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Traditional student teaching guided my experiences at Bloomsburg University as a teacher candidate and with Kutztown University as a mentor. As a teacher candidate, I remember assuming more solo teaching responsibilities as the semester progressed to demonstrate my competencies as a future teacher. In my role as a mentor, I followed the university’s suggested timeline to foster my teacher candidate’s development. More recently, I became a mentor teacher with the Penn State-State College Professional Development School (PDS) program where I was introduced to a different approach to student teaching. The PDS framework empowers mentors to work more freely and collaboratively with their teacher candidates according to our K-6 students’ needs, as well as our own interests. Teacher candidates and I were both involved in decision making, planning, teaching, and assessing our students. Coteaching became the center of what we were doing in our classroom.

Coteaching has emerged in the literature as a promising instructional practice for K-12 students and as a method for learning to teach (Bacharach, Heck, & Dahlberg, 2010; Roth & Tobin, 2001). Most coteaching literature focuses on coteachers’ roles, their relationships, and program descriptions rather than the impact on student learning and other key outcomes (Friend, Cook, Hurley-Chamberlain, & Shamberger, 2010). This literature review highlights current findings and future directions of coteaching in teacher education on K-12 student learning, teacher candidates’ preparation, and as a form of professional development for mentors and supervisors.
**Introduction**

Traditional student teaching is generally described as a “take-over” approach in the classroom (Bacharach, Heck, & Dahlberg, 2010; Badiali & Titus, 2010). The mentor is primarily responsible for all classroom activities initially with the teacher candidate gradually assuming more responsibilities over time. In addition, one teacher is usually actively teaching while the other teacher is a passive observer or engaged in other activities.

Darragh, Picanço, Tully, and Henning (2011) highlight three main issues with the traditional model of student teaching. First, with the accountability movement (No Child Left Behind [NCLB] and value-added models of teacher evaluation and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 [IDEIA]), mentor teachers are becoming less willing to host teacher candidates and relinquish their classrooms. Field experience directors are experiencing more resistance from school districts and mentors, especially during state-mandated testing time. Second, the traditional student teaching model emphasizes the “sink or swim” mentality and does not necessarily prepare teacher candidates to become collaborative practitioners. The third issue with the traditional model of student teaching places the emphasis of lead teacher onto the teacher candidate. In general, mentor teachers have a greater impact on K-12 student learning because of their relationships with their students and understanding of local contexts.

To address the issues of placement, accountability, and degree of preparation, some teacher education programs began implementing the principles of coteaching into their field experiences. Bacharach et al. (2010) define coteaching in teacher education as “two teachers (mentor and teacher candidate) working together with groups of students, sharing planning, organization, delivery of instruction and assessment, as well as the physical space” (p. 4). Roth and Tobin (2001) describe coteaching as a “viable context for teacher education that better addresses the gap between explaining (theorizing) and understanding (living) teaching” (p. 742). I combine these two definitions into a coteaching framework for teacher education that encompasses three components: K-12 student learning, teacher candidates’ preparation, and embedded professional development for mentors and supervisors. This new approach to student teaching shifts the focus from a “sink or swim” model to a more collaborative model based on shared responsibility and shared learning.
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**Figure 1: Coteaching Framework in Teacher Education**

Coteaching in teacher education programs is a way to improve the quality of instruction in K-12 classrooms, better prepare teacher candidates, and enhance professional development.
opportunities for mentors and supervisors. Traditionally mentors have seen their roles as sharing practical knowledge with teacher candidates and as a way to give back to the profession (Sinclair, Dowson, & Thistletron-Martin, 2006). Coteaching shifts this mindset of a “dispenser of knowledge” to that of reciprocal learning; the mentor becomes a colearner.

**Theoretical Background**

To understand the potential of coteaching as an approach for teacher preparation and professional development, it is helpful to see how people perceive the relationship between knowledge and practice. Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1999) describe three types of knowledge construction: knowledge-for-practice, knowledge-in-practice, and knowledge-of-practice. Knowledge-for-practice is the belief that knowledge is generated in formal settings typically conducted by outside “experts.” This belief dominates most university teacher preparation programs by valuing coursework to prepare teacher candidates for the classroom. Knowledge-in-practice, on the other hand, is the belief that knowledge comes from teaching experience in the local context. Many practitioners may feel it is beneficial for teacher candidates to experiment with different strategies and observe “best practices” in order to learn how to teach. In teacher education, it is these two conceptions that are often in competition with each other and widen the theory-practice gap. If coteaching is to impact all stakeholders in teacher education, then both university programs and mentors need to shift their current paradigm to knowledge-of-practice. Knowledge-of-practice is not a combination of the previous two types of knowledge construction; rather “knowledge making is understood as a pedagogic act-constructed in the context of use, intimately, connected to the knower, and, although relevant to immediate situations, also involves the process of theorizing” (p. 273). This conception of knowledge goes beyond applying what teachers learn in their immediate situation and challenges their existing frameworks about theory and practice and how it relates to the larger educational community.

When coteaching is seen as a structure for knowledge-of-practice, it has the potential to foster deeper learning for K-12 students, teacher candidates, mentors, and supervisors. The coteaching structure creates opportunities for teachers to co-construct knowledge in the classroom. Roth, Masciotta, and Boyd (1999) discuss the use of spielraum and cogenerative dialogues to promote shared learning opportunities for critical reflection. During the hurriedness of the school day, time and space rarely exists to reflect in action (Schön, 1983). Coteaching creates “spielraum” (room to maneuver) where coteachers can pause to reflect on the actions in the classroom while not disturbing the flow of student instruction. Cogenerative dialogues are components of coteaching that allow both coteachers to have reflective conversations about their teaching and how it relates to their students’ learning. Cogenerative dialogues can either occur as brief interludes within the action of teaching or more formal discussions after a lesson. In either case, they are seen as one of the most critical components of coteaching in teacher education (Beers, 2009) and should be seen as a key element for knowledge-of-practice.

Knowledge-of-practice in a coteaching model of student teaching does not occur in isolation. The collaborative nature of learning and development situate coteaching with sociocultural concepts that Murphy and Carlisle (2008) discuss as a relational ontology and transformative activist stance. They connect relational ontology with coteaching by saying that through shared expertise there are “expanded opportunities to learn from the interactions between coteachers, between coteachers and their students, coteachers and the classroom, and between coteachers, their students, and the classroom” (p. 495). The transformative activist stance as it relates to coteaching is
that “coteachers act together in the classroom in new ways to transform the learning opportunities for themselves and the students by creating new cultural tools” (p. 495). The difference between the two conceptions is that relational ontology assumes that by participating in the act of coteaching, you are creating opportunities to learn; however, through the transformative activist stance, it is the contributions of each coteacher that changes (transforms) the structures for learning. To connect these theories to types of knowledge construction, it is the movement from stakeholders (university faculty, mentors, teacher candidates, and K-12 students) as participants in teacher preparation programs to shared contributors of knowledge construction.

Method

Most coteaching literature discusses coteaching programs or conditions for effective coteaching practices. In addition coteaching in teacher education is a relatively new concept so coteaching studies in K-12 settings between mentors and teacher candidates is limited. I searched Educational Resources Informational Clearinghouse (ERIC) for peer-reviewed coteaching studies using the descriptors “coteaching and student teaching,” “coteaching and teacher education,” and “coteaching and teacher preparation.” Using the coteaching framework for teacher education, I will highlight current findings from seven coteaching studies from the last five years (summarized in Table 1) where coteaching has impacted K-12 student learning, teacher candidate preparation, and professional development. In addition, I will provide suggestions for future directions for coteaching in teacher education programs.

Findings

Impact on K-12 Students

The most compelling evidence of student learning resulted from the four-year longitudinal study conducted by St. Cloud University that tracked student achievement in reading and math in cotaught and non-cotaught classrooms. Bacharach et al. (2010) compared students’ reading and math achievement scores in cotaught student teaching, non-cotaught student teaching, and classrooms with one experienced teacher utilizing the Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment (MCA) and the Woodcock-Johnson III (WJIII-RE) during a four-year study. Table 2 shows MCA results indicated a statistically significant increase in academic performance in reading and math in the cotaught classrooms. In addition, Table 3 displays the WJIII-RE results that indicated a statistically significant increase in academic performance in reading over all four years and a statistically significant increase in math in two of the four years in cotaught classrooms.

To supplement the quantitative data from this study, Bacharach et al. (2010) conducted focus groups of more than 400 K-6 students over their four-year longitudinal study. When students were asked about their perceptions of coteaching, an overwhelmingly response was that they received help when they needed it (p. 12). Additional benefits that students mentioned included less wait time for teacher help, more material covered, exposure to two teaching styles, fewer classroom disruptions, improved student behavior, faster turnaround time for assignments and grades, more connections to school, and the variety of activities was greater.

Other studies looked more indirectly at K-12 student impact by soliciting feedback from coteachers. Teacher candidates at Whitworth University in Spokane, Washington, participated in a coteaching model of student teaching.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Authors</th>
<th>Research Design</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Sample Description</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bacharach, Heck, Dahlberg (2010)</td>
<td>Quantitative (two independent measures of academic performance) Qualitative (focus groups)</td>
<td>826 coteaching pairs in K-6 classrooms in St. Cloud School District (over 4 years); 400+ K-6 students (over 4 years) participated in focus groups</td>
<td>K-12 student achievement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darragh, Picanco, Tully, Henning (2011)</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>All three of Whitworth University’s teacher education programs (traditional undergraduate, thirteen-month accelerated Master in Teaching, and an alternative teacher certification program for working adults); 156 candidates responded to the survey</td>
<td>Teacher candidate impact, K-12 student impact (perceived benefits)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodnough, Osmond, Dibbon, Glassman, Stevens (2009)</td>
<td>Qualitative study using semi-structured interviews, electronic journals, observations, field notes, planning meetings</td>
<td>Four primary/elementary triads participated in this study over a four-month period.</td>
<td>Teacher candidate impact, mentor impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamens (2007)</td>
<td>Case study</td>
<td>Two teams of teacher candidates with mentors</td>
<td>Teacher candidate impact, mentor impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McHatton, Daniel (2008)</td>
<td>Quantitative (pre- and post-survey) Qualitative (open-ended questions, weekly reflections)</td>
<td>12 middle school mentors, 16 general education teacher candidates, 8 special education teacher candidates</td>
<td>Teacher candidate impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scantlebury, Gallo-Fox, Wassell (2008)</td>
<td>Ethnographic study using interviews, video data, interns’ weekly lesson plans, journal entries, and researcher field notes</td>
<td>Three cohorts of secondary science preservice teachers from the fall semester of their senior year through student teaching and into their first year as classroom teachers</td>
<td>Teacher candidate impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siry, Lara (2012)</td>
<td>Narrative grounded in phenomenology/case study</td>
<td>One teacher candidate – elementary setting</td>
<td>Teacher candidate impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.

St. Cloud Coteaching Study: MCA (Percentage Proficiency)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cotaught Student Teaching</th>
<th>Non-cotaught Student Teaching</th>
<th>One Experience Classroom Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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**Table 3.**

**St. Cloud Coteaching Study: WJII-RE Findings (Achievement Gains)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th><strong>Classroom Instruction</strong></th>
<th><strong>2004-2005</strong></th>
<th><strong>2005-2006</strong></th>
<th><strong>2006-2007</strong></th>
<th><strong>2007-2008</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Coteaching</td>
<td>15.74</td>
<td>23.44</td>
<td>14.83</td>
<td>19.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-coteaching</td>
<td>9.89</td>
<td>18.67</td>
<td>11.79</td>
<td>14.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Coteaching</td>
<td>17.20</td>
<td>20.57</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>17.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-coteaching</td>
<td>13.90</td>
<td>17.91</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>16.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


in K-12 settings. At the conclusion of their student teaching experience, they were surveyed to gather their perceptions on the benefits of using coteaching as a professional practice to increase student learning. Of 156 respondents, 96% of teacher candidates indicated that coteaching was a valuable practice that had positive learning implications for students (Darragh et al., 2011). Some of the teacher candidates’ reasoning included “there is power in numbers – more teachers to fewer kids add quality to instruction” and “coteaching is a valuable professional practice to benefit student learning because of opportunities for differentiation” (Darragh et al., 2011, p. 94). In a separate study, Goodnough, Osmond, Dibbons, Glassman, and Stevens (2009) indicated that teacher candidates and mentors felt that the coteaching experience allowed them to have a better exchange of ideas and to develop more complex lessons.

_The students are benefitting from more innovative and creative lessons. You’re getting everyone’s input on something. If I think of an idea for a language arts lesson, then my mentor might add something to make it better and then my partner, once again, adds something ... so it’s three times better than if you were planning something just on your own” (Laura, Final Interview) (Goodnough et al., 2009, p. 291)._  

**Future directions for K-12 student impact.** Bacharach, Heck, and Dahlberg (2010) show promise that coteaching can have a positive outcome on K-12 student learning, but it is the only large scale study that has been
conducted on student achievement. Murawski and Swanson (2001) highlight the lack of student achievement data in research on coteaching. Certainly, policymakers and researchers in the positivist paradigm would welcome causal-comparison studies between coteaching and student achievement, especially in this accountability era. As a coteaching mentor and qualitative researcher, I understand the complexities of classroom activities and the numerous variables that can affect student learning. I believe a more in-depth and authentic approach for looking at student learning would be through case studies that pay attention to the local contexts and aspects of coteaching.

**Impact on Teacher Candidates’ Preparation**

One of the interesting things I discovered about the studies was that most coteaching partnerships involved two teacher candidates rather than the typical mentor-teacher candidate arrangement. In some of these instances it was difficult to ascertain the role of the mentor as either an additional coteaching partner or as a “guide on the side.” While the impact a mentor had on teacher candidates’ preparation is uncertain, the two greatest benefits teacher candidates reported from their coteaching experiences were the level of support by collaborating with a partner and being able to look at teaching from different perspectives.

Many teacher candidates who cotaught with a peer indicated that there was an increased level of emotional support in the classroom. “The biggest success in this (coteaching) model … more than anything else, was having someone there with me on my level, someone to discuss various issues and concerns with” (Tina, journal entry) (Goodnough et al., 2009, p. 291). Sometimes these conversations took the form of cogenerative dialogues. “These constructs (coteaching/cogenerative dialogues) enabled teacher candidates the opportunity to accrue social capital by establishing social networks with their coteachers and fellow teacher candidates” (Scantlebury, Gallo-Fox, & Wassell, 2008, p. 977).

The other primary benefit of coteaching teacher candidates mentioned was the ability to see different perspectives about teaching. Through special coteaching arrangements teacher candidates’ initial thoughts of how to teach changed during the course of their coteaching experience. Two studies (Kamens, 2007; McHatton & Daniel, 2008) investigated the perceptions when either special education majors or dual certification majors cotaught with a general education major. McHatton and Daniel (2008) studied teacher candidates’ perceptions when two secondary English education majors paired with a special education major. McHatton and Daniel (2008) studied teacher candidates’ perceptions when two secondary English education majors paired with a special education major to coteach in their field experience. Both sets of majors gained an awareness of the roles of general education teachers and special education teachers. English education majors appeared to be more aware of how to accommodate the needs of all students while special education majors gained an increased awareness of assisting general education teachers with lesson adaptations. The English professor/researcher in this study indicated “this was the first time in 16 semesters that students’ reflections had contained any comments relative to accommodation of students with disabilities” (McHatton & Daniel, 2008, p. 128). Similarly, Kamens (2007) noted that the “special education partners became a source of information for their general education peer” (p. 160).

Another way in which teacher candidates were able to consider different perspectives about their teaching was when the coteaching structure caused disturbances in their traditional conceptions of teaching. Engeström (2000) describes disturbances as “deviations from standard scripts” (p. 965). He goes on to explain that these disturbances may eventually cause potential change within a system. For these teacher candidates coteaching was different from their conception of teaching that resulted in renegotiating some of their actions.
in the classroom. One teacher candidate commented, “There are many ways of teaching, and there is no correct way of doing something as long as you obtain the same result – learning. Before taking the class, I was too focused on the goal and not on the process” (Siry & Lara, 2011, p. 27). Kamens (2007) mentioned teacher candidates’ reflections on negotiating personalitites in the classroom and the structures of coteaching interactions in the classroom. “The teacher candidates had to face ‘the challenges of learning when to jump in when someone else is teaching, not stepping on each other’s toes.’ These observations suggested that the teacher candidates constructed knowledge about the possible structures of coteaching through experience” (Kamens, 2007, p. 162). In addition, through their coteaching experience, teacher candidates reflected on their own personalities as they interacted with their peers in the classroom. As teacher candidates saw similarities and differences between themselves and their coteaching partners, they gained insight about themselves. “For example, Harry reflected on what he has learned about himself when he wrote that, ‘I am very, very outspoken, but at the same time I can be flexible with certain people’” (Kamens, 2007, p. 162).

Future directions for teacher candidates’ preparation. Most studies focused on the role the teacher candidate played in the coteaching relationship and the teacher candidates’ perceptions of the coteaching experience. These studies align more with the relational ontological perspective investigating their participation with coteaching. To gain a deeper understanding of the impact on teacher candidates, researchers should frame studies with a transformative activist stance that investigates how teacher candidates’ development is transformed through their shared contributions in coteaching with another teacher.

The role of mentors appeared minimal in these studies. It is not clear why mentors were not as integral in the coteaching conversation. A couple of possible reasons could include that they did not have the background knowledge to fully implement coteaching. Another reason could be that mentors wanted to foster problem solving and interdependence among the multiple teacher candidates in the classroom. When teacher candidates did mention their mentors, they noted the importance of having mentors model teaching strategies for them and how that made it easier for them to transition to full-time student teaching (Darragh et al., 2011). There are times when mentor modeling is appropriate; however, an overreliance on modeling suggests that learning to teach becomes a process of transferring skills from one teacher to another rather than co-constructing learning through knowledge-of-practice. Coteaching is situated with activity theories within the sociocultural paradigm because it is the actions of teaching and reflecting between two teachers that supports transformative practices.

Impact on Professional Development for Mentors and Supervisors

Two studies (Goodnough et al., 2009; Scantlebury et al., 2008) made references to how mentors benefitted from the coteaching experience with their teacher candidates. Neither study explained these benefits in detail; however, mentors mentioned that they gained more recent science knowledge and technology skills from their teacher candidates (Scantlebury et al., 2008). Goodnough et al. (2009) asserted the importance of collaboration increased everyone’s learning in the coteaching relationship. “We helped each other through the partnership and toward the end, they seemed to be able to offer me advice as well. It was ongoing, advising each other and motivating each other. We did learn a lot from each other. (Sue, Final interview)” (Goodnough et al., 2009, p. 292).

on student teaching has continued to examine the experience from the perspective of one, or maybe two, of the triad members, rather than from the interactions among the players situated in a particular context” (p. 306). This literature analysis concurs with the previous statement. All but one of the studies focused on either teacher candidate or mentor perceptions of coteaching in teacher education programs and none of the studies addressed supervisor perceptions or supervisor learning.

The potential for coteaching involving supervisors exists in teacher education. Roth (1999, 2001) wrote extensively about a supervisor coteaching with a teacher candidate with the larger purpose for both of them to co-learn. One of the benefits of supervisors coteaching with teacher candidates is that they can gain a better understanding of the students and local context. “There is often a gap even between the theory- or research-informed comments made by outside observers and possible actions in this classroom at this time” (Roth & Tobin, 2001, p. 743). Investigating the role the supervisor plays in the coteaching relationship could lead to additional insights in supervision. In addition by investigating how supervisors can learn from coteaching with teacher candidates and/or mentors would greatly contribute to the coteaching literature in teacher education programs.

Mentors tend to view coteaching as a way to benefit K-12 students and teacher candidates. They generally do not see it as an approach for embedded professional development. Two studies briefly referenced how mentors benefitted themselves from coteaching with a teacher candidate. As Scantlebury et al. (2008) mentioned in their article, there are three important legs to the coteaching stool: coresponsibility, corespect, and cogenerative dialogues (p. 971). Teacher candidates’ perspectives are documented in these areas; however, it is not clear how mentors can benefit from coteaching with teacher candidates. Further study is required to see how coteaching in teacher preparation programs can be a professional development experience for mentors.

Summary

This article examined how coteaching in teacher preparation programs can impact K-12 student learning, teacher candidates’ preparation, and professional development for mentors and supervisors. Table 4 provides a summary of the findings.

Coteaching shows promise for restructur-ing the mindset in teacher education; however, additional studies need to be conducted to understand the full impact on students, teacher candidates, mentors, and supervisors. Coteaching in teacher education programs needs to further address K-12 student achievement. Most information regarding K-12 student benefits is reported from the perceptions of teacher candidates and mentors. More K-12 student case studies and quantitative studies should be conducted to measure student learning. Through my analysis of recent coteaching studies
Table 4.
Impact on Learning through Coteaching in Teacher Education Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Current Benefits of Coteaching</th>
<th>Needs/Future Potential of Coteaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| K-12 students                         | • Increased student achievement in math and reading  
• Received more individualized help  
• Class work was returned more quickly  
• Less discipline problems  
• Observed two different teaching styles | • Case study research on K-12 student achievement                                      |
| Teacher Preparation: Teacher candidates | • Provided emotional support and greater confidence to teach  
• Collaboration and greater exchange of ideas and feedback  
• Broadened perspectives on how to teach  
• Viewed roles various teachers play in the school system  
• Learned more about themselves through self-reflection  
• Learned to navigate relationships and resolve conflicts | • Greater collaboration between teacher candidates and mentors  
• Investigations on the transformative nature of learning |
| Professional Development: Mentors and Supervisors | • New insights about science content knowledge (mentors)  
• Increased their technology skills (mentors) | • Mentors: shift focus from “host” to “colearner”  
• Supervisors: shift focus from “outside evaluator” to “coteaching triad member” |

Conducted in teacher education programs there is evidence that coteaching has positive effects in the classroom for teacher candidates. Coteaching is an approach in teacher education programs to improve the potential of field experiences for all stakeholders.

**Conclusion**

For coteaching to become an integral part of teacher education, it is going to take a shift in mindset of university teacher preparation programs and in mentors’ roles with working with teacher candidates. Greater collaboration between university faculty and mentors will help everyone understand the importance of shared responsibility and shared learning through coteaching. As a mentor, it was with sincere intentions that I hosted teacher candidates in my classroom as a way to give back to the profession. I wanted to have a positive impact on future teachers and future classrooms. I felt it was my responsibility to show teacher candidates the realities of classroom life. It wasn’t until I was introduced to a different approach to teacher preparation (coteaching) that I began to see the potential of the impact for students and ourselves in this situation at this time. Coteaching transformed my role as a mentor to see coplanning, coteaching, and co-assessing as gifts to the K-12 students that we teach and opportunities to conduct professional development within their own classrooms.
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**NOTE:**

1 It needs to be noted that the typical coteaching arrangement in teacher education programs consists of a mentor and a teacher candidate; however, other coteaching arrangements in teacher education programs can include two general education teacher candidates (Siry & Lara, 2012), general education teacher candidates and special education teacher candidates (Kamens, 2007; McHatton & Daniel, 2008), multiple teacher candidates and a mentor (Scantlebury, Gallo-Fox, & Wassell, 2008), and a teacher candidate and university supervisor (Roth & Tobin, 2001).
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