The Implementation of the Coaching Approach to Professional Experience (CAPE) Model in Indonesian initial Teacher education: The Participants' Perspectives

Urip Sulistiyo
Universitas Jambi

Muhammad Rusdi
Universitas Jambi

Jennifer Clifton
The Queensland University of Technology

Heather Fehring
RMIT University

Kathy Jordan
RMIT University

The Implementation of The Coaching Approach to Professional Experience (CAPE) Model in Indonesian Initial Teacher Education: The Participants' Perspectives

Urip Sulistiyo
Muhammad Rusdi
Universitas Jambi, Indonesia
Jennifer Clifton
Queensland University of Technology
Heather Fehring
Kathy Jordan
RMIT University

Abstract: Professional experience is considered essential to enable pre-service teachers (PSTs) to implement what they have learned during their initial teacher education (ITE) program to school environments. There are multiple models of professional experience that address the issue of integrating theory and practice. This article reports on findings of the implementation of the Coaching Approach to Professional Experience (CAPE) model in an ITE program in Jambi University, Indonesia. Using qualitative focus groups, this research focuses on the perceptions of PSTs, a school principal, mentor teachers, teacher educators (lecturer) and a coach regarding the implementation of the CAPE model. The research findings indicate that the role of the coach helped PSTs as they were able to individualise and focus on developing teaching skills. However, several weaknesses were also identified. In adapting the model to Jambi University's context, the structure of the CAPE model was too general. The coach working with PSTs was not entirely free from her/his teaching duties, thus limiting the PST-coach interactions. This article discusses these findings and concludes by offering recommendations for future adaptions of the CAPE model in Indonesia and beyond.

Keywords: School-university partnerships, professional experience, pre-service teachers, Coaching Approach to Professional Experience (CAPE) model

Introduction

Professional experience (also known as practicum or placement) is recognised as an essential part of initial teacher education programs (Le Cornu, 2016; Ure, Gough & Newton, 2009) as it prepares pre-service teachers (PSTs) for the demands of the classroom and a variety of teaching and learning situations. The teaching practicum has the potential to bridge the dissonance between theory and practice sometimes experienced by pre-service teachers (Chiwimbiso, Adendorff & Misto, 2017) and provide them with opportunities to acquire and

demonstrate teacher competencies in areas such as classroom management, assessment practices and subject knowledge within an authentic classroom context (Goff-Kfouri, 2013).

In Indonesia, based on the 2005, Government Regulation No. 19 on National Education Standard, there are four basic teacher competencies that PSTs are required to demonstrate during their professional education: pedagogical, personal, social and professional competence (Hakim, 2015). In the Indonesian context, PSTs learn about and demonstrate these competencies through theoretical university courses and teaching practicums. Pre-service teaching training program (PTTP) refers to the courses in an initial teacher education program that includes a practicum component in Indonesia. It is commonly held for one semester, consisting of 30 days for microteaching practice in the university. The intent of this program is for pre-service teachers to develop skills and knowledge that prepare them for the experience including, lesson planning, teaching practice in a small group, conducting assessment and evaluation. Microteaching is a preparation phase before pre-service teachers go to schools for a practicum and 120 days placement in schools. Defined rules determine professional experience by each of the institutions offering the PTTP and informed by the teaching competencies. However, there is also scope to redesign PTTP to better support PSTs during their placement that better addresses the theory and practice divide. Calls for a more significant connection between the two components also feature heavily in government's reviews and reports in Australia and Indonesia.

According to the Australian Government Teacher Education Ministerial Advisory Group (TEMAG) report, theory and practice "must be inseparable and mutually reinforced in all program components" (Australian Government Department of Education and Training, December 2014, p. x). TEMAG advocates for initial teacher education providers and schools to form mutually beneficial partnerships. While there is a general acknowledgement by policymakers, academics, researchers and practitioners alike that universities and schools should be more connected, achieving this connection is complex. In part, because this connection would require a redesign of structures, learning and teaching material and pedagogical approaches to ensure the interplay between theory and practice. Therefore, alternate research-informed models of professional experience need to be developed, implemented and evaluated. This research reports on such an initiative within an Indonesian context.

RMIT University Australia and Jambi University Indonesia ITE staff collaborated to implement a CAPE model in an Indonesian primary school in the Jambi province in Sumatra. This collaboration aimed to foster partnerships between schools and universities and support PSTs to meet teacher competencies to research different approaches to professional experience. The RMIT University's version of the CAPE model was developed in association with the Department of Education, Victoria, as part of the Teaching Academies of Professional Practice initiative (DET Victoria, 2019) and involved 12 primary schools and approximately 200 PSTs. Within Jambi University's, this involved a pilot of 10 pre-service teachers and one primary school. This paper draws upon qualitative research from two focus group discussions (FGD). One FGD involved the 10 PSTs who volunteered to participate in this pilot project in FGD Phase 1. Second, a FGD in Phase 2 involved one school principal, one mentor teacher, two teacher educators, and one coach who participated in FGD Phase 2. This paper analyses the pre-service teachers' perceptions of CAPE's implementation in the pre-service teaching training program (PTTP) at Jambi University.

Literature Review

Professional experience is seen as an essential element of initial teacher education to develop pre-service teacher competencies (Loo, Maidon, & Kitjaroonchai, 2019). Like the Australian context, typically within Indonesian practicums, an experienced teacher guides PSTs to learn about their future workplace by facilitating a learning experience where they develop lesson plans, develop resource material, manage the classroom and respond to challenging behaviour. In Indonesia, PSTs are required to have teaching practicums for one semester, about 120 days. This approach allows PSTs to become actively involved in the daily school activities over a significant period of time. As Dewey's theory of experience posits, teachers, create meaning while involving themselves in teaching experiences (Schmidt, 2010). Through their teacher education program, PSTs are equipped with the necessary conditions to construct their self-image and professional identity (Kavanoz & Yüksel, 2017). In addition, these experiences provide the best opportunity for PSTs to learn and acquire personal and teaching efficacy to transfer to their context after graduation (Gray, Wright & Pascoe, 2017).

Placement also provides PST's an opportunity to demonstrate, and be judged against, a set of teacher competencies (Hakim, 2015). Each individual, who works for an organisation, is required to attain specific competencies in accordance with systems goals and targets. Hakim (2015) explains competency is the capacity of an individual to practice, or play, out an occupation or errand that depends on aptitudes, learning, frames of mind bolstered by work as per requirements of the activity. Teacher competency in an Indonesian context is measured with an instrument that evaluates performance in both research and practical settings (Panggabean & Himawan, 2016). There are many similarities with the Australian Professional Standards for Teachers within Australia (Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL, 2011). Within PPTP, pre-service teachers are required to demonstrate competence in four key issues while on placement. These include:

- Pedagogic competencies include recognising students' characteristics, mastering learning theory and educational learning principles, developing curriculum, educational learning activities, understanding and developing students' potency, communicating with students and assessing and evaluating.
- Personality competencies include acting with religious norms, law, social, and Indonesian national culture, showing a mature and respectful personality, having work ethics, high responsibility and being proud of being a teacher.
- Social competencies comprise being inclusive, behaving objectively and not being discriminative and communicating with colleagues, educational staff, students, parents, and society.
- Professional competencies include mastering concept structure material and scientific thinking patterns, which support teaching and development of professional reflective behaviour (Departemen Pendidikan Nasional, 2007).

Practicum Partnership

Teacher education providers in Indonesia, like the Australian context, traditionally design their programs with two components; a coursework component, typically taught on-site at the university and a practicum component whereby pre-service teachers undertake supervised professional experience in school settings. This separation of theory and practice, coursework and practicum, complicates the development of pre-service teacher learning, and

PSTs can experience discordance between studied-theories and practice when demonstrating their teaching competencies. Yeigh and Lynch (2017) noted that professional experience "relies upon the assumption that student teachers will be able to automatically translate their theoretical coursework underpinnings into practical classroom activities" (p. 118). Theories learned at university from reading and analysing texts, lectures, tutorials, and discussions should be experienced through microteaching or a practicum to minimise the theory/practice divide (Mudra, 2018). A gap between theory and practice may also occur as PSTs bring their own experiences and form their own opinions of teaching from their life events. These experiences may cause dissonance between university theory and classroom reality (Kertesz & Downing, 2016). Some authors believe the traditional practicum teaching approach may in itself be a disengagement between university theories and school practice and knowledge (Darling-Hammond, 2006a). However, the literature suggests that this divide can be reduced by collaboration, co-creation of curriculum and planning of ITE programs or through partnerships, between schools and universities to support PSTs connecting theory to practice (Sim, 2010).

Darling-Hammond (2006a) explains there are four issues with a traditional approach in practicum teaching; first, a gap between theories and practice; second, unqualified and inexpert mentor teachers; third, no clear description for pre-service students; and fourth, variation between teacher mentors' supervising and mentoring role and their responsibility to the profession. The notion of forming partnerships between schools and teacher education providers has long been advocated because this will enable a greater connection between the coursework delivered by providers and the practice experience at school sites. Indeed, the literature suggests that practicum within partnership models has the potential to allow university and schools to collaborate in providing meaningful experiences for PSTs to learn about and develop skills for their future work (Kenny et al., 2014; Yeigh & Lynch, 2017). The literature also suggests that placement within authentic school-university partnerships often has defined responsibilities and roles and absolute, frequent and meaningful communication (Graham & Thornley, 2000; Kertez & Downing, 2016).

Partnership models of placement often value a collaborative teamwork partnership during planning, developing, and implementing practicums (Turnbull, 2005). Thus, communicating the goals and expectations of professional experience is not merely for PSTs. It is crucial for all involved such as mentor teachers, school leadership and academics, to produce a professional teacher. Traditionally, there has been limited professional development for both mentor teachers and teacher educators involved in professional experience. During the practicum process, mentor teachers play an important role in guiding and supporting the PSTs' professional preparation and growth (Martínez Agudo, 2016). For mentor teachers to be effective, they are required to have good communication skills to avoid causing misunderstandings and to be able to articulate clear roles for each of the parties. Unfortunately, in the Indonesian context, mentor teachers are commonly selected based on seniority rather than quality and expertise (Sulistiyo, 2015). Further, Sulistiyo's (2015) research found that to become a quality mentor teacher, they must provide PSTs with clear feedback for improvement and some guidance around co-planning, goal setting, or mutual problem solving be effective. Therefore, there must be a shared understanding between all the stakeholders about the skills and knowledge required to meet each competency and all partnership members' expectations.

In practicum partnerships, ideally, both school and university ideologies have equal roles. However, in practicum, generally, decisions are dominated by the university. Universities have the authority to define the schedule, the schools involved, the microteaching requirements, and how PSTs might demonstrate competencies. PSTs do not

choose a school outside of the university-approved list, even though a different school may meet their perceived needs better. PSTs are required to be ready to teach without always being equipped with adequate knowledge, as it is challenging to prepare PSTs for every classroom context.

Lack of a mutual relationship between schools and university can result in a dissonance between PSTs' preparation and schools' expectations and requirements (Darling-Hammond, 2006b). One way to achieve mutual respect and collaboration is through working in partnership with the school-based staff, such as school leaders and teachers who can support and mentor PSTs. Putri (2014) suggests that an experienced-teacher collaboration may occur via more on-campus teaching experience allocating time for pre-service teachers to work collaboratively by developing teaching media and preparing lesson plans. Brainstorming and discussing practicum experiences could solve the issues that arise during teaching practicums (Putri, 2014). Hence, PSTs would be more classroom-ready and involving stakeholder in meaningful ways in the placement processes.

Learning to teach in schools, a pre-service teacher might face different ideas and expectations from those they have learnt at university, such as different lesson planning, behaviour management, or theoretical learning approaches. A lack of collaboration between university and school can exacerbate this matter. To address many of the concerns identified in the literature related to professional experience, the creation of university-school partnerships can provide a way to bridge the gap between theory and practice in teacher education (Zeichner, 2010). This paper reports on a partnership-based approach to professional experience known as the CAPE model that attempted to address many of the issues outlined in the literature.

The Innovation: The CAPE Model

Beginning in 2015, with the support of the Department of Education and Training, Victoria (Teaching Academies of Professional Experience initiative funding), a partnership involving the School of Education, RMIT University, 13 primary schools in the North-Western Victoria Region and industry was formed. Approximately 220 (the entire cohort) pre-service teachers were placed in partnership schools and taught through a mix of on-campus and on-site delivery by university teacher educators and school-based teacher educators. The course which housed the CAPE model began at university, where PSTs audited their current knowledge against national standards. Based on these audits, PSTs developed individualised goals that shaped their practicum experience, focusing on digital technologies. As part of the course (the four weeks practicum), PSTs were placed in a partnership school. During their 20-day placement, PST's were supported by a school-based coach and a practising teacher at the placement school, who was released from her/his regular teaching duties to support the PSTs. PSTs also attended tutorials on-site in school as part of the course. PSTs were encouraged to set a mentoring goal, and the school-based coach supported them by providing skills and strategies. PSTs were also required to apply knowledge from the university course in their teaching practice in the partner school. The course had a focus on learning how to implement technology into an authentic classroom context effectively.

After the orientation at university, PSTs continue their learning on-site in primary schools. When on-site in schools, Pre-Service Teachers were placed in small groups of 16-18 and undertook:

- a placement program (where a mentor teacher supervised them),
- a workshop program (where they were taught about designing and teaching a lesson sequence of three lessons involving ICT, shared between the university and school), and
- a coaching program (where they received feedback, observation and modelling related to their learning goals).

Utilising the CAPE model in ITE programs meant that the above boundaries were blurred as the university coursework (lectures and tutorials) were replaced with workshops. The workshops were co-designed by school and university teaching staff and leadership. Workshops were delivered by practising teachers employed by the university using audits, guided observations, and learning experiences. These were co-created and developed through a series of think-tank days with teachers, leaders, academics, and industry (e.g., Department of Education and Training and Victorian Curriculum Assessment Authority). An integral role within the CAPE model were school-based coaches. The literature on professional experience in initial teacher education has extensively reported on the roles of the triad in traditional PST, the mentor teacher and the university liaison/mentor (see for example, Gaffey & Dobbins, 1996; Guyton & McIntyre, 1990; Zeichner, 1990). More recently, there has been a rise in roles beyond the traditional triad, often referred to as a hybrid or a "boundary-crossing" role (Clifton & Jordan, 2019). A "boundary crossing" role would describe the school-based coach in this model as they were typically a practising teacher at the placement school, who was released from her/his regular teaching duties to support the PSTs for the duration of their placement (funded by University and Department of Education and Training).

Given this model's success within Australia to support PSTs develop and shape partnerships (Elsden-Clifton & Jordan, 2016), a collaborative partnership with RMIT and Jambi University in 2016 was developed. This initiative was funded by both the Australian-Indonesia Institute, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) and the School of Education, RMIT University, to adopt and trail this model. Improving and exploring pre-service teachers' practice was the main purpose of utilising this program, and both Universities were excited about such a collaboration. In August 2016, the Indonesian partners visited Victoria and visited CAPE partner schools to learn more about meeting teacher competencies with professional experience. In 2017 academics from RMIT University visited Indonesia to support the colleagues to actualise this innovation in a pilot program adjusted to address Indonesian specific issues.

Within the Indonesian context, PTTP in Indonesia is a teaching practicum program conducted by the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education at Jambi University. This program is held during the seventh semester for PSTs and runs for six months, including a month of microteaching phase and another four months (120 days) of teaching practicum in the field. Traditionally within Jambi University, PSTs have several courses taught at the University campus related to teaching practice, mostly lecture-based. PST's are allocated a school by the university and school staff. During their PTTP, PSTs will be observed by a university staff member practising and applying the strategies they learned before they teach the class themselves. However, some of the schools demand the preservice teachers undertake responsibilities beyond usual expectations, for example: substituting for absent teachers, handling extra-curricular activities, even making tea or coffee for the senior teachers. As a result, a requirement to work more closely with school partners and share responsibility for future teachers' development was essential. Therefore, the CAPE model seemed a sound model to adapt. The CAPE model was a significant departure from the way that PTTP was previously structured and administrated. The following table summarises the

difference between RMIT University's CAPE model, Jambi University's adapted CAPE model, and the PTTP program's traditional framework.

Characteristics	RMIT University CAPE Model	Jamb University Adapted CAPE Model Pilot	Traditional PTTP in Indonesia
Placement Focus	Individualised to PST needs and ICT focus	Individualised to PST needs and ICT focus	Meeting teacher competencies
Length of Placement	20 days	120 days	120 days
Coaching Professional Development Program	1-day development program and website support	1-day development program and website support	N/A
The Curriculum of Placement Course	Co-constructed between schools and university	Co-constructed between schools and university	Constructed by university
Student Numbers	220	10	Various
Placement focus	Collegial consensual	Collegial consensual	Procedural bureaucratic
Scheduling of Placement	Semester 4 of 8	Semester 7 of 8	Semester 7 of 8
Previous Placements	2 previous placements (1 observation placement)	2 previous placements (1 observation placement)	no previous placements
Expectations	Negotiated	Negotiated	Dictated
Coaches	23 across 12 schools	1 coach at 1 school	No coach
Time Allocation for Coach	Released from regular teaching duties	Released from regular teaching duties	N/A
Relationship	Partnership	Partnership	Transaction, administrative
Grouping of PSTs	In groups of 16-18	In a group of 10	Not a feature
Mentor Teacher Payment	Paid to have a PST	Paid to have a PST	Paid to have a PST
On-site tutorials	2hrs per week/4 weeks	2hrs per week/4 weeks	N/A
Support and University Courses Before Placement	Yes, co-constructed with school partners	Yes	Yes
Visit from University Teacher Educators	Yes	Yes	Yes

Table 1. The Difference between RMIT University CAPE Model, Jambi University Adapted CAPE Model, and the Traditional PTTP Indonesia Model

PTTP has a traditional placement and is seen as an administration exchange; hence, most procedures were bureaucratic, and expectations were dictated by the administration at the university. The CAPE model was seen as a significant departure from this established professional experience framework. Instead, the CAPE model was based upon developing a relationship between schools and the university to learn more about each other. There were several distinct features to the CAPE model, including:

- a school-based coach, normally a practising teacher at the placement school, who was released from her/his regular teaching duties to support the PSTs
- on-site tutorials carried out in school as part of the model
- university and school-based staff co-creating the teaching, learning and assessment materials
- Different participants' perspectives about the implementation of the CAPE model follows.

Research Method

In achieving the research purpose, the research team constructed a qualitative study involving focus group discussions with small groups of participants. The total participants taking part in this study were 10 pre-service teachers (PSTs), one school principal (SP), one mentor teacher (MT), one university teacher educator (UTE) and one Coach (C). The research took three months to complete.

The focus group discussions were conducted in two sessions. Each session was around two hours long. These sessions centred on developing the topics and were delivered in *Bahasa Indonesia* (Indonesian Language) to get the best understanding of what the participants revealed during the discussions. The first session included 10 PSTs as the participants and the second session involved the SP, MT, UTE, and C discussing the same topics. Two researchers facilitated all the focus group sessions by addressing the pre-prepared focus group discussion protocol. The participants were asked questions by the researchers, which allowed the participants to provide answers, opinions, comments and to critically analyse the model.

The sessions were held at the Principal's room, in a Primary school in Jambi Province, Indonesia. Each pre-service teacher in each focus group completed a form giving their permission to participate in the study. The video-tapings of the focus group discussions were available, and the audios were transcribed manually. For anonymity purposes, the participants were identified using their focus group number and the order of seating in the focus group discussion. Participants in each focus group were represented by a code to protect their identity. For example, the code PST1 is used to represent Pre-Service Teacher 1.

CAPE PTTP	Focus Group	No. of Participants
Z Primary school	FG 1	• 10 pre-service teachers (PST)
Y Primary school	FG 2	• 1 school principal (SP) • 1 mentor teacher (MT) • 2 university teacher educators (UTEs) • 1 coach (C)

Table 2. The Distribution of Participants and Focus Group Discussion

Findings

The Table 3 documents the key themes, sub-themes, explanations, found in the discussions. Participants who commented in the focus group discussions conducted in Bahasa Indonesia are also shown. The comments were group based on stakeholders' perceptions about the implementation of the CAPE model at Jambi University.

Themes	Sub-Themes	Explanation	Participant
Coaching experiences	Coach assistance	PSTs receive assistance which welcomes them warmly and openly to the program and schools.	FG 1 (All participants [PST1-10])
	Coach guidance	PSTs get meaningful guidance dealing with teaching matters; how to understand students' learning style, create lesson plans, and choose learning methods, etc.	FG 1 (All participants [PST1-10])

	Coach solving problem	PSTs participate in sessions to share the problems as well as possible solutions.	FG 1 (All participants [PST1-10])
New knowledge about the four Indonesian Teacher competences		PSTs are equipped to engage with the four Indonesian teacher competencies: pedagogical, personal, social and professional.	FG 1 All participants [PST1-10]
The strengths and weaknesses of the adapted CAPE model	Strength: Partnership between the university and school	School gets additional teaching from the PST. School advance their reputation. University staff and PSTs get authentic interaction with schools and teaching experiences.	FG 1 (PST4, PST7, PST9, PST10) FG 1 (PST3, PST4, PST7, PST9) FG 1 (PST1, PST3, PST5, PST6, PST9) FG 2 (SP, C, MT, UTE2)
	Weaknesses: Need to improve management	The communication between the university and school authorities needs to be improved. Feedback should be done as a follow-up activity after the program is completed Unclear assessment and instruction. Coach is not fully free from teaching duties. CAPE model needs to be adjusted to meet the specific needs of the educational system involved.	FG 1 (PST1, PST2, PST8) FG 2 (SP, C, UM1, UTE2) FG 1 (PST1, PST2, PST3, PST7, PST8) FG 1 (PST5, PST6, PST7, PST 9, PST10) FG 2 (C, SP) FG 1 (All participants) FG 2 (C, MT) FG 1 (PST1, PST5, PST7, PST 9, PST10) FG 2 (C, SP)

Table 3. Participants' Perceptions of the Implementation of the CAPE model

Discussion
Coaching Experiences

The coach's role was a significant feature of the model, and most of the comments from the participants related to the coach. Coaching sessions provided PSTs with coaching assistance, guidance and problem-solving support. PSTs were able to share their problems and experiences with the coach in overall meeting sessions. The sessions were generally held weekly. PSTs had opportunities during their placement to interact and get feedback from their coach through one-on-one or group discussions. Based on the FGD session 10 PSTs, all PSTs agreed that the coach had given them valuable assistance, as these comments below reveal:

> *During the interaction with the coach, every time we met, he gave a good response. [PST1]*

> *My coach was so humble and open in providing advice and criticism in educating the students in the proper way. [PST2]*
> *The coach is really helpful and every time we have a problem, he is always there to help. [PST5]*

The assistance from the coach supported PSTs to share what was on their mind, and they reported that they felt free to ask questions. Free expression can be more difficult with an MT who is assessing their performance. Not only did it improve PSTs teaching practicum knowledge but made them more open to receiving critical and constructive feedback about their teaching from the coach. The PST comments below indicate the value of these coach-PST interactions:

> *The coach also gives good advice and shares his experiences. He is patient in helping us, fun and friendly when we interact with each other. [PST2]*
> *Good communication occurred among us to share knowledge. [PST5]*
> *Guidance and suggestions used to be given for each of our questions and problems. He was always welcoming and involved in helping us in this program, including analysing lesson plans and sharing his teaching experiences to us, which later on will be a teacher. [PST7]*

These PST's statements provide evidence of how the coach's feedback supported their development to be effective teachers. The coach was able to personalise the feedback and support for the particular characteristics of the school. As a senior and experienced teacher, the coach could unpack and understand the connections between theory and practice. Therefore, findings indicate that the PSTs participating in teaching practicum experiences were assisted in adjusting their teaching practices to cater to the needs of the students in their classes. This change in power dynamic is significant, as Goh and Matthews' (2011) research indicates that PSTs in Malaysia face adjustment concerns such as being worried about being unable to cope with their responsibilities and not being accepted by the other teachers. They added that PSTs also struggled with personal and emotional adjustments to meet the expectations of their mentor teacher and to be accepted by students and staff (Goh & Matthew, 2011). The data from the PSTs in this study confirmed that through the guidance of the coach, they were more able to learn the responsibilities, tasks, and expectations of being on placement (Turnbull, 2002). In particular, PSTs were assisted to analyse their lesson plans and other aspects of their teaching practice:

> *Next, we obtained new knowledge from the coach, such as in mastering the material, choosing the suitable teaching and learning method, and managing the classroom, so the students could acquire and accept the material well. [PST 10]*

Through coaching sessions, the coach also shared how to understand students' learning style, create lesson plans, and choose from various teaching methods. Coaches, it seemed, also played an important role in addressing the gap between theory and practice while on placement and issue identified in the literature (Stenberg, Rajala, & Hilppo, 2016). PSTs are required to demonstrate the theories gained from university instruction and modify to meet schools' needs and expectations, such as lesson planning. As one PST noted: "Creating the lesson plan is completely different from [what] we have learned in campus" [PST 8]. The coach was able to address this difference at a school level. Hence, the coach could translate, or border-cross, between universities and schools, resulting in new insights and skills being acquired by PSTs. Martinez and Mackay (2002) stated that filling the gap between theories at university and practical teaching at school can be done by pre-service teachers through practicum teaching experiences. However, the research showed that the coach was an important part of addressing the disconnect.

Learning About and Demonstrating Teaching Competencies

In terms of developing PSTs' professionalism, the teaching practicum can provide an opportunity to practice and develop teaching competence, a key indicator of teacher quality. All PSTs in the current study agreed that more knowledge of the four teacher competencies was obtained through this program:

Before involved in this program, we have been taught about four teacher competencies at campus. Through this program we got new knowledge by implementing those competencies. Then we knew that having this profession needed to professional. [PST 6]

Teacher competencies consisted of four parts: pedagogy competence, personal competence, professional competence, and social competence. One thing that I know, being a teacher is not merely able to teach but also have to acquire those four competencies for being a professional teacher. [PST 8]

The two statements above, which represent similar sentiments to the majority of PSTs comments, outline the four competencies that PSTs learnt from their university courses that become more "real" when layered into the placement experience. However, one PST stated that these four competencies were new for him:

The new knowledge that I got was the explanation of four teacher competencies and implementing in a real class. [PST 7]

The data indicates that this program has the capacity to improve understanding of professionalism, which can facilitate PSTs becoming better equipped to become professional teachers when they begin their career.

The Strength and Weakness of the Adapted CAPE Model

As the CAPE model was implemented in a different country to where it originated, different socio-cultural beliefs and expectations needed to be considered. While a trial of this program is beneficial for both the Indonesian university and schools, the following statements from the PSTs, School Principal (SP), Coach (C) and University Teacher Educators (UTE) indicate some of the perceived issues to be addressed in the Indonesia context:

… besides getting more knowledge of theories from university and additional temporary educators from the university students, the school got a better name since as being the venue for the new program from abroad. [PST 4]

Teaching practicum was more directional because of the clear division. [SP]

The version of the CAPE model tested in this study was advantageous for those involved as there were clearer division, roles, and expectations when implementing this new model. According to the participants since it was a new program and a significant departure from the traditional way placement had previously been delivered, several weaknesses were found. The first weakness observed was that the communication between the university and school leadership required improvement to ensure there were clear lines of communication:

… the communication both university and school authorities dealing with the tasks should be done based on the fixed schedule and also the evaluation for the feedback of the program was required. [PST 1]

The lack of communication between the university will affect the success of the program. This will lead PSTs to confusion with what they need to do for the next steps of the practicum. [UTE 1]

Building good communication between the two parties should be done in order to improve the quality of the CAPE program. The school and the university

could take benefits of having a good interaction. [C]

Communication between the university and school and between the university and pre-service teachers seemed to be the main issue detected in the study. Communication issues may have been caused by the different expectations that the school and PSTs experience due to their involvement in previous placements. Based on the analysis, some of the planned activities (e.g., on-site tutorials and coaching session) did not run on schedule, which may have resulted in the PSTs getting distracted or disengaging during the program and confused about what to do.

This lack of communication was also featured in the assessment process. For example, several participants from the different groups noted that there was not clear guidance around the assessment of learning:

Less guidance of what PSTs and other participants should do during the program was also as the source of confusion. [UTE 2]

The assessment process was not clear yet. [PST 1]

There was no feedback from this program; hence PST did know well what they should achieve from the next program, and there was no evaluation program. [PST 9]

I am very happy to help PSTs but unfortunately, the program does not have a clear assessment to assess and evaluate the PSTs' performance as well as the performance of a coach, mentor teacher, and university mentor involved in the program. [C]

The literature reviewed in this paper outlined that communication is a key component of a successful partnership model. For instance, Kertesz and Downing (2016) note that effective professional experience is constructed around genuine partnerships where the "responsibilities and roles of both school staff and university lecturers are clearly defined, and where communication between these stakeholders is genuine, frequent, and meaningful" (p. 17). Given this was the first iteration of the CAPE model and a significant departure from the traditional professional experience models, some communication problems should be expected. There is scope to introduce the CAPE model to PSTs and school earlier in future interactions and provide clear and distinct explanations to all stakeholders to ensure the model can be adapted across university settings. In addition, time management and communication are required to be improved between the provider and all the participants involved.

The adapted CAPE model also demonstrated that it can be challenging to replicate a model in different contexts with changed variables such as funding. In the CAPE model implemented in Victoria, funding was provided to release coaches from their everyday teaching responsibilities (full or part-time depending on PST numbers). In the adapted model, the coach was not entirely free from her/his teaching duties. As noted several times by the coach and a principal, this impacted the quality of the implemented program.

I am not fully free from teaching duties as I am also teaching while I am doing my job to help and facilitate pre-service teachers' teaching practicum. [C]

... some adjustments need to be taken to the context needs of the pre-service teachers so the program will be successfully implemented with a bit of modification. [C].

... huge teaching loads makes it difficult for the coach to fully help pre-service teachers with this new model of teaching practicum. In the future, it would be better if the school can let the coach not to teach so he/she can work fully with the pre-service teachers. [SP].

Luciana (2006) asserted more than a decade ago that teaching practicum in Indonesia

ought to be redefined to realise a mutual collaboration between schools and the University and to develop pre-service teachers' capacity during their teaching practicum. This research paper aims to give useful feedback for the betterment of the CAPE models implemented in Indonesian schools in the future.

Conclusion

The findings of the research indicated that the role of the coach is beneficial for PSTs. The teaching practicum with the new model was considered more effective as the PSTs could bridge the theory-practice divide more easily with the coach's support and focus on areas they identified as necessary for their professional experience. This study indicates three purposive recommendations to enhance the delivery of this CAPE model in Indonesia.

First, the structure of the CAPE model in the Indonesian context had a very general focus, as PSTs could focus on any competency or area of interest. PSTs and school staff were, therefore, uncertain on how to best support students. In RMIT University's version of the CAPE model, the PST focused on specific competencies related to ICT and goal setting, which targeted support and shared understanding. In future iterations, the adapted CAPE model may need to be more specific by adjusting to be more applicable to the Indonesian educational system and the issues faced in this context, such as large numbers of students in a class; a variety of students' motivations; and the large variance of quality and availability of teaching facilities.

Secondly, the coaches working with the Indonesian PSTs were not entirely free from their teaching duties and routines. This limitation affected their level of availability to both teaching and coaching. The findings suggest that an allocation of funding like the original model would provide time to allow coaches to focus on coaching PSTs to give more detailed and precise guidance.

Thirdly, the adapted CAPE model's guidelines and communication needed to be refined for the Indonesian context. Communication about expectations, assessment and requirements of the PSTs and mentor teacher should be improved between all the participants involved. Given the large scale of the RMIT University's model, there were more explicit communication mechanisms and funding for think tanks that supported communication between stakeholders.

The CAPE model was a research-informed partnership that provided opportunities for the school and university to partner, share responsibility, and learn from each other. The data from this small-scale pilot study showed that the CAPE model could be one way that the theory and practice divide can be addressed to fulfil accreditation requirements and support PST competency development required in professional experience. However, the first iteration documented that communication and feedback issues were to be addressed in the future. Nevertheless, the adapted CAPE model's implementation demonstrated that there are possibilities to disrupt and rewrite how professional experience has traditionally been envisaged, delivered and enacted if the university, school and PST see value in doing so.

While the CAPE model was initially designed for metropolitan primary schools within Victoria, Australia, and a particular context between university and schools, this Indonesian study is an encouraging outcome, demonstrating that the CAPE model can be used in a different context. This small-scale pilot study bought about significant change in the professional experience space. The hope is that this may facilitate future innovation that may include some co-design models that are constructed to meet specific social and cultural issues particular to both schools and university conditions.

References

Australian Government Department of Education and Training. (December, 2014). *The Teacher Education Ministerial Advisory Group (TEMAG) report. Action now: Classroom ready teachers*. Canberra, Australia: Australian Government, Department of Education and Training. https://docs.education.gov.au/node/36783.

Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL). (2011). *Accreditation of initial teacher education programs in Australia*. Carlton South. http://www.aitsl.edu.au

Chiwimbiso, M. K. Adendorff, S. A. & Mosito, C. P. (2017). Student-teachers' understanding of the role of theory in their practice. *Journal of Education,* 69, 139-159. http://joe.ukzn.ac.za

Clifton, J., & Jordan, K. (2019). Who is the hybrid teacher educator? Understanding professional identity in school-university partnership. In J. Gutierrez, J. Fox, & C. Alexander (Eds), *Professionalism and teacher education. Voices from policy and practice* (pp. 71-90). Springer, Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-7002-1_4

Darling-Hammond, L. (2006a). *Powerful teacher education: Lesson from exemplary programs*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2006b). Assessing teacher education: The usefulness of multiple measures for assessing program outcomes. *Journal of Teacher Education, 57*(2), 120–138. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487105283796

Departemen Pendidikan Nasional. (2007). *Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Nasional Republik Indonesia no. 16 Tahun 2007 tentang Standar Kualifikasi Akademik dan Kompetensi Guru (Government Regulation no. 16/2007: Standards of Teachers' Academic Qualification and Competence).*

DET Victoria. (2019). *Teaching Academies of Professional Practice*. https://www.education.vic.gov.au/about/educationstate/Pages/tapp.aspx

Elsden-Clifton, J. & Jordan, K. (2016). Reframing professional experience: Adopting a distributed, open, collaborative course framework to facilitate third spaces. In T. Barkatsas, & A. Bertram, A. (Eds), *Global learning in the 21st century*, (pp. 57-70). Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill Sense. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6300-761-0_4

Gaffey, C. & Dobbins, R. (1996). *Tertiary teacher educators: Do they make a difference in practicum,* PEPE Monograph, No. 1, 105-122.

Goff-Kfouri, C. A. (2013). 3rd World Conference on Learning, Teaching and Educational Leadership (WCLTA-2012). Pre-service teachers and teacher education. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences.* 93, (October), 1786 – 1790. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.10.117

Goh, P. S. & Matthews, B. (2011). Listening to the concerns of student teachers in Malaysia during teaching practice. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 36*(3), 92 – 103. https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2011v36n3.2

Graham, S., & Thornley, C. (2000). Connecting classrooms in pre-service education: Conversations for learning, *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 28*(3), 235–245. https://doi.org/10.1080/713650697

Gray, C. C., Wright, P. R., & Pascoe, R. (2017). Raising the curtain: Investigating the practicum experiences of pre-service drama teachers. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 42*(1), 36-53 https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2017v42n1.3

Guyton, E. & McIntyre, J. D. (1990). Student teaching and school experiences. In R. W. Housten (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 514–534). New York, NY: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Hakim, A. (2015). Contribution of competence teacher (pedagogical, personality, professional competence and social) on the performance of learning. *The International Journal of Engineering and Science (IJES).* 4 (2) 1-12. ISSN (e): 2319 – 1813 ISSN.

Kavanoz, S., & Yüksel, H. G. (2017). Motivations and concerns: Voices from pre-service language teachers. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 42*(8), 43-61. https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2017v42n8.4

Kenny, J. D., Hobbs, L., Herbert, S., Jones, M., Chittleborough, G., Campbell, C., Gilbert, A., & Redman, C. (2014). Science teacher education partnerships with schools (STEPS): Partnerships in science teacher education. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 39*(12), 43-65. https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2014v39n12.4

Kertesz, J. L., & Downing, J. (2016). Piloting teacher education practicum partnerships: Teaching alliances for professional practice (TAPP). *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 41*(12), 13 -24. https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2016v41n12.2

Le Cornu, R. (2016). Professional experience: Learning from the past to build the future. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 44*(1), 80-101. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2015.1102200

Loo, D. B., Maidom, R & Kitjaroonchai, N. (2019).Non-native English speaking pre-service teachers in an EFL context: Examining experiences through borderland discourse. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 47*(4), 414-431. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2019.1607252

Luciana. (2006). Developing standards for language teacher education programs in Indonesia: Professionalizing or losing in complexity, *TEFLIN Journal, 7*(1), 19-28.

Martínez Agudo, J. (2016). What type of feedback do student teachers expect from their school mentors during practicum experience? The case of Spanish EFL student teachers. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 41*(5), 36-51. https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2016v41n5.3

Martinez, K.& Mackay, G. (2002). *Structuring critical reflection in professional experience*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Australian Association for Research in Education, 1st – 5th December, Brisbane, Australia.

Mudra, H. (2018). Pre-service EFL teachers' experiences in teaching practicum in rural schools in Indonesia. *The Qualitative Report*, *23*(2), 319-344. https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol23/iss2/3

Panggabean, M. S., & Himawan, K. K. (2016). The development of Indonesian teacher competence questionnaire. *Journal of Educational, Health and Community Psychology.* 5 (2) 1-15. https://doi.org/10.12928/jehcp.v5i2.5134

Putri, N. S. (2014). *Back to basics: Improving pre-service teachers' quality by designing sound curriculum for teaching practicum program.* Paper presented at the 61st TEFLIN International Conference October 7th – 9th, Solo, Central Java, Indonesia.

Schmidt, M. 2010. Learning from teaching experience: Dewey's theory and preservice teachers' learning. *Journal of Research in Music Education* 58 (2) 131–146. doi: 10.1177/0022429410368723. http://jrme.sagepub.com https://doi.org/10.1177/0022429410368723

Sim, C. (2010). Sustaining productive collaboration between faculties and schools. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 35*(5), 18-28. https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2010v35n5.2

Stenberg, K, Rajala, A. & Hilppo, J. (2016) Fostering theory–practice reflection in teaching practicums. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 44(5) 470-485. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2015.1136406

Sulistiyo, U. (2015). *Improving English as a foreign language teacher education in Indonesia: the case of Jambi University* (Unpublished doctoral thesis). RMIT University, Melbourne, Australia.

Turnbull, M. (2002). *Student teacher professional agency in the practicum: Myth or possibility?* (Unpublished doctoral thesis) Curtin University of Technology, Perth, WA.

Turnbull, M. (2005). Student teacher professional agency in the practicum. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 33*(2). 195-208. https://doi.org/10.1080/13598660500122116

Ure, C., Gough, A., & Newton, R. (2009). *Practicum Partnerships: Exploring Models of Practicum Organisation in Teacher Education for a Standards-based Profession.* Canberra: Australian Government Office for Learning and Teaching. http://www.olt.gov.au/resources

Yeigh, T., & Lynch, D. (2017). Reforming initial teacher education: A call for innovation. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education,42*(12). 112-127. https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2017v42n12.7

Zeichner, K. (1990). Changing direction in the practicum: Looking ahead to the 1990s. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 16*(2), 105–132. https://doi.org/10.1080/0260747900160201

Zeichner, K. (2010). Rethinking the connection between campus courses and field experiences in college-and university-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education,* (1-2), 61–89. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109347671