Student Teacher Perceptions of Evaluation Criteria Through Reflective Practice

Maria Del Vecchio and Michiyo Matsuura

マリア・デルヴェッキオ，松浦康世．教育実習生の事前研修及び実習期間中の省察活動に関する研究．***Studies in International Relations*** Vol.38, No.2. February 2018. pp.39-65.

本研究は，日本大学国際関係学部のティーチング・インターンシップ・プログラムにおける教育実習生の省察を促すための各活動に関して，先行研究と実践結果の分析により，その意義と効果を検証し，実習生が教員としての技能と資質を身に付ける過程に即した効果的な省察活動をデザインすることを目的とする。

具体的には，研修過程の中に，ピア評価，内省シート，指導教員による授業観察，及び自己評価という4つの省察活動を取り入れ，各活動の意義に関する考察と実践データの分析とを照らし合わせながら活動内容，手順，及び実施時期等について妥当性を検証する。

また，本研究は，筆者らが前回の研究報告（del Vecchio & Matsuura, 2016）で明らかにした授業観察において必要な評価項目を実習生が認識していく過程にも注目し，一連の省察活動との関連性を考察する。

Abstract

This research reports the results of a preliminary design of a set of reflective practice activities employed in the Teaching Internship Program (TIP) of Nihon University, College of International Relations, and reviews the ongoing activities of self-reflection as demonstrated by the performance of student teachers before, during and after the completion of teaching training. The authors are responsible for the planning and training aspects of the TIP.

The reflective practice activities included peer evaluation, self-reflection, reviewing Advisors' observations, and self-evaluation. Every activity is analyzed with reference to purpose and method, according to the stages of each student teacher's acquisition of teaching techniques and awareness of the goals of self-reflection.

This paper also focuses on and reveals the process of perception by the student teachers and their observers of the evaluation criteria in the Observation Form that the authors had created during previously reported research (del Vecchio & Matsuura, 2016).

Introduction

The Teaching Internship Program (TIP) gives university students practical experience of teaching the Japanese language and Japanese culture in host schools ranging from elementary schools to high schools in English-speaking countries.

Every student teacher on the TIP is required to undergo six months' prior training in teaching and communicating in English at the University before being allowed to attend on-site teacher training in an English-speaking country. The prior training consists of approximately forty 90-minute lessons, of which twenty-five lessons are for teaching practice in both Japanese and English. The remaining lessons are dedicated to English presentation practice and learning how to introduce Japanese culture and language in English. The practical on-site teacher training lasts for seven or eight weeks, depending on the schedule of each host school.

In the practical on-site teacher training, student teachers were placed in schools with pupils of ages ranging from 5 to 17 years; the schools were providing lessons on Japanese language and culture in accordance with

the knowledge prescribed by General Teaching Council (2013) and appropriate subject and aspect coverage. Class sizes ranged from 6 to 30 pupils, the average number of pupils being 23.

This research is based on data collected from the TIP preparatory training and teaching practice held by the University from June 2015 to March 2017. During this two-year period, there were two sets of six-month prior training courses and on-site trainings in which eight students participated in the first year and eleven students participated in the second year.

In the prior training courses, the teaching contents and processes each student teacher planned were tested through peer review, and self-reflection was used as a tool. Particular emphasis was placed on peer evaluation of the student teachers' performance and justification procedures. Communication and expression skills were also discussed as part of the practice process. The emphasis on peer review and self-reflection was deemed especially important because the student teachers would be expected to reflect on the lessons they would give in their host schools.

Every student teacher was assigned one Advisor by the host school for the seven or eight weeks of on-site training, and an Observation Form with instructions was created for each Advisor's evaluation of one student teacher's class. Every Advisor was informed in detail of the purpose of the Observation Form and asked to follow the instructions when observing one student teacher giving one class. In the first year, ten Observation Forms were collected from eight Advisors in six schools. In the second year, ten Observation Forms were collected from eight Advisors in seven schools. A Self Evaluation Sheet was also created for every student teacher to complete and submit to instructors after having been observed in one class, so that the student teachers could subsequently compare their own evaluations with their observers' scores and comments.

The various alternative definitions of *reflection* and *reflective practice* are reviewed and summarized in order to point up the significance of the above activities. The purpose, methodology, and effects of peer evaluation and self-reflection activities undertaken at each stage of the TIP are then discussed, followed by an overview of methodology for two further related activities involving the Observation Form and self-evaluation. Finally, in the Discussion section, necessary modifications to the reflective activities appropriate for the program are discussed and proposed for further investigation.

Overview of Literature on Reflection and Reflection in Teaching Practices

The reflective practice was designed with the four activities described above in order to foster the effect of *reflection* for learning in light of the necessity for, and efficiency of, reflective practice in a learning process. Svinicki (1999) points out the necessity of "the full participation of the learner" at all levels of the learning process, and comments that "thinking of ourselves as passive learners doesn't fit with our personal experiences" (p.11). Learners should be aware of learning and actively direct their own learning for problem-solving: Brown (1978) expresses this process as *metacognition*. Reflective practice in the TIP training program is treated as a process that stimulates and encourages student teachers to direct their learning throughout the course.

Usage of the Term "Reflective Practice"

Girding the literature and studies on reflection is the pragmatist, John Dewey (1859-1952), whose impact on educational reform is recognized as being seminal. In his book, *How we think* (1933), he describes and emphasizes the differences between reflective practice and routine thinking/action. Reflective practice lends itself to developing the skills required for observing, questioning, reasoning, analyzing and exploring possibilities

in order to solve problematic issues or feelings of doubt in a context that facilitates making a choice between two or more subsequent actions. This is in contrast with routine thinking/action, which deals with problems predefined by external authorities, customs, and expectations. In supporting the educational process and human function, Dewey argues that responses should not be driven by prejudged practice and routine, but by processes of deliberate and active inquiry as a means to ensure genuine learning.

The terminology of reflection has evolved and forked, especially over the last 50 years, in tandem with studies conducted for pedagogical purposes that address the demands for educational reform. Reflection is understood to be a tool for processing a response, a conscientious response, to a situation, an event, and experience. The theorist Habermas (1974) uses the word reflection to reference self-reflection, stating that it is analytical knowledge, and uses the term "critical reflection" (p. 223) to incorporate political and moral thought with the technical and practical knowledge that lead to autonomy. Other frequently cited terms include *the practice of reflection* (Eraut, 2005); *reflection-in-action*, where thought and action are reactive to a particular situation in real time (Schön, 1983, 1987); *reflection-on-action*, where deeper thought relative to existing knowledge, understanding of theories and values is conducted at a later time (Schön 1983, 1987; Hatton & Smith, 1995); and *action research*, where action and reflection are linked in a systematic and phased cycle composed of planning, acting, observing, and finally reflecting (Carr and Kemmis, 1986). All of the above pertain to reflection and involve review, evaluation, investigation and analysis as a means to develop and/or find practical solutions to instructional teaching and learning problems or weaknesses, though settings, methods and timing may vary.

Studies show that the term reflective practice is used frequently (Dewey, 1933; Brookfield, 1995; Hatton & Smith, 1995; Richards & Lockhart, 1996; Richards & Farrell, 2005). However, Sparks-Langer (1992) asserts that the literature fails to offer a single definition of reflective practice, and Moon (2006) maintains the term is idiosyncratic and comments that it is a term that is "vague in meaning but broadly seems to imply that a person is active in reflecting on events and using what she can learn from them to improve future action" (p. 18).

The common theme in the reflective practice is that reflection can be employed as a tool with uses that range widely: a tool for developing knowledge, for facilitating improvement, and for testing purposes; but reflection can also be a medium for risk-taking in action, an activity in which problem solving is exercised either before, during or after practice, a tool for recognizing errors, taking the blame and accepting responsibility. The process, according to Tough (1982), involves self-directed learning where individuals are actively learning more about themselves and their situation, creating strategies based on their decisions and criteria for making them, and applying the knowledge to a topic, task or problem that is of personal importance.

Reflective practice requires self-determination. Habermas (1974) considers self-determination to be a necessary component of reflection, and Loughran (1996) defines self-determination as "a purposeful, deliberate act of inquiry into one's thoughts and actions through which a perceived problem is examined in order that a thoughtful, reasoned response might be tested out" (p. 2). Hatton & Smith (1995) further define the "practice of reflection" as "a deliberate thinking about action with a view to its improvement" (p. 34). These definitions show differences in scope. For Loughran, the emphasis is rooted in a pre-existing problem or deficiency, and is a tool for problem-solving and planning ways and means of fixing the problem, whereas Hatton & Smith emphasise *improvement*, implying that self-determination is motivated by progress and that the intent of the practice of reflection is not to find solutions, but to refine. In adopting the notion of self-determination, Moon (1999) explains it as being "a form of mental processing with a purpose and/or an anticipated outcome that

is applied to relatively complicated or unstructured ideas for which there is not an obvious solution" (p. 23). Unlike Loughran (1996), Moon recognizes that problem solving and/or strategizing are not always regarded as a means to an end: Hatton & Smith (1995), for example, emphasize the purpose of reflection as being a means to improve practice. These definitions imply that the practice of reflection is motivated, sustained, and continues, as a result of self-determination. Furthermore, though it is evident that the basis for reflection may be internally motivated, as in the case of a topic or issue of personal importance, it may also be external, for example, where it is motivated by a perceived need to satisfy certain course criteria, as discussed below.

Critical Reflective Practice in Teaching Programs

Another significant element of reflective practice is critical reflective practice. Hatton & Smith (1995) consider "critical reflective practice" to be an important goal of many teacher-training programs that is supported by several researchers (Schön, 1983; Gore & Zeichner, 1991; Eraut, 1995; Edge, 2001). Recommending the use of critical reflective practice, Bartlett (1990) asserts that initial teacher training should provide the tools for analyzing classroom practice, with the aim of enabling candidates to develop their thinking skills. Fostering critical reflective practice facilitates learning skills and personal development where candidates are encouraged to assess themselves and their practice, modify their instruction to address any issues, and adapt to their changing circumstances and environments. This reasoning is based on the idea that teaching practice is more than a measured sum of skills and competencies. Calderhead & Gates (1993, p.2) contend that reflection enables practitioners "to analyze, discuss, evaluate and change their own practice by adopting an analytical approach" in the process, and that critical reflective practice "encourages them to appraise the moral and ethical issues implicit in classroom practices, including the critical examination of their own beliefs about good teaching."

Thomas (1985) reports that there are four occasions when organizations provide educational support and employees respond: 1) entry into a company, 2) promotion, 3) company-wide change, and 4) special problems. In considering these stages, McCabe et al, (2009, para. 11) state, "Pre-service teachers, however, are just at the point of entering the profession, hence the work-related problems that may stimulate their learning, (e.g., lesson planning, classroom management, or posing questions) are likely to be different, or at least framed differently, than those of highly experienced faculty members with many years of service in the profession." The expected outcomes of the implementation of a teacher training program could therefore affect the motivational needs of the student teachers. In an effort to achieve the goals of a teacher training program, student teachers may be unduly influenced by their own perceived needs, such as attaining required credits, or they may perceive their needs to be a set of activities to be performed as a "box-ticking" exercise in order to meet administrative requirements. Holding such perceptions would be likely to affect adversely the conscious process of exploring and developing the knowledge needed for the higher purpose of critical reflective practice in a teacher training program.

Features that recur in published research on critical reflective practice are "open mindedness, wholeheartedness and responsibility" (Dewey, 1933, p. 30; Zeichner & Liston, 1987, p. 24), along with analyzing, summarizing and judging information. According to Greene (1988), "To be autonomous is to be self-directed and responsible; it is to be insightful enough to know and understand one's impulses, one's motives, and the influences of one's past" (p. 214); and five key features of reflection in teaching emerge in the work of Zeichner & Liston (1996, p. 6) adapted below:

1) examination, framing and attempting to solve the problems of classroom practice

2) awareness of and questioning of the assumptions and beliefs practitioners bring to teaching
3) attentiveness to the institutional and cultural contexts in which the practitioners teach
4) participation in curriculum development and organizational change
5) the taking of responsibility by practitioners for their own professional development.

To develop and support professional learning and school improvement, Hannay, Wideman, and Seller (2007) report on work that integrates critical reflective practice with action, the collection and use of data, and dialogue in an effort to provide guidance on teaching, and suggest that a flexible approach be used. Alger (2006) refers to action research, using case studies to highlight issues, microteaching to improve skills and reflective writing assignments as ways of developing reflection, and Park (2003) and Moon (1999; 2006) describe the use of reflective journals as a resource for instructors in gaining more understanding into the perceptions and thought processes of teachers in training, as well as providing writers with a tool to practice critical thinking and to develop a deeper understanding of their own learning process.

As part of the framework when designing a course, Hatton & Smith (1995) refer to Schön's work and note that despite the distinction placed on reflection-on-action and reflection-in-action, since both approaches "involve demanding rational and moral processes in making reasoned judgements about preferable ways to act" (p. 34). Cruikshank (as cited in Hatton & Smith, 1995) is used as a reference for Hatton & Smith's study (1995) of the fostering of reflection within teacher education for students at the University of Sydney who were following a 4-year secondary Bachelor of Education degree program which included microteaching and journalizing to encourage reflection, thinking, and self-evaluation.

Regarding how reflective practice should be taught, Russell (2005) asserts that from the point of view of teacher educators, reflection "can and should be taught explicitly, directly, thoughtfully, and patiently, using personal reflection-in-action to interpret and improve one's teaching and reflective practice to others" (p. 204). Hannay et al. (2007) argue that reflection in practice should not only emphasize dialogue but should assume a flexible approach. However, with reference to the issue of incorporating reflective practice into the educational context, Russell (2005, p. 200) writes, "The absence of any clear agreement about what reflective practice is and how we recognize it helps us to understand why it is not clear how to teach it."

As to how much weight reflective practice should carry in the context of evaluation and assessment, Hargreaves (2004) argues that though reflection should be required on training courses, it should not be assumed that it is necessarily beneficial as a learning strategy. In support of her study, Hargreaves points out that honesty and openness are compromised by the need to do well academically. With this in mind, she asserts that although reflection serves a practical purpose, it should not be assessed.

These studies show that whilst reflective practice is recognized as a necessary component of teacher training programs, there is a strong, complementary argument that frameworks be established in order to facilitate the achievement of goals that will benefit the teachers' personal and professional development. However, there is little agreement on the most appropriate modes of framing, and how, and at what stage or stages in the training, the reflective practice should take place.

Overview of Learning Stages

Prior Training Period

In the six-months of prior training, self-reflection was practiced as a method that combined peer evaluation and self-reflection. The primary purpose of both peer evaluation and self-reflection was to develop critical

awareness among the student teachers in regard to their teaching competence. In the process, the student teachers started to think about the criteria they needed to meet in order to be what they all perceived to be a “good” teacher. In other words, the student teachers tried to establish in the training group a common standard for teaching assessment.

Regarding the aims of self and peer assessments, they are to increase the student teacher’s responsibility and autonomy, raise awareness of their own subjectivity and judgement, and foster a deeper understanding of the subject matter, skills and processes. Self and peer assessments also engage the student teacher as an active learner or assessor rather than a passive one since they provide opportunities to transfer what they are learning into their own teaching style, and integrate a learning culture using critical reflection.

The combination of the various reflection practices are incorporated in the developmental stage of the student teachers’ English skills. In the initial stage of their training, discussing the criteria for peer evaluation enabled the student teachers to learn new English words and expressions from their classmates with some assistance from their professors. By the time self-reflective practice was introduced into the training after a few peer evaluation practices, the student teachers had acquired sufficient English expressions to be able to write sentences and paragraphs by themselves.

On-Site Teacher Training Period

In the two-month on-site teacher training period, the Observation Form and the Self -Evaluation Sheet were used as the means of engaging the student teachers in reflective practice. At that stage, the student teachers had already established their own evaluation criteria through the prior training. For the first few weeks of the on-site training period, the student teachers observed their Advisor’s and other teachers’ classes, and tried to adjust to the new teaching environment. In that period, they had an opportunity to reflect on their personal teaching style by comparing it with their Advisor’s teaching style. After a few weeks, the student teachers were notified that their classes would be observed by their Advisor and assessed according to the Observation Form that was created by the authors. At that time, the student teachers were informed of the evaluation criteria for the first time so that they could add new aspects of evaluation standards to their own criteria.

It was estimated that the student teachers would need a week to appreciate the implications of the new standards as well as to plan one class each that would be observed according to the evaluation criteria, so the observers were asked to notify the student teachers of the observation date at least one week in advance.

Student teachers were also asked to complete the Self-Evaluation Sheet as described above. The student teachers completed the Self-Evaluation Sheet without knowing at that point the results of the Observation Forms that would be completed by their Advisors. At that time, the student teachers needed to be critical of their own performance without any preconceived ideas; this was one of the most important attributes of the reflective practice methodology. Student teachers had an opportunity to reflect on their teaching independently of their reflective practice during the prior training. The student teachers managed to reach a stage at which they were reflecting on all their performances throughout their training; they were able to appreciate what they had achieved and the extent to which they had succeeded with respect to their goals. Each student teacher then received the Observation Form completed by their Advisor so that they could inspect other aspects of it and consider it in relation to their own assessment in their own Self-Evaluation Sheet. This was the final stage of learning in the program. The student teachers acquired the skills of reflective practice that were necessary to be able to establish and achieve their own goals.

Aim and Methodology of Reflective Activity

Desimone (2011) asserts that, in order to avoid passive attendance in the learning environment, it is beneficial to engage learners actively within their own professional context. Taking this assertion into consideration, the TIP incorporated both personal and wider inputs from student peers through factual, prudential and justificatory dialogue. It was achieved through the student teachers' engagement in semi-structured reflection of what had been observed. This allowed further consideration by the student teachers of how to address ideas arising as a result of the reflective practice and allowed the student teachers to plan their next activity. The reflective practice included discussions of problematic issues such as ways of thinking, talking and identities (Avalos, 2006), and the impact of this approach on the learners.

Peer Evaluation

Peer evaluation is a common learning activity in a group work. The aim of peer evaluation in the TIP was to share the recognition of teaching criteria as well as to improve the student teachers' critical thinking skills.

Serving as a methodological tool, the Peer Evaluation Form employed observational descriptive statements utilizing quantitative data in the form of a Likert scale* and qualitative text for "Other comments." Since the Peer Evaluation Form was created by student teachers to evaluate their peers using negotiated collective criteria, and provided a space for the recording of independent perceptions regarding the observed practice, it was used as a framework adequate for the reporting of results and evidence. In addition, the use of quantitative estimates and qualitative evaluations allowed for insights into the determination of degrees of priority and agreement among the participants (Pope & Mays 1995; Devers 2011).

Our primary intent was to encourage the student teachers to think deeply and process what they needed to do in order to become their ideal teacher. Before finding their evaluative criteria, the student teachers were asked the following questions: "What skills do you need to become a good teacher?" and "Please tell us your experience if you have ever had a good teacher." Being asked about their own experience, they could visualize a certain image of their ideal teachers.

In the first year, the class of eight student teachers proposed the following evaluative criteria:

> Checking for understanding; speaking clearly; speaking loudly; appropriate posture; smiling; creating a comfortable atmosphere; correct pronunciation, accent and intonation; the teacher enjoys teaching; the students enjoy learning; time-planning; and pacing

Every student teacher suggested one or two items initially, as indicated above. As can be seen, their knowledge level of English was rather limited, resulting in unsystematic pairing of words, which may sometimes have hindered logical thought processes. However, their list shows an appreciation of expression and communication skills, but there was a lack of awareness of the necessary teaching techniques, especially in the categories of teaching skills and teaching materials. While watching their colleagues' performances in a teaching practice session, they began to recognize what skills they really needed. The following items were then added to the initial list of evaluative criteria:

---

* The Likert scale used for the Peer Evaluation Form listed peer-generated criteria as statements. Data were recorded using a five point Likert scale with one scale of descriptors, where: 1 = strongly disagree 2 = disagree 3 = somewhat agree 4 = agree 5 = strongly agree (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011)

Logical planning; visual aids; suitable materials; suitable interests for the students' ages; maintaining eye contact; effective intonation; gestures; and body movement

As we see in this list, all the items the student teachers added were categorized as teaching skills (logical planning, maintaining eye contact, effective intonation, gestures, and body movement) and teaching materials (visual aids, and interesting materials suitable for the students' ages) which were lacking in their initial thoughts.

Since the student teachers had to complete the form in the actual teaching practice within 10 minutes, only ten suggestions from the above lists were selected by the student teachers as rating questions, but a box was also provided for "Other comments." The "Other comments" box allowed for clarification whenever the student teachers felt it was necessary or appropriate. The items from the above lists that were used in the Peer Evaluation Form would be used in the subsequent teacher training.

The following is thus the complete Peer Evaluation Form prepared by the student teachers in the first year of this research project (see Figure 1).

Figure 1. Peer Evaluation Form for TIP 2015-2016 Prior Training

Teaching Internship Program 2015-2016　　Name of classmate:

Please rate your student colleague's teaching using the following scale:

1 = strongly disagree 2 = disagree 3 = somewhat agree 4 = agree 5 = strongly agree

1. Planned the lesson logically	
2. Chose a topic and materials suitable for the students' age	
3. Used visual aids effectively (Power Point or blackboard, etc.)	
4. Good time management / taught at a good pace	
5. Spoke clearly and loudly with good pronunciation / accent / intonation	
6. Used gestures effectively / good posture and body movement	
7. Maintained eye contact / checked pupils' understanding and gave feedback	
8. Kept smiling / created a comfortable atmosphere	
9. Teacher enjoyed teaching	
10. Students enjoyed learning	
Other comments:	

Priority having been given to saving time when completing the Peer Evaluation Form, there were two or three different items included within certain questions that could have created a problem for the student teachers as they were required to give just one score for each rating question. None the less, responding to the questions that included two or three items seemed not to have been difficult; on the contrary, the grouping helped the student teachers to simplify the criteria by relating the groups to the items to be achieved.

The student teachers found solutions for themselves instead of pointing out the problem. Some student teachers used the "Other comments" column to give more specific comments. For example, there were five elements in question 5, namely, "speaking clearly," "speaking loudly," "speaking with good pronunciation," "speaking with correct accent," and "speaking with correct intonation." One student teacher gave "3" for question 5 and wrote, "I want her to speak more clearly." Another student teacher gave "3" for question 8 and wrote, "I think if he keeps smiling, it'd be better." There were also comments which emphasized good points,

such as "Your visual aid was good!" after giving "5" for most of the questions. Another solution was to indicate the items which seemed to have been achieved or needed improvement with an arrow and a short comment, such as "Good!" or "Needs practice."

After repeating the peer evaluation practice two or three times, the student teachers needed less time to answer the questions, which indicated that the Peer Evaluation Form helped them to develop an image of, or memorize, the necessary criteria. The same Peer Evaluation Form was therefore used throughout the prior training.

In the second year, the class of eleven student teachers proposed the following evaluative criteria:

Communicating: Communication with students; eye contact; reacting to what students say; praising students; paying attention to students; attracting students' attention; controlling students; teaching good manners; checking students' attitudes; getting along well with students; and not using negative words

Expression: Speaking loudly and clearly; cheerfulness; using gestures; using facial expressions such as smiling; standing position; and being polite

Teaching skills: Checking if students understand or not (looking around and checking, etc.); entertaining students in the lesson; making a class interesting and enjoyable; maintaining students' concentration by using a variety of activities; explaining briefly but accurately; giving clear explanations; giving focus; using easy words; having English skills such as correct pronunciation and grammar; having a wide range of knowledge in case students ask questions; knowing how to use a blackboard; good handwriting; knowing good ways to help the students memorize; maintaining a good rhythm or tempo; teaching smoothly and speedily; having a good command of time management; and creating lesson contents and structure

Materials: Preparing a variety of teaching materials

There being more student teachers than in the first year of the research project, more items were suggested in the prior training teaching practice session; the knowledge level of English was also a little higher. Ten suggestions drawn from the above lists were selected, again by the student teachers, for the actual teaching practice. The following is the complete Peer Evaluation Form prepared by the student teachers in the second year (see Figure 2).

Figure 2. Peer Evaluation Form for TIP 2016-2017 Prior Training

Teaching Internship Program 2016-2017 Name of classmate:

Please rate your student colleague's teaching using the following scale:

1 = strongly disagree 2 = disagree 3 = somewhat agree 4 = agree 5 = strongly agree

1. Paid attention to students / checked students' understanding and gave feedback	
2. Praised students / did not use negative words / was polite	
3. Attracted students' attention / controlled students	
4. Spoke clearly, loudly and cheerfully	
5. Used gestures or facial expressions / stood in the right position	
6. Introduced enjoyable and interesting content in the right order	

7. Maintained students' concentration or interest / used a variety of activities	
8. Gave clear and focused instructions / used English and Japanese effectively	
9. Used Power Point or blackboard effectively (clarity of writing and images)	
10. Taught smoothly at a good tempo / good time management	
Other comments:	

Results of the Rating Questions

The peer evaluation practice was undertaken four times during the prior training period. We collected and collated all the scores for each question as shown in the Appendix. The data from the third peer evaluation practice was chosen for the analysis since the first two practices were necessary for the student teachers to practise filling in the Peer Evaluation Form, and the fourth practice was the presentation examination that could have affected the student teachers psychologically.

We focus on two findings extracted from the results. Table 1 shows the total scores the student teachers of each year gave for each question throughout the prior training period. The highest scores on the TIP 2015-2016 were awarded for Question 3 (Used visual aids effectively) and Question 2 (Chose a topic and materials suitable for the students' age). The three lowest scores were for Question 8 (Kept smiling / created a comfortable atmosphere), Question 6 (Used gestures effectively / good posture and body movement), and Question 5 (Spoke clearly and loudly with good pronunciation / accent / intonation). The highest score in the TIP 2016-2017 was Question 4 (Spoke clearly, loudly and cheerfully) and the lowest was Question 9 (Used Power Point or blackboard effectively).

Table 1: Total Score for Each Question in the Peer Evaluation Form

Question	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
TIP2015-2016	239	249	252	235	230	229	237	228	236	242
TIP2016-2017	480	479	480	489	460	473	476	468	449	463

These scores can be used for planning future training by incorporating the criteria that the student teachers feel they have not yet achieved. Interestingly, the two years yielded completely opposite results: the student teachers in the first year were good at using visual aids, but the student teachers in the second year gave the lowest score for the same criterion; and the first year student teachers gave the lowest score for speaking clearly and loudly, but the second year student teachers gave the highest score for the same question. This result shows that there were no specific tendencies perceptible in the students' weaknesses. The practices implemented in the teacher training course should therefore be planned carefully, taking into account the results of their peer evaluation scores.

It has to be emphasized that the criteria the student teachers felt they had not achieved were not exactly the same as their weak points, but instead showed the skills that the student teachers wanted to improve. In evaluating the shortcomings of their skills in this way, their judgmental focus demonstrates a potential for learning and is aligned with a purpose for improving practice. As a result, the student teachers were not passive learners, but were motivated to challenge themselves in developing better plans for their lessons. This process

provides the student teachers with autonomy, relatedness, and develops their competence. Furthermore, the process provided an opportunity for the instructors to explore the student teachers' accounts and take into consideration the evolving issues. It could be argued that instructors should recognize these concerns as implicit requests and incorporate them in program development. This approach would be instrumental in supporting the student teachers' own goals and the program's objectives.

The second finding was that the collected Peer Evaluation Forms showed mostly high scores in the rating questions, as can be seen in Table 2, where 47.6% of the student teachers awarded a score of 5 for "strongly agree" and 35.2% awarded a score of 4 for "agree." The student teachers were generally reluctant to give low scores and tended to give almost the same scores to all their peers even though the forms were completed anonymously.

Table 2: Total Number of Scores and Percentage on the Likert Scale from 5 to 1

	5 strongly agree	4 agree	3 somewhat agree	2 Disagree	1 strongly disagree	N/A blank	Total
TIP2015-2016	48.4% (271)	30.2% (169)	19.6% (110)	1.4% (8)	0% (0)	0.4% (2)	100% (560)
TIP2016-2017	47.2% (524)	37.7% (419)	13.0% (144)	0.7% (8)	0.3% (3)	1.1% (12)	100% (1100)
Mean percentages	47.6%	35.2%	15.1%	0.8%	0.06%	0.8%	100%

These results suggest that the instructors should make student teachers appreciate the aims of their practice. In the peer evaluation practice the student teachers should not focus on grading their peers' competence; instead they should focus on the process of learning by perceiving evaluation criteria as a means to building their critical skills from the conceptual level through to execution. In addition, this focus would allow them to identify criteria that ascertains quality and needs retrospectively and explore more deeply their future needs.

Data From "Other Comments"

Data from the "Other comments" section of the Peer Evaluation Forms were collected and coded into units of thought for analysis. The units of thought were then categorized as Factual Discourse, Prudential Discourse and Justificatory Discourse (adapted from Zeichner & Liston, 1985); Factual Discourse accounts for what is observed during a student teacher's demonstration; and Prudential Discourse includes (a) Advice/ Opinion where the observer identifies and proposes a solution to a perceived problem, and (b) Evaluation where the observer renders a positive or negative judgement based on the value or quality of factors related to an action. Justificatory Discourse identifies the reasons or rationale for teaching actions or factors.

There were 159 units of thought extracted from ten sets of writings in the responses to the "Other comments" section of the Peer Evaluation Form (2016) that was developed in the Teaching Internship Program (2016-2017). Table 3 shows the percentage of units of thought in each of the discourse categories identified.

Table 3: Percentage of Units of Thought in Discourse Categories: Peer Evaluation Forms (2016-2017)

	%
Factual Discourse	4.4%
Prudential Discourse: Advice/Opinion & Evaluation	84.3%
Justificatory Discourse	11.3%
Total	100.0%

The table shows clearly that the student teachers placed most emphasis on Prudential Discourse (84.3%), followed by Justificatory Discourse (11.3%) and Factual Discourse (4.4%). Given the high value returned in the category of Prudential Discourse, where Prudential Advice/Opinion totalled 46.5% and Prudential Evaluation totalled 37.7%, the combined figures are consistent with the goals of the TIP. However, it is noteworthy that the percentage of responses in the category of Justificatory Discourse was comparatively low, so this aspect of the results may warrant more detailed investigation as the research progresses.

The student teachers, having discussed the content of the "Other comments" section of the Peer Evaluation Form in detail, decided in the following class to add four criteria to those previously agreed: "eye contact," "pronunciation," "grammar," and "matched class level with students' level."

In order to gain further insight into the value placed on these four criteria, a semi-quantitative study was conducted to evaluate the frequency of references pertaining to the criteria prior to their use in the subsequent Peer Evaluation Form (2016). The units of thought reported in Table 4 indicate the percentile value prior to the student teachers' collective decision to include them as criteria in the Peer Evaluation Form (2016) for use in subsequent evaluations.

Table 4 provides a percentile description, extracted from ten written samples of the Peer Evaluation Form (2016), of the values placed by the student teachers on each of the four criteria found in the semi-quantitative study.

Table 4: Percentile Value of Proposed Additional Criteria for Peer Evaluation Forms (2016) %

Eye contact	7.5%
Pronunciation	5.7%
Grammar	2.5%
Matched class level with students' needs	46.5%
Total	62.3%

The total in Table 4 represents 99 units of thought as a percentage of 159 units of thought that have been extracted from the "Other comments" sections of ten sets of completed Peer Evaluation Forms (2016).

"Eye contact" was mentioned four times in "Other comments." In one case, Prudential was evaluated as "good," whereas in the other three cases it was used as a Justificatory discourse marker meaning "not reading from a script". The student teachers also used the word 'look' when referring to eye contact. It came up twice in the Prudential category, once as an evaluation, "You looked at the script too much," and once as advisory; "Look at the students more"; and "You looked at the paper and PowerPoint too much" was given as a Justificatory reason for not memorizing. The main references to eye contact also used the word "memorize": "memorize" was listed five times under Prudential Advisory. The combined data representing the "Eye contact" criteria

are measured at 7.5% of the total units of thought.

"Pronunciation" was referred to twice under Prudential Discourse, where it was advised to "check" it, and was evaluated as "really good and clear pronunciation." The word "speak", when referring to poor understanding due to lack of clarity in pronunciation, was referenced twice, as Prudential Advisory: "Speaking clearly is better" and "Speak more clearly"; and once as Justificatory: "I couldn't understand what you said." The word was also used 4 times in the Prudential Evaluation category as positive feedback on speech. The combined data representing "Pronunciation" criteria are measured at 5.7% of the total number of units of thought.

"Grammar" was referenced 3 times in the Prudential advisory category: "You should check your grammar"; "You should recheck your grammar"; and "You should check your English and grammar." It was also referenced once in the Factual category: "There were many mistakes in grammar." The combined data representing "Grammar" criteria are measured at 2.5% of the total number of units of thought.

For the "matched class level with pupils' level" criterion, a total of 74 units of thought were extracted. Prudential Discourse accounts for the largest set of units of thought, with 39 units of thought listed as Prudential Advisory. 27 units of thought are listed as Prudential Evaluative, and 8 units of thought are listed as Justificatory Discourse. Positive Prudential Evaluative comments included references to pace, "Tempo was good"; activities that were "Fun for students"; topics and quizzes that were "Very interesting"; and presentations and explanations that were "Easy to understand", "Easy to follow", and "Good." There were however, fewer positive evaluations than negative evaluations pertaining to written and oral forms of the target language which were considered inappropriate for the students: "Difficulty to only read hiragana"; "Difficulty for young children to understand"; "Difficult words"; "Too much information"; and "Too difficult to follow." Comments on content included "Relevance of example not relevant" and "Topic did not relate to slides." One Justificatory response was: "Too difficult for students because of too much Japanese." The combined data representing the "matched class level with students' level" criteria are measured at 46.5% of the total number of units of thought.

The results show that the frequency of references gathered and analyzed in the "Other comments" section corresponds quantifiably with the student teachers' decision to include the additional four criteria, accounting for 62.3% of the total units of thought. However, though eye contact, pronunciation and grammar resulted in a total percentile value of 15.7%, the needs of the students were of most concern to the student teachers when deciding to include the further four criteria in the Peer Evaluation Form (2016).

Regarding the methodology, the student teachers were not experts; however, their contributions were agreed upon collectively. That is to say, even though they were lacking in knowledge-based practice and experience, they recognized their statements as being valid for the tasks. In addition, they were able to update their Peer Evaluation Forms subsequently with respect to new ideas that they had garnered through practice. Nevertheless, it was evident that the student teachers would need to think more critically and reflect further on the instructional-learning process, give more consideration to motivation, and develop a greater awareness of the skills needed for the planning, preparation and implementation of their classes.

Self-Reflection

In the annual six-month prior training in teaching and communicating in English, self-reflection was practised in a free writing style. The student teachers were asked to write a one-page Self-Reflection Sheet following every presentation they made. Two to three Self-Reflection Sheets were collected from each student teacher during the prior training. As guidance, we made just one request of the student teachers when they were completing their Self-Reflection Sheets: They write about both the positive points and the negative points

in their presentations that they could be categorized according to their awareness of their teaching.

The researchers' expectation was that previous discussions of the peer evaluation criteria in class would help the student teachers to write their own Self-Reflection Sheets. Knowing only a limited range of English expressions, the student teachers still needed guidance on writing appropriate paragraphs. The Peer Evaluation Form was intended to provide them with examples of terms that they could use, and asking them to write down positive points and negative points was intended to give the student teachers focus. Positive points in their Self-Reflection Sheets would then indicate the achievement of the student teachers' targets, while negative points would indicate a failure to achieve their goals.

Based on this expectation, the following table compares the questions in the Peer Evaluation Form 2015-2016 and the comments in the Self-Reflection Sheets collected from the student teachers in the same year (see Table 5). The numbers in parentheses are the number of relevant responses.

Table 5: Comparison of Reflection Foci (2015-2016)

Rating questions in Peer Evaluation Form 2015-2016	Positive (P) and negative (N) points in Self-Reflection Sheets
1. Planned the lesson logically	P: Gave materials (1) N: Needed better explanation (2) N: Topic should be more focused (1)
2. Chose a topic and materials suitable for the students' age	P: Topic was interesting (3) N: There was too much to teach (1) N: Topic was too difficult (1)
3. Used visual aids effectively (Power Point or blackboard, etc.)	P: PPT had a lot of pictures (2) P: PPT was easy to understand (1) N: PPT letters were too small (2) N: There were spelling mistakes (2) N: Use of colours was ineffective (2) N: Sentences were too long (1)
4. Good time management / taught at a good pace	N: Should memorise the script (2) N: Spoke too fast (2) N: Spoke too slowly (2)
5. Spoke clearly and loudly with good pronunciation / accent / intonation	P: Voice was clear (4) N: Need to improve grammar (2) N: Bad pronunciation (2)
6. Used gestures effectively / good posture and body movement	P: Used gestures (1) N: Should use gestures (3)
7. Maintained eye contact / checked students' understanding and gave feedback	P: Praised students (1) N: Should praise more (1) N: Should give hints (1) N: Should ask more questions (2) N: Should confirm that students understood (1) N: Should respond clearly (2) N: Should review (1)
8. Kept smiling / created a comfortable atmosphere	P: Kept smiling (3) P: Spoke cheerfully (2) N: Should smile (2) N: Should speak cheerfully (2)
9. Teacher enjoyed teaching	P: Less nervous than before (2) N: Too nervous (1)

10. Students enjoyed learning	N: Need to make class more fun (1) N: Need more activities to let students talk (1)

Comments that are not answers to the specific questions were

N: Instructions were unclear (3)

N: Should change question styles (1)

N: Should use more Japanese (2)

Table 5 shows that most comments in the Self-Reflection Sheets can be categorized in the rating questions on the Peer Evaluation Form. Exactly the same sentences or terms are seen in questions 2, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 8. This result shows that the student teachers reflected the criteria in their own reflection as we had expected. Discussion of the peer evaluation criteria in advance was therefore useful for self-reflection practice. Similarities are seen in both the positive and negative points, which indicates that the student teachers set targets for each teaching practice and assessed their own performance according to those targets. The positive comments indicated achievement of their goals while the negative comments indicated a failure to achieve their goals.

The student teachers' comments also included some points that are not categorized in any of the rating questions. The category found in Question 8 of the Peer Evaluation Form for TIP 2016-2017 was not included in the Form for TIP 2015-2016. The student teachers following TIP 2015-2016 later recognized the necessity of the teaching skills while they are practicing, as seen in the comments when reflecting on their practice, "Instructions were unclear," "Should change question style" and "Should use more Japanese." The student teacher who made the comment "Should change question style" later made another comment "I used different questions styles." It was clear that on finding a negative point, the student teacher made it her target to improve and later wrote whether or not she had achieved the goal in the next presentation. A Self-Reflection Sheet could thus include the student teachers' own findings and recognition of their negative points and improvement.

After listing all the comments in the Self-Reflection Sheets, it was found that there were twice as many comments that identified negative points that needed to be improved as points that the student teachers felt represented achievements: 47 out of 71 comments identified negative points (see Table 5). The student teachers learned how to be critical of their own performance by watching their classmates' performances and comparing them with their own performance: No matter how good the scores given by their peers, the student teachers tried to be critical of their own performance. This demonstrates that the student teachers were learning through and learning from the evaluation process in an effort to build on knowledge and improve their practice.

Observation Form

The Observation Form was introduced to evaluate performance and achievement by using a set of structured criteria during one student teachers' lesson. The aim was to create the Observation Form as a tool to help the administrators of the TIP to evaluate the effectiveness of the student teachers in their placements at host schools in America, Australia, and New Zealand, and as an instrument to support the preparation and objectives of the TIP.

The Observation Form was therefore designed with a view to planning and exploring the practical context of lessons on a methodological basis, using statements in a questionnaire to illustrate the understanding, skills and content that had been taught in the TIP (del Vecchio & Matsuura, 2016). Since the Observation Form highlighted an explicit set of skills which are directly relevant to class management and delivery, with one Observation Form having been completed for each lesson that was observed, every student teacher's behaviour

in each of a number of important instructional-learning processes was documented. It was thus possible to ascertain qualitatively and quantifiably for each student teacher: (a) the student teacher's interactions with pupils and the purposes of those interactions, (b) the setting in which the teaching took place, (c) the materials which were available and deployed, and (d) the specific activities in which the student teacher and pupils had engaged.

The Observation Form in this study was thus used as a tool whereby the classroom skills, the level of knowledge and understanding, and the attitudes, as well as the practical skills, of the individual student teachers were assessed. Although the Observation Form listed the competencies in a set of three main groups, the competencies were not intended to be viewed as independent items, since the aim was to distinguish entities and whether or not they interacted with each other. A list of 50 statements was set out in the Observation Form, along with five boxed areas for open questions and responses. The statements and questions therefore provided insights into two domains: that of the student teacher's practice and that of competencies, with a view to highlighting for trainers the areas that would need further development. The Observation Form was thus primarily a quantitative list of statements focused on the competence skills of the individual student teachers being observed, and the statements on the Observation Form were created as a means to minimize, as far as possible, any subjectivity in the observer's responses.

Self-Evaluation

The Self-Evaluation Sheet was used as a tool for student teachers to evaluate their own classroom skills through reflective practice during the observed lesson. The aim of the self-evaluation was to make it possible to assess the extent to which the stated goals in the Observation Form mirrored the instructional-learning process, through reflective practice, of the student teacher, and to provide evidence that would clarify the extent of consistency between the content of observed lessons as assessed by the observers, and the judgements and reflections of the student teacher.

A Self-Evaluation Sheet, which consisted of four questions and was designed to be completed by each student teacher, was used in order to yield the necessary qualitative and quantifiable evidence of both reflection and accountability on the part of the student teacher shortly after teaching in the instructional-learning context in which the student teacher had been observed. The data in the completed Self-Evaluation Sheet, when collected, collated and processed, thus documented the student teachers' reflection on their behaviours and attitudes during the instructional-learning process, and their personal accountability, with reference to: (a) student teachers' interactions with pupils and the purposes, (b) the settings in which the teaching took place, (c) the materials which were deployed, and (d) the specific activities the student teachers and pupils had engaged. The findings of the self-evaluations will be reported in a separate study at a later date.

Perceptions of Evaluation Criteria

The Observation Form was designed to encompass all the necessary criteria for teaching. There are four stages at which the student teacher perceives the evaluation criteria in the Observation Form: during the peer evaluation practice in the prior training (Stage 1), during the self-reflection practice in the prior training (Stage 2), in the self-evaluation practice after the on-site training (Stage 3), and after receiving the Observation Form from the Advisor after the on-site training (Stage 4). Table 6 shows in which stage the student teachers following the TIP 2015-2016 perceived the Observation Form criteria by noting the words the student teachers used in

each reflective practice. Table 6 also shows the mean scores the same student teachers were given by their Advisors in the Observation Form after the on-site training. As shown in the Appendix, the scores are indicated on a Likert scale of four numbers: "4" for very well accomplished, "3" for good, "2" for more emphasis recommended, and "1" for poor (del Vecchio & Matsuura, 2016).

Table 6: Stages at which the Observation Form criteria were perceived (TIP 2015-2016)

	Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3	Stage 4	Mean Score
1. Interest and Motivation					
Student teacher followed pupil work efforts.	×	×	●		3.4
Praise and encouragement were given to build confidence.	●	●	●		3.5
Student teacher showed patience and tolerance.	●	●	●		4.0
Student teacher recognized pupils as individuals.	●	●	●		3.8
Student teacher showed respect to the pupils.	●	●	●		3.9
Pupils showed respect to the student teacher.	●	×	●		3.7
Student teacher was welcoming.	●	●	●		3.9
Pupils' interest was maintained.	●	●	●		3.4
2. Planning and Preparation (purpose, activities, resources, teaching method)					
The purpose of the session was explicit.	×	●	●		3.8
The objectives were appropriate.	●	●	●		3.9
The content was suitable (level and skills).	●	●	●		3.6
The sequencing was logical.	●	●	●		3.6
The learning outcomes for pupils were achieved.	×	●	●		3.6
There was enough pupil activity.	●	●	●		3.6
There was a good balance between teacher and pupil activity.	●	×	●		3.8
Activities were varied.	×	●	●		3.8
Activities were engaging.	●	●	●		3.5
Student teacher showed awareness of needs and abilities of pupils.	●	●	●		3.5
Pupils were involved in activities	●	●	●		3.6
Materials, if used, were appropriate (paper, scissors, pencils, worksheets, etc.).	●	●	●		3.9
Resources, if used, were appropriate (CD player, video, computer, internet, etc.).	●	●	●		4.0
Resources, if used, considered the needs and abilities of pupils.	●	●	●		3.8
Resources, if used, were engaging.	●	●	●		3.5
Student teacher was confident with available resources.	●	●	●		3.7
Student teacher used effective strategies to teach objectives.	×	●	●		3.5
Student teacher used resources and time effectively.	●	●	●		3.3
Teacher-centred approach was effective when used.	●	●	●		3.4
Pupil-centred approach was effective when used.	●	●	●		3.5
3. Implementation (communication skills, questioning, group work, pupils)					
Information was clearly presented.	●	●	●		3.5
Pace and delivery were appropriate.	●	●	●		3.3
Visual aids, supplemented oral communication.	●	●	●		3.6
The student teacher recognized non-verbal feedback.	●	×	●	●	3.3

The student teacher engaged the pupils.	●	●	●		3.4
The student teacher showed enthusiasm.	●	●	●		3.5
The student teacher showed confidence.	●	●	●		3.2
The student teacher could draw the attention of the whole class.	×	×	●		3.1
The student teacher handled disruption effectively (if any).	×	×	●		3.7
The student teacher established a good rapport.	●	●	●	●	3.5
Student teacher questioning was encouraging.	×	●	●		3.5
Sufficient time was allowed for responses.	●	●	●		3.7
Incorrect answers were dealt with sensitively.	●	●	●		3.6
Questions addressed recognised the abilities of the students.	●	●	●		3.8
Questions used varied structures (yes/no, 'wh')	×	●	●		3.3
Group work was organized effectively.	●	●	●		3.5
The purpose of group work was explained clearly.	×	●	●		3.8
Pupils contributed and supported each other.	●	×	●		3.8
Groups remained on-task.	×	×	●		3.7
Pupils were encouraged to be active.	×	×	●		3.6
Pupils were encouraged to ask questions.	●	●	●		3.6
Pupils were given opportunities to build confidence and learning.	×	×	●		3.6

Comparison of Criteria Perceived Before and After On-Site Training

As can be seen in Table 6, 88% (44 out of 50) of the criteria were perceived during the prior training (Stage 1 and Stage 2). The terms the student teachers used in the peer evaluation and self-reflection practices were not identical to the criteria presented in the Observation Form, but the Observation Form criteria were generally perceived as a result of the prior training. For example, "Praise and encouragement were given to build confidence" and "Student teacher showed patience and tolerance" were aims to be achieved in the prior training, as can be seen in the question "Maintained eye contact / checked students' understanding and gave feedback" in the Peer Evaluation Form (Stage 1) and also in the comments "I praised students," "I should praise more," "I should give hints," and "I should confirm that students understood" in the Self-Reflection Sheets (Stage 2).

On the other hand, 12% (6 out of 50) of the criteria were perceived for the first time in the on-site training. Those criteria are listed and categorized below:

- Student teacher followed pupil work efforts. (Interest and Motivation)
- The student teacher could draw the attention of the whole class. (Implementation)
- The student teacher handled disruption effectively. (Implementation)
- Groups remained on-task. (Implementation)
- Pupils were encouraged to be active. (Implementation)
- Pupils were given opportunities to build confidence and learning. (Implementation)

The Observation Form consisted of three categories: "Interest and Motivation," "Planning and Preparation," and "Implementation." Most of the criteria in the first two categories were perceived during Stages 1 and 2. Only one criterion, "Student teacher followed pupil work efforts," was not perceived until Stage 3. This resulted in the lowest score marked by the Advisors of the host schools in the Observation Form. It can be said that

either the instructor or the student teachers neglected to pay due attention to this criterion during the prior training course.

Five questions in the Implementation category were not perceived during the prior training. The criteria "Drawing attention of the class" and "handling disruption" had not been proposed by the student teachers during the prior training because their peers had always been supportive while they were performing practice teaching. They had had no opportunity to face any disobedience or disruption in front of their peers. However, this could be experienced in the prior training by having some student teachers play the role of bad pupils during their practice teaching. Although we found no comments about handling disruption, the prior training had introduced methods to handle disruptions and the student teachers had practiced them in class. The Mean Score for "Handling disruption" was rather high (3.7). This result shows that the level of skill they had achieved during the prior training was not necessarily apparent in their comments in the reflection practice. "Keeping them on-task," "Encouraging to be active," and "Building confidence" were also not seen in the comments during the prior training, although they practiced planning enjoyable group activities and learning words to enable them to encourage their pupils. The mean scores achieved for these three questions were also relatively high.

The student teachers' comments in the prior training were focused on the actual practice of teaching, whereas the criteria in the Observation Form were focused more on the outcome of the teaching. However, the results show that most criteria in the Observation Form can be perceived and achieved by student teachers before the commencement of the on-site training.

Self-Reflection After Reviewing Observation Forms Completed by the Advisors

After studying the Observation Forms received from their Advisors, most of the student teachers accepted their Advisors' scores and comments without question, except for two student teachers. One student teacher asked the meaning of "The student teacher established a good rapport," for which the student teacher had received a score of 4 (Very well accomplished), because of unfamiliarity with the key word "rapport." The other request was for examples of "non-verbal feedback." The student teacher had received a score of 2 (More emphasis recommended) for the question "The student teacher recognized non-verbal feedback." In her Self-Evaluation Sheet, the student teacher had commented, "I spent too much time in cultural lectures in English. Students might have got bored. I should have done more Japanese learning activities." In fact, she received scores of 3 (Good) for every question in the "Activities" section, the questions being, for example, "There was enough pupil activity" and "Activities were engaging." The same student teacher received a score of 3 for "Student teacher recognized pupils as individuals," even though her score for "Student teacher showed respect to the pupils" was 4. She then realized that she had not paid sufficient attention to every pupil because she had not employed activities that required it.

Discussion

The developmental assumptions underlying the Peer Evaluation Form took into account: 1) acceptable instructional practices, 2) the need for a means to help student teachers to recognize and reflect on their pedagogy, 3) the recognition that problematic areas exist in instructional practices, and 4) the need to embolden student teachers to change their existing practices when appropriate. The design and construction of a checklist with appropriate characteristics could help the student teachers to evaluate and review criteria and help them

to develop the skills of peer review, self-reflection, and self-evaluation. A student teacher generated checklist would be a useful tool to evaluate teaching practice and collaborative program development. The Peer Evaluation Form was intended to provide student teachers with concepts and criteria that they could use to reflect on their personal experience and teaching practice (Nuthall & Alton-Lee, 1990), and was designed as a set of guidelines for teaching practice. The feedback from the Peer Evaluation Form was to be used primarily as a platform to encourage dialogue and discussions of the instructional strengths and weaknesses observed in the teaching practice: in particular, the feedback would help to initiate discussions of specific instructional areas that could or should be improved in the classroom. The student teachers were all at the initial stages of their practice, so the Peer Evaluation Form was designed collaboratively: the contributions and ideas of every student teacher were given the same importance, thus providing a democratic forum in which everyone's contribution was equally valid.

Cooperative grouping and small group instruction were found to be effective instructional strategies. They allowed for the development of the student teachers' self-directedness and encouraged a sense of responsibility, both of which are accepted educational goals. Irvin (1992) asserts that interaction among students in small groups, cooperative learning and active participation address the critical problems of teaching and improve the education of learners. This would include cognitive learning strategies, techniques and approaches to promote the development of student teachers' own learning through metacognition and cognitive monitoring activities (Irvin, 1992; Pintrich, 2002). Since the interaction between participants was student-led during the peer review stage, this necessitated the active participation of all of the student teachers. As a result, it led to engagement in focusing on authentic and complex problems that related to practice and other variables, including socio-cultural factors and student-centered concerns. The interaction also allowed for active participation with the aim of using dialogue to understand better the assumptions of the practice and process of teaching, question those assumptions, and encourage discussion and reflection on how to deal with the challenges that came to light.

The size of the groups and weekly meetings allowed for a positive and mutually supportive learning environment: the student teachers were encouraging of each other, showed personal regard for each other, and showed interest in each other's work. These attributes are generally accepted as being critical factors when developing a positive learning environment which allows students to become more successful learners. Small groups allow student teachers to be part of a homogeneous group in which everyone feels free to offer contributions and propose ideas for further reflection and improvement in the practice of teaching. By way of small group dialogue, assessment of rationales regarding the adequacy of values that dictate the form and content of the materials and instructional practices, improves the learning environment. Justificatory discussion in small groups regarding goals, curricula, syllabi and materials, procedures, students and context gives student teachers opportunities to develop their critical thinking skills.

Resistance to changing preconceived ideas regarding the nature of teaching was challenged throughout the course. Positive effects were that the student teachers learned to question, adapt, plan and apply what they learned through reflective activities; that their self-esteem increased; and that they developed a more flexible approach to teaching. This imbued the student teachers with the confidence to take risks and be more creative in their practice.

Furthermore, the student teachers fostered in each other a sense of caring and tolerance. One of the advantages of the Peer Evaluation Form was that the participants, during the stage of feedback after observed presentations, were allowed free exchange of information. Providing a supportive environment through the

practice of peer evaluation was of importance since it supported reflective practice on a critical and moral level about issues of learning and the teaching environment.

Limitations of the Peer Evaluation Form

Providing critical verbal feedback on peer demonstrations initially incurred problems, problems arising from the classroom management seating arrangements and the influence of the cultural protocols of *tatemae* and *honne*. Several student teachers reported that they felt unable to express their views candidly because of the semi-circular desk placement, where everyone could see and be seen by everyone else. Such an arrangement, intended to foster a community spirit within the classroom, actually caused anxiety and/or conflict when views were to be expressed verbally. This was especially evident at the beginning of the course when supportive bonds between the student teachers had yet to be established. After the first class, the student teachers were given an opportunity to rearrange both the seating plan and the layout of the classroom furniture themselves. As a group decision, they actually chose to follow the same seating plan. Consequently, they became more familiar with each other and their self-confidence improved. It also became evident that the concept of tatemae, a cultural protocol for maintaining group harmony *wa* and maintaining "good" feelings on the part of their colleagues, interfered with honest verbal discussion and evaluations. According to Alston & Takei (2005) "… *tatemae* are messages spoken to make other persons feel better, to maintain *wa,* and to avoid conflict caused by bad news, rejection, or conflict" (p. 19). The issue of distinguishing between polite social behaviour and "*honne,*" "the truth as one sees it" (Alston & Takei, 2005, p. 19), prevalent in Japan, and how to manage it during classroom activity, needed to be addressed. This was handled by asking the student teachers to consider how tatemae might distort or, indeed, provide a sense of shallowness to the context of a relationship and evaluation, and how it could ultimately cause problems due to a failure to provide appropriate feedback to their peers. The result of the discussion led to a deeper understanding of the influence of cultural backgrounds and its effects in the learning environment. By the end of the discussion, there was a consensus as to why the concept of tatemae was not conducive to providing constructive feedback and could impede critical reflective practice. This encouraged critical reflection and proved to be enlightening in developing knowledge creation and awareness.

Since the responsibility for verbal feedback was managed principally by the peer reviewers, they were encouraged to address any relevant issues which involved a high cognitive demand. However, a need for prudential and advisory intervention was required from time to time in order to facilitate the examination of problematic areas that came up during the dialogue. For this and the preceding reasons, a positive learning environment was supportive of the needs of the observed student teachers.

A further limitation of the Peer Evaluation Form is that the quantitative section of the form, may generate classification and measurement bias. That is to say, the Peer Evaluation Form represents criteria which are based on the limited experience of the student teachers and is therefore prone to personal subjectivity. Therefore, even if changes in student teacher's behaviour and practice are evidenced through peer assessment both in the quantitative and qualitative sections of the Peer Evaluation Form, there remains the risk that the data may not necessarily be regarded as evidence sufficiently solid for it to be used as a basis for modifying the student teachers' practice (Manterola & Otzen, 2017).

Conclusions

In this paper we have described the major goals and concepts that underpin Nihon University's Teaching Internship Program (TIP), we have described aspects of the organizational structure and plan of the program, and we have provided an overview of facets of the curriculum-in-use. We have highlighted the positive factors which support the use of reflection in practice, peer evaluation and self-evaluation on the individual level and the contextual level, based on an exploratory research design. In addition, we have identified some of the problematic areas that have become apparent as a result of our preliminary investigation regarding the development of metacognitive skills and an ideological framework.

The tools and strategies used on the pre-TIP course were not used in order to set up a list of rules or guidelines for student teachers to follow. The aim was for the student teachers to reflect on their practices, to exercise their minds and make considered judgements on what action to take as a result of their discussions with their peers. The Peer Evaluation Form was used to collect a range of criteria that the student teachers felt were of value in improving their practice. The criteria were the product of a student-centred collaborative exercise which conceptualised items perceived as effective for teaching and learning and by which performance and competence could be judged. Group support and cooperative grouping developed a sense of relatedness through communication, cooperation and problem solving. Though the student teachers had difficulty in logically conceptualizing criteria, they were able, none the less, to identify criteria that determined their needs and the quality of practice that would be of value to them in the future. In developing the Peer Evaluation Form, the student teachers were able to apply their cognitive skills through self-questioning based on their beliefs and values, and their metacognitive skills in evaluating and giving prudential advice. The implementation of peer evaluation was formative in providing constructive feedback within a cooperative framework of mutual development.

The second finding from the Peer Evaluation Form was that peers tended to rate criteria with high scores in both years, suggesting that all the stated criteria were perceived as having a high standard during the observed practice. In contrast, the analysis of language used in the 'Other Comments' section of the 2016 form showed more detailed evaluations in which the Prudential Discourse category represented by two subcategories, Advice/Opinion and Evaluation, returned the highest value at 84.3%. Advice/Opinion identified and proposed solutions to perceived problems, and Evaluation reflected the value or quality of factors related to an action. The results from both sections of the Peer Evaluation Form thus showed two complementary approaches to evaluation. The Likert scale necessitated the systematic scoring of values between 1-5, and high scores of success prevailed, whereas in the 'Other Comments' section of the form, the responses were significantly more critical and did not correlate with the high scores. The results from both sections of the Peer Evaluation Form strongly suggest that more consideration needs to be given to its design and value as a tool for the instructional-learning process.

The Peer Evaluation Form has provided a catalyst for further exploration through the use of the Self-Reflection tool, the aim of the self-reflection being to see if the student teachers' perceptions raised self-awareness of both their achievements and the areas of practice they themselves felt they needed to plan to improve. The use of free writing in this stage was used so that the student teachers would write about what they perceived retrospectively as being positive and negative points in their presentations, and to give them the skills required to formulate their own ideas and plans with the goal of improving their teaching practice. A relatively high frequency of comments presented as criteria in their Peer Evaluation Forms were seen also in their self-reflections. This represents a dependency of the student teachers on perceiving their criteria as

targets for achieving goals, and indicates a preference to follow a prescribed form. However, the free writing task provided a forum for processing ideas that went beyond the descriptive and factual acknowledgement of perceived strengths and weaknesses. The student teachers were able to reflect on how best to build on the strengths and shore up the weaknesses observed and discussed in their evaluations, and provided evidence of learning that engaged not solely in the factual, but in prudential, justificatory, and critical thinking. The student teachers demonstrated that they were developing their thinking skills by actively utilizing their knowledge and experience, and by exploring a variety of ways of improving their practice through dialogue and reflective practice.

Evidence obtained from the "Other comments" section of the Peer Evaluation Form, the Self-Reflection Sheets and the Self-Evaluation Sheets proves that these tools supported the preparation and planning of the TIP. The tools also allowed student teachers to review their procedural and practical knowledge through peer observation, self-evaluation and self-assessment. In addition, we have shown how, through collaboration and reflective practice, student teachers were able to conceptualize ideas, reason, and rationalize their actions, both pre and post practice. This enhanced their level of knowledge of their own values and beliefs during the training process.

Not all our efforts had the expected outcomes; indeed, some aspects of the training may have been neglected due to the contextual constraints of the TIP. We recognize that further correlational, longitudinal and experimental research is necessary. However, we have achieved the primary aims of fostering and improving the theory and practice of the program as we move along the path to improving the quality of the TIP training. It could also be argued that the criteria identified in building the Peer Evaluation Form were actually the first step in conceptualizing and executing the critical skills required to determine the quality and needs of student teachers and therefore underlines the case for undertaking more research. Preparing student teachers, whose knowledge is initially only partial or fragmented, by devising more advanced methods for teaching and developing the skills that are critical to reflection, are ways in which the Teaching Internship Program can educate and train more effective and competent student teachers in the future.

References

Alger, C. (2006). What went well, what didn't go so well: Growth of reflection in pre-service teachers. *Reflective Practice*, 7(3), 287-301. doi:10.1080/14623940600837327

Alston, J., & Takei, I. (2005). *Japanese business culture and practices: A guide to twenty-first century Japanese business*. New York: iUniverse. [Google Books version]. Retrieved from https://books.google.co.jp/books?id=6lJTqe_IwdsC

Avalos, B. (2006). The curriculum and professional development of teachers. *PRELAC Journal*, 3, 104-111. Retrieved from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0015/001516/151698e.pdf

Bartlett, L. (1990). Teacher development through reflective teaching. In J. C. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Second language teacher education* (pp. 202-214). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Brookfield, S. D. (1995). *Becoming a critically reflective teacher*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Brown, A. L. (1978). Knowing When, Where, and How to Remember: A Problem of Metacognition. In R. Glaser (Ed.), *Advances in Instructional Psychology*, (Vol. 1, pp. 7-10). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Calderhead, J. & Gates, P. (1993). *Conceptualizing reflection in teacher development*. London: Falmer Press.

Carr, W., & Kemmis, S. (1986). *Becoming critical: Education, knowledge and action research*. Lewes: Falmer Press.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research methods in education* (7th ed.). New York: Routledge.

del Vecchio, M., & Matsuura, M. (2016). Student Teacher Observation: Perspectives on Evaluation and Criteria. *Studies in International Relations,* 37(1), 53-72.

Desimone, L. M. (2011). A primer on effective professional development. *Phi Delta Kappan, 92*(6), 68-71. doi: 10.2307/25822820

Devers, K. J. (2011). *Qualitative methods in health services and management research: Pockets of excellence and progress, but still a long way to go*. Med. Care Res. Rev., *68*(1), 41-48. doi: 10.1177/1077558710384269

Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think: A restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the education process*. Boston, MA: Heath & Co.

Edge, J. (2001). *Action research*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Eraut, M. (1995). Schön schock: A case for reframing reflection-in-action. *Teachers and teaching: Theory and practice, 1*(1), 9-22. doi: 10.1080/1354060950010102

General Teaching Council. (2013). *Guidelines for initial teacher education programmes in Scotland*. Retrieved from http://www.gtcs.org.uk/web/FILES/about-gtcs/guidelines-for-ite-programmes-in-scotland-0413.pdf

Greene, M. (1988). The dialectic of freedom. In Cochran-Smith, M, Feiman-Nemser, S., McIntyre, J. & Demers, K. (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 214-225). Oxon, England: Routledge.

Gore, J. M., & Zeichner, K. M. (1991). Action research and reflective teaching in preservice teacher education: A case study from the United States. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 7*(2), 119-136. doi: 10.1016/0742-05X(91)90022-H

Habermas, J. (1974). *Theory and Practice*. London: Heinemann.

Hannay, L., Wideman, R., & Seller, W. (2007). *Professional learning to reshape teaching*. Toronto: Elementary Teachers' Federation of Ontario, (ETFO).

Hargreaves, J. (2004). So how do you feel about that? Assessing reflective practice. *Nurse Education Today, 24*(3), 196-201. doi: 10.1016/j.nedt.2003.11.008

Hatton, N., & Smith, D. (1995). Reflection in teacher education: Towards a definition and implementation. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 11*(1), 33-49. doi:10.1016/0742-051X(94)00012-U

Irvin, J. L. (1992). Developmentally appropriate instruction: The heart of the middle school. In J. L. Irvin (Ed.), *Transforming middle level education*: *Perspectives and possibilities* (pp. 295-313). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Loughran, J. (1996). *Developing reflective practice*: *Learning about teaching and learning through modelling*. London: Falmer Press.

Manterola, C., & Otzen, T. (2017). Checklist for reporting results using observational descriptive studies as research designs. The MInCir initiative. *International Journal of Morphology,* 35(1), 72-76. doi: 10.4067/S0717-95022017000100013

McCabe, M., Walsh, S., Wideman, R., Winter, E. (2009). The 'R' word in teacher education: Understanding the teaching and learning of critical reflective practice [PDF file]. *International Electronic Journal for Leadership in Learning, 13*(7). Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ940630

Moon, J. (1999). *A handbook of reflective and experiential learning*. London: Routledge.

Moon, J. (2006). *A handbook of reflective and experiential learning,* (2nd Ed.). London: Routledge.

Nuthall, G., & Alton-Lee, A. (1990). Research on teaching and learning: thirty years of change. *Elementary*

School Journal, 90, 546-570. Retrieved from www.journals.uchicago.edu

Park, C. (2003). Engaging students in the learning process: The learning journal. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education, 27*(2), 183-199. Retrieved from www.lancaster.ac.uk/staff/gyaccp/cjgh_27_2_05lores.pdf

Pintrich, P. (2002). The role of metacognitive knowledge in learning, teaching, and assessing. *Theory Into Practice, 41*(4), 219-225. doi: 10.1207/s15430421tip4104_3

Pope, C. & Mays, N. (1995). Reaching the parts other methods cannot reach: an introduction to qualitative methods in health and health services research. *British Medical Journal, 311*(6996), 42-45. doi: 10.1136/bmj.311.6996.42

Richards, J.C., & Farrell, T. (2005). *Professional development for language teachers.* New York: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from http://assets.cambridge.org/97805218/49111/sample/9780521849111ws.pdf

Richards, J.C., & Lockhart, C. (1996). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Russell, T. (2005). Can reflective practice be taught? *Reflective Practice, 6*(2), 199-204. doi:10.1080/14623940500105833

Schön, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner. How professionals think in action.* New York: Basic Books.

Schön, D. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner: Toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Sparks-Langer, G. M. (1992). In the eye of the beholder: Cognitive, critical, and narrative approaches to teacher reflection. In L. Valli (Ed.). *Reflective teacher education: Cases and critiques* (pp. 147-160). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Svinicki, M. (1999). New directions in learning and motivation. *New directions for teaching and learning, 80,* 5-27.

Thomas, A. (1985). Principia mathetica V. In M. Savaria (Co-ordinator). *Report of the fourth annual conference of the Canadian Association for the Study of Adult Education* (pp. 243-250).

Tough, A. (1982). *Intentional changes: A fresh approach to helping people change.* Chicago: Follett Publishing.

Zeichner, K. M., & Liston, D. P. (1985). Varieties of discourse in supervisory conferences. *Teaching and Teaching Education. 1*(2), 155-174. doi.10.1016/0742-051X(85)90013-7

Zeichner, K. M., & Liston, D. P. (1987). Teaching student teachers to reflect. *Harvard Educational Review, 56*(1), 23-48. Retrieved from http://www.colorado.edu/education/sites/default/files/attachedfiles/Zeichner%26Liston_Teaching_Student_Teachers_to_Reflect.pdf

Zeichner, K. M., & Liston, D. (1996). *Reflective teaching: An introduction.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Appendix

<Peer Evaluation Scores for TIP 2015-2016 Prior Training>

Q.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Student Teacher A										
B	4	4	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5
C	5	5	4	5	5	5	4	4	5	5
D	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	4
E	4	3	4	4	5	5	4	5	4	5
F	5	5	3	4	5	5	4	5	5	5
G	4	4	4	3	3	4	3	3	4	4
H	5	4	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5
Student Teacher B										
A	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5
C	5	5	4	5	4	4	4	4	5	5
D	5	5	5	5	3	4	5	3	4	5
E	4	3	3	4	4	5	5	3	4	5
F	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	4	3	NA
G	3	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	4
H	4	5	5	5	3	4	3	4	4	5
Student Teacher C										
A	4	5	5	4	4	4	4	5	5	4
B	4	5	5	4	4	4	5	5	5	4
D	5	5	5	3	3	5	5	5	5	5
E	3	5	4	3	3	4	2	5	4	4
F	5	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4
G	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	4
H	5	5	5	4	3	4	4	3	4	5
Student Teacher D										
A	4	5	5	5	4	4	4	3	3	4
B	3	3	4	4	4	3	5	3	3	3
C	NA	5	5	4	5	4	5	4	4	4
E	3	5	4	3	3	2	3	2	3	3
F	3	4	5	4	3	5	5	2	3	3
G	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
H	3	4	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3

Q.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Student Teacher E										
A	4	4	4	5	5	4	4	5	4	5
B	4	5	4	3	5	5	5	3	4	5
C	5	4	4	5	5	3	3	3	4	5
D	5	5	5	5	3	2	5	2	2	5
F	4	5	5	4	5	3	3	4	5	5
G	4	3	4	3	3	3	2	3	3	3
H	5	4	4	5	4	4	5	3	4	5
Student Teacher F										
A	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
B	4	4	5	4	5	4	5	5	4	4
C	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
D	5	5	5	5	4	3	5	5	5	4
E	4	4	5	5	5	4	3	5	4	4
G	4	4	4	3	4	3	3	3	3	4
H	4	5	5	5	5	3	5	5	5	5
Student Teacher G										
A	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
B	4	5	5	4	5	5	5	4	5	4
C	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	4	5	5
D	5	5	5	4	3	5	3	5	4	4
E	4	4	4	5	4	5	4	5	4	4
F	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5
H	5	5	3	5	4	5	5	5	5	5
Student Teacher H										
A	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
B	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	4	5	4
C	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5
D	5	5	5	5	4	3	5	5	5	5
E	5	4	5	3	5	4	5	5	4	4
F	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5
G	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	3
Total	239	249	252	235	230	229	237	228	236	242

Total number and percentages of each rate

5	4	3	2	1	NA	Total
271	169	110	8	0	2	560
48.4	30.2	19.6	1.4	0.0	0.4	100.0

<Peer Evaluation Scores for TIP 2016-2017 Prior Training>

Q.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Student Teacher A										
B	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	4	5	5
C	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
D	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
E	5	5	4	5	5	4	5	4	4	4
F	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	3	5
G	3	3	4	5	5	4	3	3	3	5
H	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	4
I	5	5	4	5	5	4	4	5	5	5
J	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
K	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	NA	4

Q.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Student Teacher G										
A	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	4	4	4
B	4	5	4	4	5	4	5	5	5	5
C	5	4	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	3
D	3	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	3
E	4	5	4	3	4	3	4	4	5	3
F	5	5	5	4	4	4	3	5	5	4
H	3	4	4	3	3	3	4	3	3	3
I	3	4	4	5	3	5	4	5	5	5
J	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	4	5	4
K	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	4

Student Teacher B

Q.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
A	5	5	5	5	4	5	4	4	5	3
C	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
D	4	5	4	5	4	4	4	5	5	5
E	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5
F	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	4	5	5
G	3	3	3	5	3	4	4	4	5	5
H	4	4	5	4	5	4	5	4	5	4
I	5	4	5	5	5	3	5	3	5	5
J	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5
K	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5

Student Teacher C

A	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	4
B	5	5	5	4	4	3	4	4	2	5
D	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
E	4	4	4	5	3	4	4	4	4	4
F	5	3	5	5	4	4	4	5	3	5
G	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	1	4
H	4	4	5	4	5	4	3	3	4	4
I	5	5	4	5	3	5	5	4	5	4
J	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5
K	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	5	5	5

Student Teacher D

A	3	5	4	4	5	4	4	4	4	4
B	5	2	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
C	5	4	3	5	5	5	4	4	5	4
E	4	5	4	4	5	4	5	5	4	5
F	5	5	4	5	5	5	4	4	5	4
G	4	4	3	4	3	4	3	3	3	5
H	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	4	4
I	4	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	4	5
J	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
K	4	5	5	5	4	5	5	4	NA	5

Student Teacher E

A	4	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	5	4
B	5	5	5	3	5	5	5	5	5	5
C	4	5	4	5	5	5	4	5	5	5
D	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	3
F	5	5	5	3	5	4	4	4	3	4
G	3	3	3	2	2	3	4	3	3	4
H	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	4
I	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	3	4
J	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
K	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	NA	5

Student Teacher F

A	4	5	4	4	5	5	5	4	5	4
B	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5
C	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
D	4	4	5	4	5	5	5	3	4	NA
E	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5
G	4	4	3	4	3	4	3	3	3	5
H	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	4	4
I	4	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	4	5
J	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
K	4	5	5	5	4	5	5	4	NA	5

Student Teacher H

Q.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
A	5	5	4	3	4	4	4	4	5	3
B	5	5	4	3	3	5	4	5	5	5
C	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	4
D	4	4	5	5	3	3	4	3	4	4
E	4	4	5	5	3	4	4	3	4	NA
F	5	5	5	5	4	4	3	3	3	4
G	4	5	4	5	3	3	3	2	NA	5
I	4	3	4	5	4	5	4	5	5	5
J	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	5
K	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	NA	4

Student Teacher I

A	5	5	4	4	4	3	4	4	NA	NA
B	5	4	5	3	4	5	5	5	5	5
C	5	4	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5
D	5	5	4	5	4	5	5	5	5	4
E	4	4	4	5	5	3	4	4	4	3
F	5	5	5	4	5	5	4	4	5	5
G	4	3	4	5	3	4	5	5	4	5
H	3	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4
J	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
K	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5

Student Teacher J

A	3	4	3	5	3	3	4	4	5	4
B	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3
C	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
D	4	4	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	4
E	4	4	4	5	4	4	4	4	5	5
F	5	NA	5	5	4	4	4	5	5	5
G	3	5	3	5	5	4	3	4	5	3
H	4	3	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	3
I	5	4	4	5	4	5	3	4	4	NA
K	5	4	5	5	5	3	4	4	5	5

Student Teacher K

A	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4
B	5	5	5	4	4	4	5	4	5	5
C	5	4	3	5	5	4	4	4	5	3
D	3	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	3
E	4	5	4	3	4	3	4	4	5	3
F	5	5	4	4	3	5	4	5	4	4
G	4	3	3	5	3	3	3	3	3	4
H	3	2	4	3	4	3	3	4	3	4
I	3	4	4	5	5	5	5	4	4	5
J	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4
Total	480	479	480	489	460	473	476	468	449	463

Total number and percentages of each rate

5	4	3	2	1	NA	Total
522	417	142	6	1	12	1100
47.5	37.9	12.9	0.5	0.1	1.1	100.0