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Abstract

The achievements of teacher preparation models have been studied through the use of input-output models. While teacher education programmes are considered to be the input, student achievements are the output. Consequently, certain models have been found to be more effective and evaluated more than others. It is noted that of all the components that constitute teacher education programme, the student teaching has received less attention. This study evaluates the student teaching sub-components of the University of Lagos, Faculty of Education and the University of Columbia Teachers College, with a view to attempting an enrichment of the former with some of the best pedagogical provisions from the latter. With the use of an adopted instrument tagged Comprehensive School Reforms Classroom Observation System (CSRCOS) and other trainee records, the evaluation identifies strengths and weaknesses as well as best practices for enrichment purposes. Results reveal that there were disparities in Lagos teacher trainees’ scores by their Departments and over a period of three academic sessions. These disparities can be defined and explained by the mode and type of field experience that the student teachers were exposed to. The study underscores some of the Columbia pedagogical practices for systematic replication by the Lagos Model.
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INTRODUCTION

Literature has been reviewed along the following concepts: effective teaching, organized teaching, evolution of student teaching, and models of teaching. It is noteworthy that good teaching is a common denominator to all these teaching related concepts. Good teaching is a product of effective student teaching which is a core object higher education. Student teaching is central to teacher preparation (Koksal & Genc, 2019). It is intended to prepare the student teacher for an effective engagement with learners in the classroom situation that forms a part of their professional experience during teaching practice. The student teaching sub-component is so crucial to teacher education that the success of the entire programme is often determined by the quality of student teaching (Orland-Barak & Yinon, 2007; Paker, 2011; Mutlu, 2014; Koksal & Genc, 2019), especially in view of the fact that “success depends less on materials, techniques, and linguistic analyses, and more on what goes on inside and between the people in the classroom” (Stevick, 1980 in Koksal & Genc, 2019: 896).

The value of student teaching is so enormous that no one can become a teacher without experiencing it at the actual teaching and learning setting (Kramer, 1973; Agudo, 2016; Beck & Kosnik, 2002; Kiggundu & Nayimuli, 2009). It is the stage at which a student teacher is given the opportunity to practice the art of teaching before entering the real world of pedagogical practices as a certified professional. That probably explains why student teachers see it as “the crux of their preparation for the teaching profession” in view of its place as the interface between their training as student teachers and their practice as professional teachers (Kiggundu & Nayimuli, 2009: 345). This probably accounts for the dominant thinking in the profession that teaching practice normally occasions excitement and apprehension as well as anxiety and anticipation in the student teachers as new entrants into the teaching profession (Buchner & Hay, 1999; Hallway, 2001; Hascher, Cocard & Moser, 2004; Perry, 2004; Castle, Fox & Souldier, 2006; Cuskun, 2013).

According to Genevieve (2017), student teaching is the most essential ingredient of teacher education. In fact, being core to the professional experience of a teacher, it is often based on a country’s National Policy on Education. The significance of student teaching is evident in its core status in the professional requirements for the graduation of a prospective teacher (Genevieve, 2017:101). The incorporation of student teaching as a core component of teacher training was intended to “help the preservice teachers to use their theoretical knowledge in schools and classroom settings and to help them experience the real classroom atmosphere” (pp. 895-896).

According to Nguyen and Baldauf (2010) what matters is not the name by which the exercise is called but the experience to which the student teacher is exposed during the period. Student teachers must be enabled to practically demonstrate the pedagogical principles, methodological theories, and instructional techniques that they have learned in the course of their training whose ultimate objective is the facilitation of effective teaching. However, this paper shall later engage critically with each of these concepts. Effective teaching, which is central to all the concepts, has been identified as playing a significant role in preparing prospective teachers for professional teaching (Good, 2008). Rosenshine (1985) has summarized the research on most effective teaching into specific pedagogical skills. Others have found that effective teacher preparation normally leads to effective teaching practices (Berliner, 1988; Fisher & Berliner, 1985 Rosenzain & Yarden (1986)). Research also indicates that teachers’ creativity and resourcefulness normally affect the quality of student teaching (Glaser, 1984; Kiggundu, 2007; Wenglinsky, 2004).

Despite the fact that the aim of research in teacher education is to improve the quality of teacher preparation programmes, only a few studies have actually focused on specific components or variables connected to training procedure or preparation methods (Rosnani, 1996). However, a handful of studies have addressed such training procedures only with a view to determining their efficacy in influencing the immediate behaviour of student teachers. Lanier and Little (1986: 535) discovered that research on teacher education has concentrated more on teachers’ cognitive development and factors that influence their decisions. There have been other instances of excessive emphasis on the use
of technology, almost to the detriment of the social and philosophical requirements in educational foundations (Finkelstein, 1982; Warren, 1982; Rosnani, 1996). Other researchers have maintained that the component that is most important to teacher professional development is the teaching practicum (Conant, 1963; Zeichner, 1990; Maphosa, Shumba & Shumba, 2007; and Rosnani, 1996).

Teaching practice is expected to bring the student teacher face-to-face with what Kramer (1974) characterizes as “reality shock” which is a stage in teacher preparation during which the student teacher is made to understand that his expected approach to teaching may not always be consistent with the approach employed by his or her teacher educator in preparing him/her for teaching. What this offers the student teacher is appreciation of the professional line of demarcation between school-based knowledge and workplace practical operations. This line of analysis is consistent with the anticipated instances of mixed feelings, confusion and pressure that often characterize the behavior of some prospective teachers during their first visit to schools where they are posted for teaching practice (Ngidi & Sibaya, 2003; Perry, 2004; Quick & Sieborger, 2005; Koksal & Genc, 2019: 897).

Teaching practicum is a generic term that comprises a wide variety of components such as clinical experience, student-teaching-in-school experience, teaching rounds, field experience and micro teaching (Iqbal, 1996). Accordingly, “the practicum refers to that body of professional experiences during which the student applies, tests and reconstructs the theory which he is evolving and during which he further develops his own competence as a teacher” (p.117). The need for effective delivery by the teacher requires sufficient amount of practical training to enable him function well. This infact is the part of teacher preparation that is of most value. For teacher preparation that is of most value.

Teaching practice is aimed at the acquisition of practical pedagogical skills that are capable of aiding or facilitating a meaningful realization of pedagogical objectives makes it central to teacher education. This component depends more on the teacher’s creativity and resourcefulness than on any other factor or consideration.

Student teaching is traceable to the effort of Jean Baptiste de la Salle, generally known as the father of student teaching, who, according to Johnson (1968), founded the first formal school at Rheims in France. Given that the period before Jean Baptiste witnessed little interest in specialized teacher preparation (Guyton and McIntyre, 1990). Student teaching can not be said to have been developed by any teacher or education beyond the medieval apprenticeship training model which, itself, has been criticized for lack of sound theoretical basis and lack of uniform or standard structure (Guyton and McIntyre, 1990).

Yes it was that apprenticeship model that, with the passage of time and especially sequel to the emergence of the normal schools in the mid-1800s, metamorphosed into student teaching though consisted of initiation and repeated practice of a particular method taught by the normal-school professor and demonstrated in the classroom by the model teacher” (p. 55). That was the approach to student teaching as at 1848 when formal education of teachers started in the United States in high schools (Larabee, 1992). Infact, it was those high schools that played pioneering role in preparing teachers for the elementary schools of the day which later became known as normal schools when they assumed more responsibility for teacher preparation.

This approach to student teaching dominated the professional education component of teacher education until the introduction of foundation courses at the beginning of the nineteenth century (Tozer et al, 1990). This explains why Andrews (1964) posits that the student teaching sub-component is like a structure constructed without a foundation. The implication of this analogy is that the component “developed prior to knowledge that would have provided a more sound theoretical base and that might have preempted the development of a sys-
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tem narrow in both its conception and practice.” (Guyton and McIntyre, 1990: 55).

Then followed a transition period which started in 1860 and continued till 1950 during which teacher education witnessed the metamorphosis of the normal schools into the university by either joining the existing faculties of education or becoming full-fledged faculties within the universities themselves, in North America and later in Europe (McIntyre and Mclntyre, 1974). During this period, student teaching took the form of a vocational and practically oriented course required for prospective elementary teacher while secondary teachers were produced by liberal arts colleges with no professional teacher education. It was during this period, especially “from 1920 to 1940 that most states began requiring student teaching and professional courses as prerequisites to certification.” (Guyton and McIntyre, 1990: 55).

With the emergence of the American Association of Teacher Colleges (AATC) in 1917 which was later known as American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), a minimum of 90 clock hours of student teaching was required of students of member institution. This same period witnessed the emergence of the Association Student Teaching (AST) which was later known as Association of Teacher Educators. The same period also witnessed the promotion of student teaching through the introduction of laboratory schools which provided a sit for student teaching and also served as centres for the study of teaching. The essence of this arrangement was to enable student teachers to practice teaching after their coursework which itself requires them to observe and work in laboratory schools.

Consequently, there were innovations in student teaching and school experiences. One of them, according to (McIntyre, 1983), is that student teachers are required to spend as many as 300 contact hours in classrooms prior to student teaching. Another development is the cooperation between the teacher education college and the school where student teachers undergo their teaching. The cooperation lies in the fact that a student may go over hundreds of miles from the university while a faculty member from the university supervises the student teaching and communicates his assessment thereof, to the university.

Yet another development concerns the importance later attached to preparing student teacher supervisors at both the university and the public school levels (Killian & McIntyre, 1986b). Again, another notable development concerns the attention now being given to research in student teaching and school experiences which makes it imperative on researchers to beam their searchlight on various issues relating to student teaching and examining the implication of various actions and practices of student teachers in the course of their teaching. There is no gainsaying that it is through a critical evaluation of the student teaching sub-components in the context of specific institutions that the strengths and weaknesses of the sub-component can be determined, for enrichment or reforms purposes. Hence the attempt in this study to benchmark the Lagos model of student teaching with the Columbia model.

The components of teacher education programme at the University of Lagos are typical of the components of programmes of most schools of education, with general education, specialized education, professional education and teaching practicum. However, there has not been any comprehensive evaluation of the student teaching sub-component of the programme which has attracted only casual comments and evaluative statements that are not significant enough for development into a theoretical framework. The component in question, is arguably the most neglected in research scholarship. In evaluating the model, this paper benchmarked it with the University of Columbia Teachers College model. This paper is specifically aimed at articulating the importance of pre-service student teaching to teacher education, examining variants of and best practices in student teaching, evaluating the Lagos model of student teaching, exposing how the Lagos model of student teaching compare between Departments and across three academic sessions, and offering the Lagos model of student teaching enrichment propositions on replicable best practices in the Columbia model. Pursuant to these objectives the study is guided by five corresponding research questions namely: What is the importance of pre-service student teaching to teacher education?; What are dominant variants of student teaching?; What is the nature of the Lagos model of student teaching?; How does the Lagos model of student teaching compare between Departments and across three sessions?; and, How can best practices in the Columbia model of student teaching translate into an enrichment framework for the Lagos model?
METHOD

This consists of the research design, population sample, adoption of instruments and data processing. The design adopted for this research is a comparative study of existing phenomenon - that is the practice of teaching is carried out in the sampled locations. Marshall and Rossmann (2006) adduced that it is not uncommon in qualitative studies to combine several data collection and analysis methods over the course of the study. The population for the study comprised all student teachers of the University of Lagos, as well as their cooperating teachers and Faculty-based supervisors for the period from the 2008/2009 academic session to the 2010/2011 academic session. From this population, a total of 541 trainees form the study sample Employing the analytic method, the study conducts a critical analysis of the various features of the student teaching sub-components of the two models which are also subjected to a comparative evaluation (Kosterek, 2016).

The study thereafter employs curriculum criticism and creative synthesis in enriching the Lagos model with appropriate ingredients from the Columbia model (Kliebard, 1992). Creative synthesis plays a methodological role in making a synthetic whole through enrichment (Murphy, 2009: 105). The Comprehensive School Reform Classroom Observation System (CSRCOS) developed by Good et al (2008) and adopted by this study involved 10-minute observation intervals during the first 5 minutes of which coders observe classroom activities and write down their observations. The next 3 minutes are devoted to reflection and refinement of the classroom activities whereas the last 2 minutes is devoted to observers' scoring of their observation interval. This study also adopt Good et al (2008)'s system of assigning observers randomly to classrooms, on the ratio of one observer for each classroom observation.

A. The Columbia Model of Student Teaching

Student teaching is a major component of the professional education of trainees in the Columbia model of teacher education. Infact, all aspects of the entire teacher preparation programme are designed to facilitate the acquisition of pedagogical knowledge and development of pedagogical skills in the teacher trainee. That explains why coursework related directly to student teaching accounts for as much as 25% of the total points for degree requirements for graduation. The much importance attached to student teaching is also reflected in the fact that all student teachers are required to be in school as for two full semesters, sequel to their mandatory registration for a stipulated number of full regiment of courses associated with student teaching experiences. The mandatory course and the codes and number of points are as follows:

1. A & HW 4729 Fall observation in one’s major specialization (0pts)
2. A & HW 4530 Fall seminar for student teaching (2pts)
3. A & HW 4730 Fall student teaching placement (3pts)
4. A & HW 4730 Spring semester for student teaching (3pts)
5. A & HW 4730 Spring student Teaching Placement (3pts)

It is worthy of mention that most of the student teachers undertake highly demanding placement at schools that require their attendance for full school day and the entire duration of an academic session. Others, who are not on such placements, do a significant amount of classroom observation during the spring semester. In such cases, student teachers are normally required to teach a minimum of two classes a day in their teaching placement. Student teachers’ involvement in all these pedagogical practices characteristically enable them to log hundreds of hours in classrooms it various locations in New York City and its environs.

It is remarkable that Teachers College, Columbia has a good formula for tracking the number of observations and teaching hour through the instrumentality of both the student teaching Grid of Hours and the Student Teaching Record of Hours. The latter is meant to gather information from the student teacher, his current semester, course code, his school of placement, cooperating teacher, Teachers College field supervisor, student teaching placement coordinator or seminar instructor, while the former normally contains specific details of the student teacher’s performance. It contains details of the student’s actual teaching hours, and indicates when he has interacted with students in any capacity, of which examples include instruction of students in a full-time classroom teaching situation, tutoring of a small groups or individuals, laboratory and studio work with students, or supervision of
homeroom and study halls. It is the desire of the designers of the student teaching package under discussion that the insights gathered in the field will assist student teachers in developing a personal teaching style based on self-reflection and feedback from cooperating teachers, supervisors, and students (p. 5).

**B. The Lagos Model of Student Teaching**

The Faculty of Education University of Lagos started off as a College of Education in 1967' having provided for the teaching of both professional education discipline and content teaching subjects and having “inherited the National Certificate in Education (NCE) programme” from the Teachers' College. The Faculty mounted programmes for the NCE, Bachelor's degree and postgraduate degrees in Education” (Faculty Prospective, 2009-2010).

The year 1975 witnessed the dissolution of the College and the emergence in its place of the Faculty of Education and an Institute of Education. The vision and mission of the Faculty are the preparation of “highly motivated, conscientious, efficient, and effective classroom teachers from all level of Nigerian’s educational system” (p.2).

Student teaching, as noted above, is a mandatory exercise in the Lagos model of teacher education. It currently runs for a period of 6 to12 weeks during which student teachers are expected to participate in teaching under close monitoring by a teacher in a cooperating school. However, there are no clearly stipulated eligibility requirements for student teaching other than being in the final year of one's training. That explains why it does not really matter whether the student teacher has passed appropriate courses in teaching theory (FED 202), or not, despite the fact that these courses and others in the professional component of teacher education are ultimately aimed at preparing student teachers for the practicum.

Yet, the Lagos model attaches importance to student teaching supervision as lecturers are posted to various schools for the purpose of assessing students’ performance during the period. Yet there are no eligibility requirements for teaching practice supervision. In some cases, student teaching is assessed, supervised, or managed by lecturers with little or no pedagogical knowledge and skills and this has serious implications for the quality of teachers produced by this model. Afterall, the professional outcome of having such a professional education component as student teaching handled by both trained and untrained teacher trainers at the university of Lagos, can be accurately predicted.

**RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

An evaluation of teaching practice results for the sessions of 2012-2014 were done with reference to the six departments of the faculty of education in Lagos.

**A. 2008/2009 Session**

There is no significant differences in the performances of trainees across the six departments in 2008/2009 sessions.

From Table 1 the F-statistic (2.908) is significant (p-value = 0.013), indicating that we reject the null hypothesis. Thus, there is significant evidence that the mean scores of the students' in these six Departments for the 2008/2009 session are not equal.

**Table 1 Differences in Scores across Departments in 2008/2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>531.891</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>106.378</td>
<td>2.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>19568.279</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>36.576</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20100.170</td>
<td>540</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significance is at alpha level of 0.05.

Having established that differences exist between the mean scores of students across these Departments, Table 2 examines the extent of difference between the mean scores of Education Admin and the other Departments in a pair-wise format. From the significance values, it is observed that there is significant evidence (at a p-value of 0.046, though not very strong evidence) to infer that the mean score of Education Admin students is better than that of Adult Education students by 5.61. There is no other significant evidence to conclude that differences exist between the mean scores of Education Admin students and each of the remaining Departments.

As shown in Table 3, there is confirmation that there is significant evidence (at a p-value of 0.046) to infer that the mean score of Adult Education students is lesser than that of Education
Admin students by 5.61. Also, there is significant evidence (at a p-value = 0.019) to agree that the mean score of Adult Education Students is lesser than that of Science and Tech students by 5.78. In the same vein, there is significant evidence (at a p-value = 0.04) to conclude that the mean score of Adult Education Students is lesser than that of Arts and Social Sciences students by 5.07. There is no other significant evidence to conclude that differences exist between the mean scores of Adult Education students and each of the remaining Departments.

Generally, for 2008/2009 session, there is significant evidence (at a p-value = 0.019) to agree that the mean score of Adult Education Students is lesser than that of Science and Tech students by 5.78. In the same vein, there is significant evidence (at a p-value = 0.04) to conclude that the mean score of Adult Education Students is lesser than that of Arts and Social Sciences students by 5.07. There is no other significant evidence to conclude that differences exist between the mean scores of Adult Education students and each of the remaining Departments.

Therefore, from Table 3, it can now be said that there is significant evidence to infer that the students from Science and Tech had best performance with mean score of (58.09 ± 5.008), followed by Education Admin students (57.92 ± 6.184), HKHE students (57.41 ± 5.705), students of Arts and Social Sciences (57.38 ± 5.903), Guidance and Counselling (56.10 ± 6.594), then, Adult Education Students had least performance (52.31 ± 10.103).

Pictorially, Figure 1 shows the mean plot of the mean of the scores for the various selected Departments for 2008/2009 session.

### B. 2009/2010 Session

As shown in Table 4, the F-statistic (2.978) is significant (p-value = 0.011), showing that we
Table 5 presents that the F-statistic (2.959) is significant (p-value = 0.012), indicating that we reject the null hypothesis. Therefore, there is significant evidence that the mean scores of the students’ in these six Departments for the 2010/2011 session are not equal.

Table 5 Anova for 2010/2011 Scores across Departments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degree of freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>425.819</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>85.164</td>
<td>2.959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>18852.790</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>28.783</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19278.608</td>
<td>660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significance is at alpha level of 0.05.

Table 7 shows the extent of the differences between the mean score of Education Admin and the other Departments in a pair-wise approach. There is significant evidence (at a p-value of 0.038) to conclude that the mean score of Education Admin students is lesser than that of Science & Tech students by 2.38. Then, there is no significant evidence to infer that differences exist between the mean scores of Education Admin students and each of the remaining Departments.

There is no significant evidence to infer that differences exist between the mean scores of Adult Education students and each of the rest of the Departments (See Table 9.). In all, for 2010/2011 session, there is significant evidence (F = 2.959, at p-value = 0.012) to conclude that there are differences between the mean scores of the students in the six selected Departments. For the pair-wise performance across these Departments, as revealed from the Tukey’s post-hoc test, the mean score of Science & Tech students is bigger than that of Education Admin students by 2.38. Then, there was no other significant revelation for the out-performance of any other Department pair-wise.

Therefore, from Table 8, it can now be said that there is significant evidence to infer that the students from Science and Tech had best performance with mean score of (60.43 ± 6.188), followed by Guidance and Counselling (60.35 ± 6.692), Adult Education (59.45 ± 4.295), HKHE students (58.78 ± 6.374), Education Admin students (58.65 ± 6.553), then, students of Arts and Social Sciences had least performance (58.51 ± 6.396). Graphically, Figure 2 shows the mean plot of the mean of the scores for the various selected Departments for 2009/2010 session.
Table 6 General Description of the Mean Scores for Departments in 2009/2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Mean</th>
<th>Minimum Scores</th>
<th>Maximum Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education Admin</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>58.6475</td>
<td>6.55287</td>
<td>0.55581</td>
<td>57.5485 - 59.7465</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>59.4545</td>
<td>4.29357</td>
<td>0.9578</td>
<td>57.5501 - 61.359</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HKHE</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>58.7838</td>
<td>6.37442</td>
<td>0.52397</td>
<td>57.7483 - 59.833</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and tech</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>60.4286</td>
<td>6.18807</td>
<td>0.53657</td>
<td>59.3672 - 61.49</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>58.5074</td>
<td>6.39636</td>
<td>0.3474</td>
<td>57.824 - 59.1907</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance and Counselling</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>60.3481</td>
<td>6.69185</td>
<td>0.5794</td>
<td>59.209 - 61.487</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>59.1463</td>
<td>6.42556</td>
<td>0.2231</td>
<td>58.7296 - 59.563</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 Tukey’s Multiple Comparisons for Education Admin and other Departments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tukey HSD</th>
<th>Education Admin</th>
<th>Adult education</th>
<th>HKHE</th>
<th>Science and Tech</th>
<th>Arts and Social Sciences</th>
<th>Guidance and Counselling</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult ed</td>
<td>-2.66031</td>
<td>1.0695</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>-5.8242</td>
<td>0.5036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HKHE</td>
<td>-1.75076</td>
<td>1.3248</td>
<td>0.766</td>
<td>-5.5021</td>
<td>2.0005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Tech</td>
<td>-2.37576*</td>
<td>0.80298</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>-4.6708</td>
<td>-0.0807</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>-1.34944</td>
<td>0.80596</td>
<td>0.549</td>
<td>-3.653</td>
<td>0.9541</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance and Counselling</td>
<td>-0.56435</td>
<td>0.94976</td>
<td>0.991</td>
<td>-3.2789</td>
<td>2.2502</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significance is at alpha level of 0.05.

Table 8 General Description of the Mean Scores for Departments in 2010/2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Mean</th>
<th>Minimum Scores</th>
<th>Maximum Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>57.2909</td>
<td>6.84666</td>
<td>.92320</td>
<td>55.4400 - 59.1418</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>68.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>59.9512</td>
<td>4.37579</td>
<td>.68338</td>
<td>58.5700 - 61.3324</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>67.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>59.0417</td>
<td>4.26797</td>
<td>.87205</td>
<td>57.2395 - 60.8439</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>66.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>59.6667</td>
<td>4.78905</td>
<td>.31108</td>
<td>59.0538 - 60.2795</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>69.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>58.6404</td>
<td>5.56044</td>
<td>.36825</td>
<td>57.9347 - 59.3600</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>57.8553</td>
<td>6.00601</td>
<td>.68894</td>
<td>56.4828 - 59.2277</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>67.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>58.9017</td>
<td>5.40463</td>
<td>58.4889 - 59.3164</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HKHE students (59.04 ± 4.268), Arts and Social Sciences (58.64 ± 5.560), Guidance and Counselling (57.86 ± 6.006), with Education Admin students having least performance (57.29 ± 6.847). Graphically, figure 3 shows the mean plot of the mean of the scores for the various selected Departments for 2010/2011 session.

D. Comparing All the Sessions

Table 9 portrays that the F-statistic (12.095) is highly significant (p-value = 0.000), indicating that we reject the null hypothesis. Therefore, there is significant evidence that the mean scores of the students in these selected sessions are not equal.
Table 10 shows the extent of the differences between the mean scores of students across the three selected sessions in a pair-wise approach. There is a very high significant evidence (at a p-value of 0.000) to conclude that the mean score of students in the 2008/2009 session is lesser than that of 2009/2010 by 1.54 and also lesser than that of 2010/2011 session by 1.35.

Table 9 Anova for the Scores across Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>871.947</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>435.974</td>
<td>12.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>76238.491</td>
<td>2115</td>
<td>36.047</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77110.439</td>
<td>2117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the 2009/2010 pair-wise comparisons, there is confirmation that students mean score in 2009/2010 session is better than that of 2008/2009 session by 1.54 (at p-value =0.000). However, there is no significant evidence (at p-value = 0.799) to infer that the means scores of students for 2009/2010 and 2010/2011 sessions are any different.

Similarly, for the 2010/2011 pair-wise comparisons, there is confirmation that students mean score in 2010/2011session is better than that of 2008/2009 session by 1.35 (at p-value =0.000).

Therefore, for 2008/2009, 2009/2010 and 2010/2011 sessions, there is overwhelming significant evidence (F = 12.095, at p-value = 0.000) to conclude that there are differences between the mean scores of the students in these three selected sessions. Judging by the pair-wise comparisons of performances across these sessions, as revealed from the Tukey’s post-hoc test, the mean score of 2009/2010 session is bigger than that of 2008/2009 by 1.54 while that of 2010/2011 is bigger than the same 2008/2009 by 1.35. Then, there was no other significant revelation for the out-performance of either of 2009/2010 and 2010/2011 sessions pair-wise.

Hence, from Table 11, it is now obvious that there is significant evidence to infer that 2009/2010 session witnessed the best performance with mean score of (59.10 ± 6.458), followed by 2010/2011 session (58.90 ± 5.405), with 2008/2009 session having least performance (57.56 ± 5.899). Figure 4 shows the mean plot of the mean of the scores for the three selected sessions (2008/2009, 2009/2010 and 2010/2011).

E. Enriching the Lagos Model of Student Teaching with the Columbia Model

It has been noted earlier that the Lagos model of student teaching has as three of its cardinal objectives promotion of “high standards of teaching through mandatory participation in practical teaching by all student teachers”. It is also noted that the exercise runs for a period of 6 to 12 weeks during which student teachers work with cooperating teachers and get assessed by their lecturers who are posted to such schools for supervision which is conducted once or twice. It is interesting to note that there is no other eligibility requirement for student posting for the exercise other than being in a final year as students who have not passed courses in the
principles of teaching and preparation for teaching practice are all posted to schools. A model with some of such characteristics as enumerated above, undoubtedly deserves an enrichment or ameliorative attention based on best practices from a stronger or more recognized model.

It is not a bad idea to have all aspects of the entire teacher preparation programme in Lagos designed and channeled towards the facilitation of the acquisition of pedagogical knowledge and development of pedagogical skills in the teacher trainee, as is the case in the Columbia model coursework related directly to student teaching accounts for as much as 25% of the total points for degree requirements for graduation. This recommendation is consistent with the line of argument pursued by Haigh and Ell (2014), Kiggundu and Nayimuli (2009), Genevieve (2017), and Koksal and Genc (2019) with regard to the fact that preparation for student teaching is the essence of teacher education.

Another area of possible enrichment for the Lagos model is that the Columbia model requires all student teachers to be in school as for two full semesters, "sequel to their mandatory registration for a stipulated number of full regiment of courses associated with student teaching experiences." It is remarkable that a total of 14 points is devoted to preparation for student teaching in the Columbia model while the Lagos model devotes just six units to such an important subcomponent. The six units cover principles of teaching, preparation for teaching practice and teaching in one's specialized area on a ratio of two units per course. The fact that these courses are not prerequisites to student teaching in the Lagos model whereas a minimum of fourteen points is associated with student teaching in the Columbia model, explains the strengths of the two models.

Also of immense value is that the Columbia model requires the attendance of student te-

Table 10 Tukey's Multiple Comparisons for Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008/2009</td>
<td>2009/2010</td>
<td>-1.54078*</td>
<td>0.32555</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-2.3043 - 0.7773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/2011</td>
<td>2009/2010</td>
<td>-1.34529*</td>
<td>0.34808</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-2.2417 - 0.5289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/2009</td>
<td>2010/2011</td>
<td>1.54078*</td>
<td>0.32555</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.7773 - 2.3043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/2009</td>
<td>2009/2010</td>
<td>0.3955</td>
<td>0.30641</td>
<td>0.799</td>
<td>-0.5231 - 0.9411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/2009</td>
<td>2010/2011</td>
<td>1.34529*</td>
<td>0.34808</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.5289 - 2.1617</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significance is at alpha level of 0.05.

Table 11 General Description of the Mean Scores for Departments in 2010/2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008/2009</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>57.5564</td>
<td>5.89939</td>
<td>0.25363</td>
<td>57.0581 - 58.0546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/2010</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>59.0972</td>
<td>6.45847</td>
<td>0.21339</td>
<td>58.6784 - 59.5160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/2011</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>58.9017</td>
<td>5.40463</td>
<td>0.21022</td>
<td>58.4889 - 59.3144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2118</td>
<td>58.6426</td>
<td>6.03526</td>
<td>0.13114</td>
<td>58.3854 - 58.8998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On. The importance of pedagogical practices in Lagos context may be determined for integration. Replicability but the most replicable of them for the room and study halls. All these may not be fully work with students, or supervision of home classroom teaching situation, or tutoring of a small students whether in the form of a full-time class teaching hours, timelines of his interaction with information concerning the student’s actual teaching support, the latter is of observations and teaching hour through the field experience is that the student teachers’ involvement in all these pedagogical practices characteristically enable them to log hundreds of hours in classrooms it various locations in New York City and its environs. This indeed is one of the remarkable strengths of the Columbia model that is worth replication and contextualization in the Lagos model. This recommendation is in consonance with the practice of embracing standards required for qualified teacher status, as enunciated by Mutlu (2014), Agudo (2016), Geneveive (2017) and Koksal and Genc (2019).

Another replicable strength of the Columbia model is its strategy for tracking the number of observations and teaching hour through the instrumentality of both the student teaching Grid of Hours and the Student Teaching Record of Hours. While the former contains details of the student teacher’s performance, the latter is used to gather information on the student teacher and his activities with regard to his current semester, course code, his school of placement, cooperating teacher, Teachers College field supervisor, student teaching placement coordinator or seminar instructor. Replicating this Columbia strategy for the Lagos model has the potential to facilitate efficiency in obtaining information concerning the student’s actual teaching hours, timelines of his interaction with students whether in the form of a full-time classroom teaching situation, or tutoring of a small groups or individuals, laboratory and studio work with students, or supervision of home room and study halls. All these may not be fully replicable but the most replicable of them for the Lagos context may be determined for integration. The importance of pedagogical practices involved in this regard is underscored by Hallaway (2001), Marais and Meier (2004), Shumba and Shumba (2007), Kiggundu and Nayimuli (2009), and Gursoy et al (2013) who emphasise the need for close monitoring and mentorship of the student teachers during field experience.

It may also be a kind of improvement for the Lagos model to pay more attention to formulation of a template for gathering accurate information on the student’s teaching support and observation hours like conferencing with or observing the cooperating teacher, participating in curriculum planning committee meetings, attending staff meetings, sitting in on parent-teacher conference and others, all of which are part of the strengths of the Columbia model. This has the potential to strengthen the student teaching sub-component through accurate capturing of the total number of times student teachers were observed by the Teachers College supervisor. The implication of this is that the student teacher is normally supervised several times in the Columbia model, as against once, twice or, in rare cases, thrice that the present writer was accustomed to supervising his student teachers in the Lagos model. The importance of repeated assessment of student teachers is well captured in the contemporary scholarship of teaching (Gebhard, 2009); Hasher, et al. (2004; Koc, 2012; and Koksal & Genc, 2019). The most unpardonable weakness of the Lagos model at the time under review was lack of regard for professionalism as both professional teacher educators and lecturers in the content areas with no formal training in education were allowed to supervise student teachers. This disregard for professionalism attained its peak when a non-education specialist was appointed Teaching Practice Coordinator for the Faculty of Education during the period from 2010-2014. It is derivable from the foregoing that what constitutes a weakness in the Lagos model, is a replicable strength in the Columbia model.

**CONCLUSION**

This paper has attempted to assess the student teaching model of the University of Lagos for the purpose of enriching it with some of the pedagogical provisions of the Columbia model which is generally recognized as offering one of the best practices in student teaching. The paper analysed variants of teaching practice and enumerated their implications. It assessed the performance of students on practical teaching across three consecutive academic sessions as
well as across the six Departments that constitute the Faculty of Education. It identified some of the strengths and deficiencies that deserve attention in any attempt to effectively strengthen the Lagos model. Results reveal that there were disparities in trainees’ scores by their Departments and over a period of three academic sessions. These disparities can be explained by the mode and type of field experience that student teachers were exposed to.
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