for this study contained fewer than 100 participants and could have been considered small, Harrington (2009) deemed the sample size suitable for a simple study.

The superintendent of the school system and the dean of the College of Education were contacted requesting permission to conduct the survey research (see Appendix C). After receiving approval from the superintendent and the dean, the principals of the respective schools
were contacted and asked to sign a letter of agreement requesting permission to conduct the study (see Appendix D). Upon receiving permission from the respective administrators and the Institutional Review Boards (IRB) of The University of Alabama and The University of Montevallo, consent forms were distributed to each participant (see Appendix E). The consent forms explained the purpose of the study and outlined rights of participants during the research process. Research officially began at each site upon receipt of consent forms from all participants.

**Research Questions**

The following is a list of research questions for this study:

1. Is there an interaction effect between method of pairing (purposeful, random) and classification (pre-service, cooperating teacher) on opinions of collaboration;

2. Is there an interaction effect between method of pairing (purposeful, random) and dominant personality type (blue, gold, green, orange) on opinions of collaboration;

3. Are the responses to individual items on the survey dependent on the method of pairing (purposeful, random);

4. Are the responses to individual items on the survey dependent on the classification (pre-service, cooperating) of the teachers; and

5. Are the responses to individual items on the survey dependent on the dominant personality type (blue, gold, green, orange)?

**Data Analysis**

Data were analyzed to identify the cooperating and pre-service teachers’ opinions of collaboration during the internship semester. Data analysis was conducted using Cronbach’s
alpha to determine internal reliability of the instrument and confirmatory factor analysis to confirm the factor structure established during the pilot study. Statistical significance was determined using a two-way ANOVA to investigate the differences of opinions between cooperating and pre-service teachers. Chi-square was used to determine if any of the individual items depended on the demographics of the respondents. Table 7 shows the research questions and the data analysis that were administered for the study.

Table 7

_Research Questions and Corresponding Data Analysis_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 1</strong> - Is there an interaction effect between method of pairing (purposeful, random) and classification (pre-service, cooperating teacher) on opinions of collaboration?</td>
<td>A two-way ANOVA was used to investigate the interaction between pre-service and cooperating teachers on opinions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 2</strong> - Is there an interaction effect between method of pairing (purposeful, random) and dominant personality type (blue, gold, green, orange) on opinions of collaboration?</td>
<td>A two-way ANOVA was used to investigate the interaction between pre-service and cooperating teachers on opinions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 3</strong> - Are the responses to individual items on the survey dependent on the method of pairing (purposeful, random)?</td>
<td>A chi-square analysis was used to investigate if opinions are dependent on the method of pairing (purposeful, random).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 4</strong> - Are the responses to individual items on the survey dependent on the classification (pre-service, cooperating) of the teachers?</td>
<td>A chi-square analysis was used to investigate if opinions are dependent on classifications (pre-service, cooperating).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 5</strong> - Are the responses to individual items on the survey dependent on the dominant personality type (blue, gold, green, orange)?</td>
<td>A chi-square analysis was used to investigate if opinions are dependent on the dominant personality type (blue, gold, green, orange).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS OF DATA

Chapter IV presents the analysis of data for the study. This chapter will contain a description of the sample size and participants. The participant descriptors will include teacher classifications (pre-service and cooperating teachers), grade-levels taught (K-2 or 3-5), method of pairing (purposeful, random) and dominant personality types (blue, gold, green, or orange). Following the description of the sample, is a discussion of the Opinions of Collaborative Relationships Survey (OCRS) used to collect data from the participants. Finally, the chapter presents data organized by the research questions followed by the corresponding data analysis.

Description of Sample

The sample for the main study consisted of 66 participants. Of this sample, 32 participants were pre-service teachers that made up an entire population of elementary education students completing their internships in the spring 2012 semester. The remaining 34 participants were cooperating teachers with whom the pre-service teachers were paired. The cooperating teachers worked in eight local public elementary schools in close proximity to the university. There were two fewer pre-service teachers than cooperating teachers because they were removed from their placements during the internship semester. The remaining two cooperating teachers requested to continue in the study.

Thirty-two of the participants were purposefully paired based on dominant personality type (blue, gold, green, orange) as determined by their scores on the True Colors personality assessment. The remaining 34 participants were randomly assigned. Table 8 provides a description of the sample size and participants’ descriptors.
Table 8

Sample Size and Participant Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>$N$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Classification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperating Teachers</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Service Teachers</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method of Pairing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purposefully Paired</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randomly Assigned</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade-Levels Taught</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-2</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant Personality Types</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Data

Survey Instrument

The 16-item Opinions of Collaborative Relationships Survey (OCRS) created by the researcher in a pilot study was used for this study. Analysis of the instrument for this study revealed the instrument had a reliability coefficient using Cronbach’s alpha of .960 and item-to-total correlations from .568 to .882. This suggests that most of the items provided a significant contribution to the total instrument. High item-to-total correlations support the internal reliability of the instrument. The standard error of measurement was found to be 1.88. The means, standard deviations, and item-to-total correlations are presented in Table 9.
Table 9

Means, Standard Deviations, and Item-to-Total Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Item-to-Total Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.498</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.921</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.834</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.829</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.701</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.766</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.827</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.659</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.685</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.685</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.585</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55.72</td>
<td>9.393</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted using MPlus to determine the accuracy of the instrument’s factor structure. CFA was used to determine if the hypothesized structure actually fit the data (Vogt, 2007). A model with two factors was tested. The chi-square was found to be 145.55 with 103 degrees of freedom, \( p = .004 \). This value was less than .05, which indicated that the data did not fit the factor structure. Additional fit indices provided some evidence for the retention of the two-factor solution. The Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) was .079 which was within range from 0 to .08. The Standardized
Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) was found to be .81, with the desired value of .08 or less. The Tucker-Lewis Fit Index (TLI) was found to be .988. The Comparative Fit Index (CFI) was found to be .990. CFI and TLI values range from 0 to 1, with larger scores indicating better fit. A CFI or TLI value of .90 or larger is considered an acceptable model fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Therefore, the results of both the TLI and CFI were within range for model fit. While a tighter fit model would have been optimal, based on the RMSEA, TLI and CFI, the two factor solution can be retained. The path diagrams for the final model are in Figure 2.
Figure 2. Path diagram for the final model of I) Future Use of Strategies and II) Components of Collaboration (unobserved variables or continuous latent variables)
Research Question 1

Is there an interaction effect between method of pairing (purposeful, random) and classification (pre-service, cooperating teacher) on opinions of collaboration?

A two-way ANOVA was conducted to investigate the interaction between method of pairing (purposeful, random) and teacher classification (pre-service, cooperating). This analysis found no significant interaction between method of pairing (purposeful, random) and teacher classification (pre-service, cooperating) on opinions of collaboration, $F(1, 62) = 3.166, p = .080$. The main effect of method of pairing was not significant, $F(1, 62) = .208, p = .650$. However, the main effect of teacher classification was significant, $F(1, 62) = 4.388, p = .040$. The two-way ANOVA results are presented in Table 10. The means and standard deviations for teacher classification are presented in Table 11.

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Method of pairing (M)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.10</td>
<td>17.10</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Classification (T)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>361.29</td>
<td>361.29</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>.040*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M X T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>260.65</td>
<td>260.65</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>5104.86</td>
<td>82.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>210700.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at $p < .05$

Table 11
Table 11

*Means and Standard Deviations of Teacher Classification*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Classification</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Service Teacher</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>58.10</td>
<td>5.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperating Teacher</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>53.50</td>
<td>13.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>55.70</td>
<td>9.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Question 2**

*Is there an interaction effect between method of pairing (purposeful, random) and dominant personality type (blue, gold, green, orange) on opinions of collaboration?*

A two-way ANOVA was used to investigate the interaction between method of pairing (purposeful, random) and dominant personality type (blue, gold, green, orange) of the participants. The results of the two-way ANOVA indicated no significant interaction between method of pairing (purposeful, random) and dominant personality type (blue, gold, green, orange) of the participants on opinions of collaboration, $F(3, 58) = .223, p = .880$. The main effect of method of pairing was not significant, $F(1, 58) = .025, p = .874$. Additionally, the main effect of dominant personality type was not significant, $F(3, 58) = .475, p = .701$. The two-way ANOVA results are presented in Table 12.
Table 12

Two-Way ANOVA Summary Table of Method of Pairing and Dominant Personality Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Method of pairing (M)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.392</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant Personality (D)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>135.19</td>
<td>45.07</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>.701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M X D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>63.44</td>
<td>21.15</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>5497.09</td>
<td>94.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>210700.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 3

Are the responses to individual items on the survey dependent on the method of pairing (purposeful, random)?

A chi-square analysis was conducted to investigate if opinions of collaboration were dependent on the method of pairing (purposeful, random). A significance level of .05 was used for each analysis. There was a significant relationship found between the method pairing and item eight (sharing confidential information) \( \chi^2 (3, N = 66) = 8.028, p = .045 \). However, due to missing cells the categories of strongly disagree and disagree were collapsed to represent a disagreement category and the categories of agree and strongly agree were collapsed to represent an agreement category for item eight. After collapsing, item eight was not found to be significant \( \chi^2 (1, N = 66) = 0.004, p = .950 \).

Research Question 4

Are the responses to individual items on the survey dependent on the classification (pre-service, cooperating) of the teachers?

A chi-square analysis was conducted to investigate whether opinions of collaboration were dependent on classification (pre-service, cooperating) of the teachers. A significance level
of .05 was used for each analysis. There was a significant relationship found with classification of the teachers and item two (learning new information) $\chi^2 (3, N = 66) = 15.719, p = .001$. Item six (positive learning experience) was found to have a significant relationship with classification of the teachers $\chi^2 (3, N = 66) = 8.630, p = .035$. Item thirteen (future use of strategies) was found to have a significant relationship with classification of the teachers $\chi^2 (3, N = 66) = 26.089, p < .001$. However, due to missing cells in items six and thirteen, the categories of strongly disagree and disagree were collapsed to represent a disagreement category and the categories of agree and strongly agree were collapsed to represent an agreement category. After collapsing, item six (positive learning experience) remained significant $\chi^2 (1, N = 66) = 4.008, p = .045$ as did item thirteen (future use of strategies) $\chi^2 (1, N = 66) = 11.092, p = .001$.

Research Question 5

Are the responses to individual items on the survey dependent on the dominant personality type (blue, gold, green, orange)?

A chi-square analysis was conducted to investigate whether the opinions of collaboration were dependent on the dominant personality type (blue, gold, green, orange). A significance level of .05 was used for each analysis. There were no significant relationships found between opinions of collaboration and dominant personality type.

Summary

This chapter contained a description of the sample and participants within the study. In addition, validity and reliability of the survey instrument were reported. The data analysis for this study was presented by individual research questions.

A two-way ANOVA was conducted for research questions one and two. The two-way ANOVA results for question one found no significant interaction between method of pairing and
teacher classification. However, there was a significance found for the main effect of teacher classification. The two-way ANOVA results for question two indicated no significant interaction between method of pairing and personality type.

A chi-square analysis was used for questions three, four, and five. Research question three found no significant relationships between survey items and method of pairing. There were significant relationships found in research question four. Item six (positive learning experience) and item thirteen (future use of strategies) were significant. Finally, research question five yielded no significant relationships between survey items and dominant personality type.
CHAPTER V
FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter V presents the findings, conclusions, and recommendations from this study. First, this chapter gives a brief overview of the study’s purpose, sample, and procedures. Next, key findings from this study are discussed, as well as, how it relates to current research. Last, based on this study’s findings and the current research, recommendations are made for future research and teacher education programs.

Overview of the Study

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to determine if purposefully pairing pre-service and cooperating teachers with similar personality traits improved the opinions of collaboration during the internship semester. Current research explains that the internship semester is the most important component of the pre-service teacher’s training (Valencia et al., 2009). During this learning experience, pre-service teachers must learn how to implement strategies learned during methods courses while meeting the expectations of mentor teachers (Kasperbauer & Roberts, 2007). This crucial semester can impact the way pre-service teachers view themselves as educators and ultimately determine if they will enter and stay within the teaching profession (Ediger, 2009).

Sample

The sample for this study consisted of 66 participants. Of this sample, 32 participants were pre-service teachers that made up an entire population of elementary education students completing their internships in the spring 2012 semester. The remaining 34 participants were cooperating teachers with whom the pre-service teachers were paired. The cooperating teachers
worked in eight local public elementary schools in close proximity to the university. Thirty-two
of the participants were purposefully paired based on dominant personality type (blue, gold,
green, orange). The remaining 34 participants were randomly assigned.

**Procedures**

Prior to internship, the participants completed the True Colors personality assessment. The Opinions of Collaborative Relationships Survey (OCRS) was administered to participants during the final week of the internship semester. Data analysis was conducted using Cronbach’s alpha to determine internal reliability of the instrument and confirmatory factor analysis to confirm the validity established during the pilot study. Statistical significance was determined using a two-way ANOVA to investigate the differences of opinions between cooperating and pre-service teachers for research questions one and two. Chi-square analysis was used to determine if any of the individual items were dependent on the descriptors of the participants (classification of teachers, dominant personality types, method of pairing).

**Psychometrics**

**Pilot Study**

The OCRS had a reliability coefficient using Cronbach’s alpha of .959 which were considered strong (Gregory, 1996). Item-to-total correlations from .403 to .895 which were considered desirable (Cronk, 1999). The standard error of measurement was found to be 1.88. The survey responses were subjected to an exploratory factor analysis using principle components analysis with a varimax rotation. Of the 16 factors, there were two factors extracted with an eigenvalue of 1.00 or greater. The first factor explained 65% of the variance with two factors explaining 73% of the variance. After examining the principal components solution, a two-factor solution was retained which provided the best simple structure. The loadings were all
above .675, which presented evidence to the validity of the instrument. The underlying dimensions identified by each factor were as follows: 1) future use of strategies; and 2) components of collaboration.

**Final Study**

The OCRS that was administered in the pilot study was also used in the final study. The instrument had a reliability coefficient using Cronbach’s alpha of .960 which was considered strong (Gregory, 1996) and item-to-total correlations from .568 to .882 which were desirable (Cronk, 1999). This finding suggests that most of the items gave a significant contribution to the total instrument. Further, high item-to-total correlations support the internal reliability of the instrument and the standard error of measurement was found to be 1.88. A confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted to determine the accuracy of the instrument’s factor structure. A model with two factors was tested. The chi-square was found to be 145.55 with a 103 degrees of freedom, \( p = .004 \). This value was less than .05 which indicated that the data did not fit the factor structure. Additional fit indices provided some evidence for the retention of the two-factor solution. The Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) was .079 which fell within the acceptable range of 0 to .08. The Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) was found to be .81. This finding was close to the desired value of .08 or less. The Tucker-Lewis Fit Index (TLI) was found to be .988. The Comparative Fit Index (CFI) was found to be .990. CFI and TLI values range from 0 to 1, with larger scores indicating better fit. A CFI or TLI value of .90 or larger is considered an acceptable model fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Therefore, the results of both the TLI and CFI were within range for model fit. While a tighter fit model would have been optimal, based on the RMSEA, CFI and TLI, the two factor solution can be retained.
Comparison of Pilot and Final Study

The OCRS was found to be reliable and valid for both the pilot and final study. The Cronbach’s alpha for both studies was .96 which indicates high reliability (Gregory, 1996). Similarly, the standard error of measurement for both studies was 1.88. The confirmatory factor analysis indicated that the two-factor solution can be retained. Therefore, the confirmatory factor analysis from the final study supports the exploratory factor analysis from the pilot study. Current research explains that the goals for effective collaboration consist of shared planning, comparable content knowledge, shared philosophies, mutual goals, and trust and respect (Madigan & Schroth-Cavatalo, 2011). These goals align with the two factors extracted during this study that include: 1) future use of strategies learned; and 2) components of collaboration. Effective collaboration must occur before strategies learned will be used in future teaching experiences by both pre-service and cooperating teachers (Chamberlin, 1999).

Findings

Research Question 1

Is there an interaction effect between method of pairing (purposeful, random) and classification (pre-service, cooperating teacher) on opinions of collaboration?

The analysis for research question one yielded two key findings. The first finding was that there was no significant interaction found between method of pairing and teacher classification on opinions of collaboration during internship. This finding indicates that effective collaborative relationships can occur during the internship semester regardless of method of pairing used or teacher classification. Nguyen’s (2009) work supports this finding, wherein he explained that pre-service and cooperating teachers with conflicting opinions and teaching styles can effectively collaborate. Both groups of teachers must be willing to value each other’s
contributions and be willing to try new strategies, even though they might not always agree. Although personality traits can be predictive of a successful teacher, they may not necessarily predict collaborative relationships (Rushton et al., 2007). Personality traits should not be used as a tool to stereotype, but rather only to make one aware of similarities and differences of all individuals (Lowery, 1989). In contrast, other research conflicts with the findings from this study. Some researchers explain that random assignment with no regard to personality type could result in an unpleasant and ineffective student teaching semester (Hsu, 2005; Liliane & Colette, 2009; Tilema, 2009) and interfere with meaningful learning, (Hertzog, 2000; Montgomery, 2000; Gardiner & Robinson 2009). However, additional studies indicated that purposefully pairing pre-service and cooperating teachers with similar personality traits could enhance collaboration and should not be left to random chance (Wilson, 1996; Pushkin, 2001). Similarly, other studies (Kitchel & Torres, 2007; Rajuan et al., 2007; Eick, 2008) found that when obstacles resulting from conflicting personality types can be avoided, purposefully paired partnerships can foster a personal relationship and create a learning environment. Researchers (Parks, 2009; Tilema, 2009) found that purposefully pairing pre-service and cooperating teachers can create a learning environment that encourages pre-service teachers to feel secure and confident in trying new teaching strategies. However, this study found that purposefully pairing pre-service and cooperating teachers did not impact opinions of collaborative relationships during the internship semester.

The second key finding for research question one indicated a significant difference of opinions of collaboration between pre-service and cooperating teachers. Pre-service teachers gave higher ratings of effective collaborative relationships than cooperating teachers. This finding suggests that pre-service teachers may be more satisfied with their collaborative
relationships during the internship semester and it is supported by researchers who found that many pre-service teachers are accustomed to portraying the relationship as effective, when in truth, the relationship was unproductive (Spencer, 2008). If pre-service teachers are aware that cooperating teachers can impact their final grade and write letters of recommendation for future employment, it is not unreasonable to find that they avoid conflicts or challenges for fear of being treated unfairly or suffering negative repercussions (Liliane & Colette, 2009; Valencia et al., 2009). On the other hand, cooperating teachers may feel less able and willing to collaborate due to anxiety and feelings of stress and responsibilities related to hosting a pre-service teacher (DelGesso & Smith, 1993; Wilson, 1996; Rajuan et al., 2007; Liliane & Colette, 2009).

**Research Question 2**

Is there an interaction effect between method of pairing (purposeful, random) and dominant personality type (blue, gold, green, orange) on opinions of collaboration?

The analysis for research question two indicated there was no significant interaction between method of pairing and dominant personality type. This finding is supported by Lowery (1989) who explains that dominant personality types should be used to identify commonalities and differences of all individuals, yet not used as a means to label or stereotype. If both teachers are aware of their similarities and differences, they are better able to understand the activities or operations with which their partner feels the most comfortable (Bryce, 2000). Thus, Lowery (1989) indicated that individuals with differing personality types are able to collaborate more effectively. Partnerships with different dominant personality types can be successful if cooperating teachers guide and allow pre-service teachers freedom in the classroom (DelGesso & Smith, 1993). In contrast, this finding differs from researchers that stress the need for purposeful pairing for the enhancement of collaboration (Pushkin, 2001; Rajuan et al., 2007). These studies
(Croker, 1999; Kitchel & Torres, 2007; Eick, 2008) found that pre-service and cooperating teachers with similar personality traits reported a better personal relationship than randomly assigned teachers.

**Research Question 3**

**Are the responses to individual items on the survey dependent on the method of pairing (purposeful, random)?**

Data analysis for research question three indicated one key finding. Although there were no items on the survey found to be dependent on the method of pairing, randomly assigned participants consistently reported higher opinions of collaboration. This finding indicates that opinions of collaboration were reported higher when working with partners of different personality types. This result is supported by Bryce (2002) who has suggested that individuals are able to work effectively together when distinct differences are recognized and viewed as valuable contributions. Therefore, pre-service and cooperating teachers may be able to use unique personality differences to learn from one another, thus promoting effective collaboration.

Purposefully pairing teachers with matching dominant personality types could be a barrier to effective collaboration. According to Lowery (1989), individuals with blue personality types tend to avoid hurting others’ feelings and put others first. Consequently, purposefully paired blue personality types could have difficulty with honest conversations in order to avoid hurting the other teacher’s feelings. Similarly, individuals with gold personality traits consist of being a planner, detailed-oriented, and structured. As such, purposefully paired gold types could potentially have conflicts when the other partner plans differently than he or she is accustomed to or would prefer to. Finally, individuals with orange personality types are competitive and thrive on control. The purposefully paired individuals with orange types may have conflicts when role
reversals must take place between the cooperating and pre-service teacher. For this study, the differing personality types appeared to compliment each other as randomly assigned participants rated higher collaboration.

**Research Question 4**

Are the responses to individual items on the survey dependent on the classification (pre-service, cooperating) of the teachers?

Analysis for research question four revealed two key findings. The first finding involved rating the internship semester as a positive experience (item 6, I feel like this lab placement has been a positive learning experience for me). All of the pre-service teachers rated the internship experience as being a more positive experience than cooperating teachers. Spencer (2007) found that cooperating teachers reported complications such as interruption of instruction, teacher displacement, disruption of classroom routine, teacher isolation, and shifting of the cooperating teachers’ time and energy as being stressful during the internship semester. Prior to internship semester, the cooperating teacher may not realize how much time and energy will be required to effectively mentor a pre-service teacher (Siebert et al., 2006). Spencer’s (2007) work also supports the findings from research question one that many pre-service teachers felt the need to portray a positive sense of collaboration due to anxiety over final evaluations and grades received from the cooperating teacher (Borko & Mayfield, 1995).

The second key finding related to implementing newly learned strategies in future teaching experiences (item 13, I plan to use teaching strategies learned during this lab placement in the future). The finding indicated the willingness of pre-service teachers to implement newly learned strategies and information learned in their future teaching. Cooperating teachers rated these areas significantly lower than pre-service teachers. Perhaps these results suggest that
cooperating teachers did not feel that they learned valuable information they would use in their future instruction. These findings are similar to current research that explains if cooperating teachers do not allow pre-service teachers opportunities to showcase new strategies reciprocal learning cannot occur (DelGesso & Smith, 1993; Munby & Russell, 1994; Roberts, 2007; Ediger, 2009). However, the findings from this study conflict with some studies pertaining to opinions of cooperating teachers. Some studies (e.g., Hertzog et al., 2000; Spencer, 2008) reported that effective cooperating teachers are able to modify and improve their own instruction as they learn new information from pre-service teachers. Consequently, it is important that cooperating teachers view the internship semester as a learning experience rather than a burden.

**Research Question 5**

**Are the responses to individual items on the survey dependent on the dominant personality type (blue, gold, green, orange)?**

The analysis for research question five found no significant relationships between opinions of collaboration and dominant personality type. Thus, dominant personality types do not impact the opinions of collaborative relationships. Whether pre-service and cooperating teachers are randomly assigned or purposefully paired, there is no indication of differences in opinions of collaboration. This finding is similar to other studies (Lower, 1989; Rushton et al., 2007; Nguyen, 2009) who found that purposeful pairing based on personality type will not ensure effective collaboration. Although this study revealed that personality types do not impact collaborative relationships, current research (Glenn, 2006; Marlow, 2009) indicates there are failed internship semesters resulting from lack of collaboration. Since personality type did not appear to be the reason for this difficulty, other barriers preventing successful collaboration should be explored. Previous research (Dennen & Burner, 2007; Roberts, 2007; Ediger, 2009;
Valencia et al., 2009) consistently indicated that efficient communication and an effective cooperating teacher were crucial in building meaningful collaboration during the internship semester. Collaboration can be enhanced if cooperating teachers demonstrate effective communication skills, positive attitudes, and are willing to be mentors for novice teachers (Kasperbauer & Roberts, 2007; Spencer, 2008). Thus, randomly assigned partnerships could be successful if these collaborative components (communication and selection effective cooperating teacher) were acknowledged and addressed by educational institutions prior to the internship semester.

**Limitations**

Although this study revealed key findings related to collaboration during the internship semester, there were limitations that should be noted that could affect the generalizability. Prior to the internship semester, the OCRS was created by the researcher and administered to participants. There were disadvantages to using this type of survey instrument. One disadvantage was the inability for pre-service and cooperating teachers to explain or clarify their responses because they were rating their opinions on a Likert scale (Babbie, 1990; Fink, 2009). Pre-service and cooperating teachers could have also responded to the survey in a socially desirable way (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007). Pre-service teachers could have felt that their responses would impact their final grade for the internship semester. The True Colors personality assessment was also completed by pre-service and cooperating teachers prior to the internship semester. A disadvantage of using this type of assessment was that participants were self-reporting their perceptions of their personality traits. In addition, participants were required to rank their personality traits in order from most relative to least relative. This type of ranking
forced participants to make a choice among similar traits (Lowery, 1999). This may have forced participants to choose inaccurate personality characteristics.

The sampling size and population for this study could also be a limitation. The participants for this study consisted of an entire population of elementary pre-service teachers entering internship during the spring 2012 semester from a local teaching institution. These participants were a convenient sample (Fink, 2009). In addition, all of the pre-service teachers were enrolled in the same teaching institution and were all elementary education majors. These participant characteristics could affect the generalizability of the study’s findings (Fink, 2009).

During the study, another limitation was identified. Due to the nature of randomly assigning the participants who were not purposefully paired, it was possible that randomly paired partners could have been randomly assigned a partner with the same dominant personality type. Therefore, a pre-service and cooperating teacher who were randomly assigned could have had matching dominant personality types which could present problems with the generalizability of the study.

Finally, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted at the completion of the study. The results indicated a good model fit in two of the fit indices. However, a tighter fit model would have been optimal by freeing covariance between error terms.

Conclusions

At the conclusion of this study, three key findings emerged from both the analysis and current research. The first key finding is that method of pairing (purposeful, random), teacher classification (pre-service, cooperating), and dominant personality type (blue, gold, green, orange) do not appear to enhance opinions of collaboration for the internship semester. Although various studies (Kitchel & Torres, 2007; Liliane & Colette, 2009) indicated that purposefully
pairing pre-service and cooperating teachers based on dominant personality types could be predictive of an effective collaborative relationship, this study found no advantages of this method of pairing. In fact, more participants rated higher opinions of collaboration when randomly assigned and dominant personality types were not taken into consideration. This random method of pairing appears to work as diverse personality characteristics are recognized and valued thus enhancing collaboration. In contrast, this finding indicates that purposefully paired partnerships could hinder effective collaboration. The method of purposefully pairing based on personality types could interfere with the ability to embrace role reversals from teacher to learner. Although personality type did not have a significant impact on opinions of collaboration, it should be noted that personality testing was a valuable tool in analyzing teachers’ personality traits. Personality assessments allow for partners to be made aware of each other’s communication styles, strengths, and areas of focus. This awareness enables both teachers to understand effective ways to communicate and collaborate within the partnership. Knowing this information prior to internship may help in avoiding tensions later in the internship semester. The knowledge of personality characteristics prior to internship could possibly help randomly assigned partners achieve effective communication.

The second key finding from this study is the vastly different opinions of collaboration between pre-service and cooperating teachers. Cooperating teachers consistently rated components of collaboration lower than pre-service teachers. Pre-service teachers rating components of collaboration higher could be attributed to fear of receiving a negative evaluation from the cooperating teacher at the completion of the internship semester. A positive sense of collaboration could also be due to the excitement that pre-service teachers have as they complete their internship requirements resulting in graduation. Pre-service teachers could rate the
experience higher because they are finally getting the opportunity to have ownership in the classroom. The excitement of getting to teach, plan, and manage a classroom are tasks in which the pre-service teachers have been preparing for years. In contrast, cooperating teachers may rate collaboration lower due to unexpected stress from the demands of mentoring a pre-service teacher. Many times, cooperating teachers do not volunteer to mentor a pre-service teacher, but rather assigned one by a school administrator. They may not be properly trained or understand the importance of having effective communication skills and skills needed to effectively mentor a pre-service teacher. The low ratings could also be due to the conflicts that commonly arise as roles begin to shift in the partnership when cooperating teachers are expected to release control of their classroom and allow pre-service teachers to implement new teaching strategies. Mentor teachers may also feel as if the partnership is only for the benefit of the pre-service teacher. The cooperating teacher may not view the internship experience as a form of professional development or a time to reflect on their own teaching beliefs. Cooperating teachers could feel as if their style of teaching (if not mirrored) is not valued or appreciated. Whatever the reasons, the cooperating teachers who were part of the study did not rate collaboration as highly as pre-service teachers.

Finally, the third key finding that emerged from this study and the current literature is the extreme importance of the selection of the cooperating teacher. Many cooperating teachers request or are assigned pre-service teachers without giving much thought as to what will be expected of them. Cooperating teachers must be willing and able to be effective mentors for their assigned pre-service teacher. It is imperative that these teachers be prepared through professional development prior to internship semester so that they are aware of the teaching institution’s expectations and conflicts that can arise during the internship semester. Giving
cooperating teachers this information proactively could help in achieving a meaningful learning experience. Cooperating teachers must also be able to effectively communicate with the pre-service teachers and know how to give information such as feedback on teaching performances, as well as suggestions during shared lesson planning. Mentor teachers must also be willing to receive information as they allow pre-service teachers the ability to try new strategies and not be offended if their own methods are not used. Similarly, cooperating teachers must be able to be confident in the role reversal or shift of power. The responsibility of the cooperating teacher is great and must be navigated carefully for effective collaboration to take place.

**Recommendations**

As previously discussed, this study had various limitations due to sample size which allows for unanswered questions and opportunities for further research. The first recommendation is for teaching institutions to use random assignment when assigning pre-service and cooperating teachers for the internship semester. This study found that randomly assigned participants reported higher ratings of collaboration than purposefully paired participants. It appears as if the traditional method of randomly assigning pre-service and cooperating teachers could be the best practice for partnerships.

It is also recommended that personality assessments be administered to both pre-service and cooperating teachers prior to the internship semester. As a result, both teachers will be aware of different traits each other possesses which enables partners to understand better how to interact during the internship semester. Although personality tests are useful for getting to know one’s traits, it is not recommended as a means for method of pairing pre-service and cooperating teachers.
Another recommendation that stems from this study is the need for effective cooperating teachers. This recommendation applies to both placement officers at teaching institutions and public school administrators. Placement officers at teaching institutions should keep a record of evaluations of cooperating teachers completed by pre-service teachers and university supervisors. These evaluations could be used to determine if cooperating teachers are effective mentor for future partnerships. Similarly, it is recommended that public school administrators not merely assign a pre-service teacher to a cooperating teacher who volunteers to be a mentor. This teacher must be willing to spend time communicating with the pre-service teacher through shared lesson planning and provide feedback on lessons. The cooperating teacher should be willing to allow the pre-service teacher the opportunity to try new strategies and make mistakes.

The next recommendation from this study is the need for cooperating teacher training prior to the internship semester. Teaching institutions could offer training for pre-service and cooperating teachers to explain the procedures, expectations and required paperwork. However, a specific training focusing on communication and feelings associated with each transitional stage (peripheral, inbound, insider, and outbound) is needed to make cooperating teachers aware of possible conflicts (complex social interactions) that could occur during the internship semester. The need for effective communication must also be stressed to cooperating teachers. If researched-based strategies for effective collaboration were shared proactively, it could possibly help in avoiding tension during internship and promote effective collaboration.

Another recommendation from this study is the need for determining incentives for cooperating teachers when hosting a pre-service teacher. Research indicates that effective cooperating teachers view the internship as a learning experience for themselves (Glenn, 2006). They are able to reflect on their own teaching practices. Therefore, school districts should
determine ways in which cooperating teachers could earn professional development credit for hosting a pre-service teacher. Professional development credit could be an incentive for the numerous requirements that are expected from a cooperating teacher. In addition, some universities offer free classes or stipends to cooperating teachers as a reward for hosting a pre-service teacher. Therefore, universities should determine feasible incentives they could offer in return for the many hours of mentoring a pre-service teacher. Both universities and school districts could consider writing educational grants that would provide resources for cooperating teachers that could help them view the internship experience as a more positive and worthwhile endeavor.

Finally, it is recommended that future studies be conducted based on the results from this study. The participants for this study were all elementary pre-service and cooperating teachers. Therefore, inferences cannot be made about middle and high school partnerships. It is recommended that a similar study be conducted with participants at these levels. In addition, qualitative studies could be conducted observing partnerships in the field and collecting data on other issues that may influence effective collaboration could add to the findings from this study. Similarly, further studies examining the Situated Learning theory and the phases in which the novice teacher must transition. Specifically the barriers that prevent pre-service teachers from successfully becoming fully members of a community of practice should be researched. This information could be used to explain how tensions that could occur mid-way through the internship semester as classroom roles are being shifted impact this progression. It is recommended that future studies use the OCRS to measure opinions of collaboration at the beginning, mid-way, and at the conclusion of the semester to determine if opinions change as the roles of the partnership evolve.
Concluding Remarks

This chapter presented a brief overview of the study followed by findings, conclusions, and recommendations for this confirmatory study. The findings were discussed for each research question along with supporting or conflicting research. Next, three overall conclusions were presented as follows: 1) method of pairing (purposeful, random) based on dominant personality type (blue, gold, green, orange) does not appear to enhance opinions of collaboration for either pre-service or cooperating teachers; 2) cooperating teachers consistently rate opinions of collaboration lower than pre-service teachers; and 3) cooperating teachers must be selected based on the ability to be an effective mentor. Finally, recommendations were presented for teaching institutions and school administrators and new ideas for future studies based on the data collected.
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APPENDICES
Appendix A

Pre-Service and Cooperating Teachers’ Opinions of Collaborative Relationships (OCRS)
During Student Internship

This is an anonymous survey. Please DO NOT write your name on it. The purpose of this survey is to determine your opinion on your collaborative relationship during lab placement. For the purpose of this survey, collaboration refers to the act of working with another on a joint project.

Please circle your response following each statement, using a strongly disagree, disagree, agree, or strongly agree scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I feel comfortable verbally communicating with my cooperating teacher/pre-service teacher.
   SD D A SA

2. I feel as if I am learning new valuable educational information from my cooperating teacher/pre-service teacher.
   SD D A SA

3. I would feel comfortable telling my cooperating teacher/pre-service teacher that I disagreed with something he/she said.
   SD D A SA

4. My cooperating teacher/pre-service teacher and I have a similar work ethic.
   SD D A SA

5. My cooperating teacher/pre-service teacher exhibits professionalism at all times during school.
   SD D A SA

6. I feel like this lab placement has been a positive learning experience for me.
   SD D A SA

7. I feel as if my cooperating teacher/pre-service teacher and I have a shared vision of students’ educational outcomes.
   SD D A SA

8. I feel comfortable sharing confidential information with my cooperating teacher/pre-service teacher.
   SD D A SA
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9. If given the opportunity, I would work with my cooperating teacher/pre-service teacher again in the future.

SD      D      A      SA

10. I feel comfortable approaching my cooperating teacher/pre-service teacher with a concern.

SD      D      A      SA

11. My cooperating teacher/pre-service teacher and I share similar beliefs about how students learn.

SD      D      A      SA

12. I feel like my input during shared lesson planning is valued.

SD      D      A      SA

13. I plan to use teaching strategies learned during this lab placement in the future.

SD      D      A      SA

14. I feel like my teaching practices are valued by my cooperating teacher/pre-service teacher.

SD      D      A      SA

15. My cooperating teacher/pre-service teacher and I effectively plan lesson plans together.

SD      D      A      SA

16. I feel comfortable expressing my opinions to my cooperating teacher/pre-service teacher.

SD      D      A      SA

In order to help in knowing a little about the respondents to this survey, please answer the following two items. Remember that the survey is anonymous. There will be no way to determine your identity.

1. Status: Please circle one. Pre-service Teacher  Cooperating Teacher

2. Grade-level Placement: Please circle one. K-2  3-5

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME
Appendix B

True Colors On-Line Personality Assessment
Appendix B

True Colors On-Line Personality Assessment

Describe yourself...

Question 4 of 5

Click and drag numbers to score the word groups:

1. LEAST like you
2. 3. MOST like you

Daring
Impulsive
Fun

Concerned
Procedural
Cooperative

Tender
Inspirational
Dramatic

Determined
Complex
Composed

Describe yourself...

Question 5 of 5

Click and drag numbers to score the word groups:

1. LEAST like you
2. 3. MOST like you

Exciting
Courageous
Skilful

Orderly
Conventional
Caring

Vivacious
Affectionate
Sympathetic

Philosophical
Principled
Rational

Your results...

Here are your results!

13 13 9 15

Orange  Gold  Blue  Green

Your True Color is green!

You are also shades of the other colors.

Mouse over your color to find out more. Your color represents your personality, which can play an important role in your career and life outcomes.

Enjoy your new self-knowledge and share it with a friend or family member.
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Appendix C

INFORMED CONSENT STATEMENT (Survey)

Pre-Service and Cooperating Teachers’ Opinions of Collaborative Relationships During Student Internship

Dear Administrator,  

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Jennifer (Ji Ji) Lawley and Dr. Julianne Coleman from The University of Alabama, departments of Curriculum and Instruction. We hope to learn the opinions from participants in your school system pertaining to collaborative relationship during the Spring 2012 student internship semester.

If you decide to participate, your teachers (cooperating or pre-service) will be asked to complete a free online personality assessment that takes approximately 10 minutes during the Fall 2011 semester. This assessment will be used to purposefully pair half of the pre-service and cooperating teachers with matching dominant personality types. The remainder of the pairs will be randomly assigned like they have been paired in the past. The cooperating teachers will also be asked to complete an anonymous 16 item survey near the end of the internship semester. The survey will only take 15-20 minutes of their time. The purpose of this survey is to determine their opinions about collaborative relationships. A sample item from the survey consists of: I feel as if I am learning new valuable educational information from my cooperating/pre-service teacher. They will select an answer from a four choice Likert scale including strongly disagree, disagree, agree, and strongly agree.

Your signature on this letter indicates that you agree to using your school site for this study. Please fax the signed form to 205-665-6376 – Attention: Ji Ji Lawley

__________________________________________  __________
School Administrator                              Date

__________________________________________  __________
Researcher’s signature                            Date
Appendix D

INFORMED CONSENT STATEMENT

Pre-Service and Cooperating Teachers’ Opinions of Collaborative Relationships During Student Internship

Dear Principal,

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Jennifer (Ji Ji) Lawley and Dr. Julianne Coleman from The University of Alabama, departments of Curriculum and Instruction. We hope to learn the opinions from participants in your school pertaining to collaborative relationship during the Spring 2012 student internship semester.

If you decide to participate, your teachers will be asked to complete a free online personality assessment that takes approximately 10 minutes during the Fall 2011 semester. This assessment will be used to purposefully pair half of the pre-service and cooperating teachers with matching dominant personality types. The remainder of the pairs will be randomly matched like they have been paired in the past. The cooperating teachers will also be asked to complete an anonymous 16 item survey near the end of the internship semester. The survey will only take 15-20 minutes of their time. The purpose of this survey is to determine how they perceive their collaborative relationship with their assigned partner. A sample item from the survey consists of: I feel as if I am learning new valuable educational information from my cooperating/pre-service teacher. They will select an answer from a four choice Likert scale including strongly disagree, disagree, agree, and strongly agree.

Your signature on this letter indicates that you agree to using your school site for this study.

Please fax the signed form to 205-665-6376 – Attention: Ji Ji Lawley

_________________________________________  __________________________
School Administrator  Date

_________________________________________  __________________________
Researcher’s signature  Date
Appendix E

INFORMED CONSENT STATEMENT

Pre-Service and Cooperating Teachers’ Opinions of Collaborative Relationships During Student Internship

Dear Potential Participant:

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Jennifer (Ji Ji) Lawley and Dr. Julianne Coleman from The University of Alabama, departments of Curriculum and Instruction and Educational Research. We hope to learn your opinion pertaining to collaborative relationships during the Spring 2012 student internship semester. You were selected as a possible participant in this study because you are either serving as a pre-service or a cooperating teacher during this student internship.

If you decide to participate, you will be asked to complete a free online personality assessment that takes approximately 10 minutes during the Fall 2011 semester. This assessment will be used to purposefully pair half of the pre-service and cooperating teachers with matching dominant personality types. The remainder of the pairs will be randomly assigned like they have been paired in the past.

You will be asked to complete an anonymous 16 item survey near the end of the student internship. The survey will only take 15-20 minutes of your time. The purpose of this survey is to determine how your opinions pertaining to your collaborative relationship with your assigned partner. A sample item from the survey consists of: I feel as if I am learning new valuable educational information from my cooperating/pre-service teacher. You will select an answer from a four choice Likert scale including strongly disagree, disagree, agree, and strongly agree.

The pre-service teachers will take the online survey during the Fall 2011 semester on campus at The University of Montevallo during methods courses. The cooperating teacher will be asked to take the online survey in their school technology lab at a time determined by the school administrators.

The cooperating teachers will be asked to take the survey in the school library. The days and times are to be determined and will be made known to you ASAP. The surveys will be administered and collected by a colleague of mine. I will analyze the survey results myself.

There are no known risks or discomforts associated with your participation in this study. The benefits of the study include learning new information about how cooperating and pre-service teachers’ perceive their collaborative relationships during lab placement. This will help in determining if randomly assigning lab partners is the best strategy. However, I cannot guarantee that you personally will receive any benefits from this research.

Subject identities will be kept confidential by administering anonymous surveys. The results of the survey will be used to determine how future lab placements should be assigned.
Your participation is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your relationship with The University of Montevallo. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw your consent and discontinue participation at any time without penalty.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at 205-368-1982 or lawleyja@montevallo.edu. You are also welcome to contact Julianne Coleman at The University of Alabama at 205-348-3248 or jcoleman@bama.ua.edu. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant you may contact Ms. Tanta Myles, The University of Alabama Research Compliance Officer, at 205-348-8461, or toll free 877-820-3066.

Completing and returning the questionnaire/survey constitutes your consent to participate and certifies that you are 19 years of age or older.

Researcher’s signature _______________________
Date _____________

Participant’s signature _______________________
Date _____________
Appendix F

Approval Forms
November 16, 2011

Jennifer Lawley  
Department of Curriculum & Instruction  
College of Education  
Box 870232

Re: IRB # 11-OR-331, “Pairing of Pre-Service and Cooperating Teachers During Student Internship: Opinions of Collaborative Relationships”

Dear Ms. Lawley:

The University of Alabama Institutional Review Board has granted approval for your proposed research.

Your application has been given expedited approval according to 45 CFR part 46. Approval has been given under expedited review category 7 as outlined below:

(7) Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including, but not limited to, research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices, and social behavior) or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies.

Your application will expire on November 15, 2012. If the study continues beyond that date, you must complete the IRB Renewal Application. If you modify the application, please complete the Modification of an Approved Protocol form. Changes in this study cannot be initiated without IRB approval, except when necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to participants. When the study closes, please complete the Request for Study Closure form.

Should you need to submit any further correspondence regarding this application, please include the assigned IRB application number.

Good luck with your research.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Carpentaro T. Myles, MSM, CIM  
Director & Research Compliance Officer  
Office for Research Compliance  
The University of Alabama
MEMORANDUM

TO: Mrs. Jennifer (Jiji) Lawley and Dr. Julianne Coleman
From: Dr. Jenifer Moore, Chair IRB
RE: Research Review
Date: October 25, 2011

The research described in the attached Ethical Compliance Statements (Lawley and Coleman, “Pairing of Preservice and Cooperating Teachers During Internship: Opinions of Collaborative Relationships” has received approval from the IRB and is considered to be in compliance with the APA’s Ethical Guidelines (Submitted by Principal Investigators: Mrs. Jennifer (Jiji) Lawley and Dr. Julianne Coleman).

The study is approved for one year from the approval date listed above, after which you must apply for a continuation or submit a closure form.

Signature of Chair  

Date  

10-25-11
INFORMED CONSENT STATEMENT (Survey)

Pre-Service and Cooperating Teachers’ Opinions of Collaborative Relationships During Student Internship

Dear Administrator, 

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Jennifer (Ji Ji) Lawley and Dr. Julianne Coleman from The University of Alabama, departments of Curriculum and Instruction. We hope to learn the opinions from participants in your school system pertaining to collaborative relationship during the Spring 2012 student internship semester.

If you decide to participate, your teachers (cooperating or pre-service) will be asked to complete a free online personality assessment that takes approximately 10 minutes during the Fall 2011 semester. This assessment will be used to purposefully pair half of the pre-service and cooperating teachers with matching dominant personality types. The remainder of the pairs will be randomly assigned like they have been paired in the past. The cooperating teachers will also be asked to complete an anonymous 16 item survey near the end of the internship semester. The survey will only take 15-20 minutes of their time. The purpose of this survey is to determine their opinions about collaborative relationships. A sample item from the survey consists of: I feel as if I am learning new valuable educational information from my cooperating/pre-service teacher. They will select an answer from a four choice Likert scale including strongly disagree, disagree, agree, and strongly agree.

Your signature on this letter indicates that you agree to using your school site for this study. Please fax the signed form to 205-665-6376 — Attention: Ji Ji Lawley

______________________________  __________________________
School Administrator

______________________________  __________________________
Researcher’s signature

Date

Date

CONSENT FORM APPROVED: 11/16/11
EXPIRATION DATE: 11/18/12
INFORMED CONSENT STATEMENT

Pre-Service and Cooperating Teachers’ Opinions of Collaborative Relationships During Student Internship

Dear Principal, 

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Jennifer (Ji Ji) Lawley and Dr. Julianne Coleman from The University of Alabama, departments of Curriculum and Instruction. We hope to learn the opinions from participants in your school pertaining to collaborative relationship during the Spring 2012 student internship semester.

If you decide to participate, your teachers will be asked to complete a free online personality assessment that takes approximately 10 minutes during the Fall 2011 semester. This assessment will be used to purposefully pair half of the pre-service and cooperating teachers with matching dominant personality types. The remainder of the pairs will be randomly matched like they have been paired in the past. The cooperating teachers will also be asked to complete an anonymous 16 item survey near the end of the internship semester. The survey will only take 15-20 minutes of their time. The purpose of this survey is to determine how they perceive their collaborative relationship with their assigned partner. A sample item from the survey consists of: I feel as if I am learning new valuable educational information from my cooperating/pre-service teacher. They will select an answer from a four choice Likert scale including strongly disagree, disagree, agree, and strongly agree.

Your signature on this letter indicates that you agree to using your school site for this study.

Please fax the signed form to 205-665-6376 – Attention: Ji Ji Lawley

School Administrator ______________________ Date __________

Researcher’s signature ______________________ Date __________
INFORMED CONSENT STATEMENT

Pre-Service and Cooperating Teachers’ Opinions of Collaborative Relationships During Student Internship

Dear Potential Participant:

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Jennifer (Ji Ji) Lawley and Dr. Julianne Coleman from The University of Alabama, departments of Curriculum and Instruction and Educational Research. We hope to learn your opinion pertaining to collaborative relationships during the Spring 2012 student internship semester. You were selected as a possible participant in this study because you are either serving as a pre-service or a cooperating teacher during this student internship.

If you decide to participate, you will be asked to complete a free online personality assessment that takes approximately 10 minutes during the Fall 2011 semester. This assessment will be used to purposefully pair half of the pre-service and cooperating teachers with matching dominant personality types. The remainder of the pairs will be randomly assigned like they have been paired in the past.

You will be asked to complete an anonymous 16 item survey near the end of the student internship. The survey will only take 15-20 minutes of your time. The purpose of this survey is to determine how your opinions pertaining to your collaborative relationship with your assigned partner. A sample item from the survey consists of: I feel as if I am learning new valuable educational information from my cooperating/pre-service teacher. You will select an answer from a four choice Likert scale including strongly disagree, disagree, agree, and strongly agree.

The pre-service teachers will take the online survey during the Fall 2011 semester on campus at The University of Montevallo during methods courses. The cooperating teacher will be asked to take the online survey in their school technology lab at a time determined the school administrators.

The cooperating teachers will be asked to take the survey in the school library. The days and times are to be determined and will be made known to you ASAP. The surveys will be administered and collected by a colleague of mine. I will analyze the survey results myself.

There are no known risks or discomforts associated with your participation in this study. The benefits of the study include learning new information about how cooperating and pre-service teachers’ perceive their collaborative relationships during lab placement. This will help in determining if randomly assigning lab partners is the best strategy. However, I cannot guarantee that you personally will receive any benefits from this research.

Subject identities will be kept confidential by administering anonymous surveys. The results of the survey will be used to determine how future lab placements should be assigned.

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA

CONSENT FORM APPROVED: 11/16/11
EXPIRATION DATE: 11/15/12
Your participation is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your relationship with The University of Montevallo. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw your consent and discontinue participation at any time without penalty.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at 205-368-1982 or lawleyia@montevallo.edu. You are also welcome to contact Julianne Coleman at The University of Alabama at 205-348-3248 or jcoleman@bama.ua.edu. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant you may contact Ms. Tanta Myles, The University of Alabama Research Compliance Officer, at 205-348-8461, or toll free 877-820-3066.

Completing and returning the questionnaire/survey constitutes your consent to participate and certifies that you are 19 years of age or older.

Researcher’s signature ___________________________  Date ____________
Participant’s signature ___________________________