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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Background of the Problem

"To the casual observer, American education is a confusing and not altogether edifying spectacle. It is productive of endless fads and panaceas; it is pretentiously scientific and at the same time pathetically conventional; it is scornful of the past, yet painfully inarticulate when it speaks of the future." This is not a quote from one of the recent reports on the state of education in the United States, although it surely could be. It is Boyd Bode writing in The New Republic in 1930.

The condition of education in America was a major issue during the mid-1980's. Between 1982 and 1984, no fewer than 17 reports on the state of primary, secondary, and higher education in the United States were issued by various agencies, commissions, and foundations. The greatest weakness in the recently proposed reforms of teacher education is the lack of knowledge about what presently goes on in teacher education. The first step in proposing useful and constructive reforms for teacher education should be the careful consideration of what has taken place in the past and what presently occurs in the name of teacher education. This study investigates what goes on in teacher education from the preservice teacher's
point of view. It is concerned with identifying what preservice
teachers believe to be their most significant experiences in the
process of learning to teach and investigating how these experiences
have influenced the development of their teaching perspectives. A
brief historical overview of reports recommending reform of teacher
education is provided in the following paragraphs. The intent of
this selective review is to establish the context for the purpose
and significance of the study.

The most recent stream of reports on the condition of American
education began with The Paideia Proposal (M. Adler, 1982), but it
was not until the publication of A Nation at Risk in 1983 by the
National Commission on Excellence in Education that the attention of
the national media and the public was focused on the issue of
excellence in education. Reactions within the field of education to
this new scrutiny of the schools and professional educators ranged
from defensive to supportive. Some educators felt the reports were
unwarranted attacks upon their profession, while others welcomed the
reports and seized the opportunity to initiate overdue reforms in
the schools.

Throughout American history, education has experienced several
periods of critique and reform. National reports recommending
changes in curricular content, testing and standards, teacher
training, and locus of control over schools have been issued
periodically since the late 19th century. Historically, calls for
reform in education have not emerged from grass-roots concerns, but
have been the result of the concerns of a corporate and professional elite that was taking an increasing amount of control over school systems in the 19th and 20th centuries (Molnar, 1985).

One of the first and most far-reaching of the national reports on education was the result of the National Education Association (NEA) Committee of Ten on Secondary School Studies. The committee was established as a result of appeals on the part of Charles W. Eliot, the president of Harvard University, and other reformers who desired the creation of uniform college entrance requirements (Tanner & Tanner, 1980). The report of the "Committee of Ten," issued in 1893, established four basic curriculum tracks and espoused the college preparatory curriculum as the best curriculum for all students.

A second report by the NEA, known as the **Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education**, was issued in 1918 by the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education. The "Cardinal Principles" reflected the progressivism of that period of American history (cf., Dewey, 1916). It called for a curriculum that was based on individual and social needs of all youth, rather than one that catered to the college-bound minority.

During the 1930's and 1940's, the influence of progressive ideas in education expanded (cf., Counts, 1932; Bode, 1938). The NEA's Educational Policies Commission issued a study entitled **Education for ALL American Youth**. In this report, the Commission promoted a curriculum that was integrated, flexible, and child-
centered. Along with the Progressive Education Association's famous Eight-year Study experiment in the 1930's, the Commission's report represented the high point in the progressive education movement.

During the 1950's and 1960's, a storm of criticism regarding the quality of American education grew, predominately as a result of the Soviet Union's launching of the satellite Sputnik. Progressive education fell into disfavor as Americans became concerned that their schools were not stressing excellence. This resulted in a return to intellectual training and a focus on the disciplines, especially science and mathematics. Books such as Jerome Bruner's (1960) *The Process of Education* provided the structure for this new emphasis on the "structure of the disciplines." James Coleman (1966), H. G. Rickover (1963) and Charles Silberman (1970) provided the public with other critiques of the American educational system and warned of an existing crisis situation in the schools. The reports by the NEA, the writings of education scholars such as Dewey, Bode, and Counts, and the critiques of others such as Rickover, Coleman, and Silberman set the stage for the most recent round of reports on the state of our educational system and the need for its reform.

Despite the number and scope of the reports recently issued on the status of American education, there are several common themes to be found among them. Altbach (1985) has summarized some of the more important recommendations of these reports:
The schools must stress science and math and move away from the "frills" that are seen to have little relevance to preparing America for global economic competition.

The teaching profession has fallen on hard times. The quality, pay, and autonomy of teachers must be improved. Teacher education programs must be strengthened. "Merit pay" is seen as a means of attracting better teachers and rewarding those who perform well, but there is little guidance concerning how "merit" is to be determined.

The school curriculum should be more related to the job market and to perceived needs of industry.

Foreign-language instruction should be started in the elementary schools and should generally receive a high priority.

Students should spend more time in school, and that time should be used more effectively for instructional purposes. (p. 19-20)

These are just broad outlines of the recommendations. There are, of course, many variations to be found in these reports and it is not possible to review them all in this chapter. However, the following paragraphs provide a closer examination of what these reports have had to say about the status of the teaching profession.

It is generally accepted that without well-prepared, motivated, and qualified teachers quality education cannot take place. The teaching profession has always been afflicted by low pay, low status, and limited autonomy in comparison with other professions. In the past, these characteristics were somewhat balanced by employment security and a relatively secure source of income. However, in general, even job security has become a thing of the past. Today's teachers have been plagued by retrenchment and many
of those that have kept their jobs have been asked to learn new specialties or take on entirely new responsibilities (Roth & Ross, 1985). The public also has placed increasing demands on teachers regarding the correction of the social ills of society. Teachers now find themselves faced with increasing demands and criticism, while the resources and rewards for teaching have failed to keep pace.

While most of the reports focused their attention on teaching and teachers, teacher education has not escaped the attention of education critics. As the "great debate" continues, teacher education programs have become one of the central issues in discussions of educational reform. Teacher education has been criticized for attracting less than average students, lacking sufficiently rigorous admission standards, and offering course work with little or no substance. Three types of reform initiatives have been suggested as a result of these reports: (a) higher standards for admission to and exit from teacher education programs; (b) more extensive preservice course work in "content" areas or the liberal arts, with less emphasis on methods of teaching; and (c) elimination of the undergraduate education major and a restructuring of the teaching profession (Holmes Group, 1986; Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986).

The various critiques of teacher education and the resulting reform initiatives are well intentioned, but many contain serious flaws. In commenting on the relationship between educational reform
and teacher education Petrie (1985) points out that:

The problem is that many of the critics have taken only a superficial look at teacher preparation, and the recommendations they make do not reflect the critical analysis of the situation for which one might hope. Although the issues affecting teacher education identified by the critics are indeed important, the typical suggestions made for dealing with these issues are often indefensible. In some cases the common wisdom, if pursued, would actually make the situation worse, rather than improving it. In other cases, it is time for colleges of education to realize that teacher education is not a monolithic whole and that some radical reforms are in order. (p. 234)

The Carnegie Foundation report (1983), The Condition of Teaching, charges that, "never before in the nation's history has the caliber of those entering the teaching profession been as low as it is today" (p. 113). The concern for the quality of students entering teacher education is also reflected in the National Center for Educational Statistics' (1980) report, The High School and Beyond Study and in Boyer's (1983) report, High School. Boyer referred to evidence that illustrated that standardized test scores of high school students intending to teach have been traditionally lower than the national average for all students.

The conclusion that teacher education is attracting academically below average students has been contested. Fisher and Feldmann (1985) assert that the primary concern should be the quality of students who graduate from teacher education programs, rather than the quality of students in high school or college intending to become teachers. In their study, Fisher and Feldmann found that students are screened from teacher education in a variety
of formal and informal ways and that several institutions have found that teacher education students compare favorably with other students on academic measures. "There is certainly no evidence to suggest in these studies that teacher education students represent the lowest academically able students" (Fisher & Feldmann, p. 40).

In addition to these findings Evertson, Hawley, and Zlotnik (1985) have pointed out that there is little evidence that raising academic standards and testing teachers' knowledge prior to certification would screen out people that would not be successful teachers (Evertson, Hawley, & Zlotnik, 1985).

The second charge by critics, that teacher education curricula place too much emphasis on the methods of teaching and therefore lack depth in the subjects teachers will be teaching, is not generally supported in studies of the characteristics of teacher education programs. Kluender (1984) reports that most of a prospective teacher's program takes place outside of the schools, departments, and colleges of education. Teacher education programs generally have three parts: (a) liberal arts, (b) major/minor fields of specialization, and (c) professional education. For elementary education majors, the professional studies make up an average of 44% of their total program, while professional studies for secondary education majors make up only 21% of their total program. In response to the call for less emphasis on teacher education course work, Evertson, Hawley, and Zlotnik (1985) note that there is little reason to believe that increasing teachers'
knowledge of their subjects beyond what is now required for certification will make a significant difference in teacher effectiveness.

Reacting to the charge that teacher education courses lack sufficient substance, Evertson, Hawley and Zlotnik (1985) suggest that teacher educators and their classes should be models for prospective teachers to follow. They point out that greater efforts should be made by teacher education faculty to present models of teaching that reflect research findings regarding: (a) mastery learning, (b) individualized instruction, (c) cooperative grouping, (c) competency based education, (d) microteaching, (e) student teaching, and (f) induction/professional growth programs. The concern for teaching teachers in a new and different manner is also reflected in a proposal presented by Pickle (1984). In an investigation of the relationship between knowledge and learning environments in teacher education, Pickle suggests that different types of learnings are best accomplished in different learning environments. Based upon this finding, she suggests that teacher education programs use field experiences, laboratory environments, and the classroom to transmit different types of knowledge.

The number of deficiencies in teacher education and initiatives for their solution are many. The weakness of recently proposed programs for the reform of teacher education is the lack of fundamental knowledge about what takes place in teacher education. It is impossible to make constructive recommendations for the reform
of teacher education without knowing more about what it is actually like. Sarason, Davidson, and Blatt (1962) described teacher education as "an unstudied problem" and called for more "detailed descriptions of how teachers are actually trained." This call for the study of teacher education was echoed in 1975 by Fuller and Bown, who said, "the appropriate question at this stage of our knowledge of teacher education is not 'Are we right?', only 'What is out there?'" (p. 52).

**Statement of the Problem**

Learning to teach is a complex, stressful, intimate, and largely covert process (Fuller & Bown, 1975). But what does learning to teach mean? Does it mean mastering the subjects to be taught, successfully completing a certification program, or does it mean something else? There are many different approaches to the investigation of how an individual becomes a teacher, as Feiman-Nemser (1983) points out:

There are studies of teacher socialization and teacher development. There is research on teacher education and teacher training at both the preservice and inservice levels. There is a body of literature on staff development and school improvement. There are autobiographies and descriptive accounts by teachers about their teaching experience over time. From all these sources together, one can begin to construct a general picture of how someone learns to teach and improves at teaching over time. Rarely is this topic addressed directly, however, and what we know is far from adequate....With few exceptions, the existing research tells us very little about the actual conduct of teacher preparation and inservice training. (p. 151)
Merton, Reader, and Kendall (1957) defined socialization as being, "the process by which people selectively acquire the values and attitudes, the interests, skills, and knowledge—in short the culture—current in groups to which they are, or seek to become a member" (p. 13). Lacey (1977) describes the term "learning to teach" as only one component of the larger process of teacher socialization. According to Lacey, "learning to teach" corresponds to the part of this definition regarding the acquisition of "skills and knowledge." Lacey includes two other aspects of teacher socialization not described by Merton's definition. First, teaching is an occupation, therefore, there are particular skills and values relevant to teaching situations or situations in which an individual is acting in the role of teacher. However, individuals do not necessarily carry these skills and values over to other situations. That is, it is important to recognize the existence of the socializing forces of the occupation, but one must also be aware of the increasing freedom of the individual to act on his/her own within society. For example, Lacey points out that "some young teachers whose life-style is [sic] not conventionally associated with that of teachers may avoid stressful situations by insulating their in-school and out-of-school lives" (p. 14).

Secondly, Lacey rejects the "filling empty vessels" notion of socialization implied in Merton's definition of socialization. Merton describes the "selective acquisition" of values, attitudes, etc., as though the individual enters the situation tabula rasa.
Lacey points out that the particular values and attitudes associated with teaching are known to teachers well before they enter the profession, for example, they were known to them when they were pupils. In the process of becoming a teacher, "what has changed is their own relationship to the classroom situation, that is their perspective. Teacher socialization includes the process of developing a teacher perspective in which situations are both seen and interpreted in a new way" (Lacey, 1977, p. 14).

Fuller and Bown (1975) identify two elements that must be a part of an investigation into the process of becoming a teacher. These are: (a) the context of learning to teach and (b) the teacher's perceptions of that task. The context includes: peers, teacher educators, cooperating teachers, pupils, characteristics of preservice teachers, and the particulars of the situation being investigated. Secondly, the experience of becoming a teacher includes early experiences, motivations, developmental tasks and concerns, and the process of change during preservice and early inservice experiences. The process of change is illustrated by the development of teaching perspectives, which are the meanings and interpretations that teachers give to their work and their work situation (S. Adler, 1984). Perspectives differ from attitudes because they include actions and not just dispositions to act. Perspectives differ from values because they are situation specific and are not necessarily representative of generalized beliefs or ideologies (Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1985). A key to better
understanding of both, what goes on in teacher education and the process of becoming a teacher, is an understanding of the development of teacher perspectives in prospective teachers.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to investigate teacher perspectives and the role of preservice teacher education their development. The concept of teaching perspectives as used in this study is based upon the work of Becker, Hughes, and Strauss (1961) and the extension of this work by Tabachnick, Popkewitz, and Zeichner (1979-1980), S. Adler (1984), and Zeichner and Tabachnick (1985). Examples of teaching perspectives were obtained through interviews with students participating in the secondary social studies education program at Ohio State University. The interviews focused on five aspects of the process of becoming a teacher—selection of teaching as a career, experiences as a student, models and images of teaching, formal teacher preparation, peer relations in the program, and practice teaching experiences. Previous studies of professional socialization were used as models for the development of the structure of the interviews and the nature of some of the questions (cf. Becker et al., 1961; Lortie, 1975). A preliminary study provided additional questions for use in the interviews.

The study explores the factors that influence the formation and development of preservice teachers' perspectives and whether these factors can be influenced or controlled by teacher educators.
The Methodology

The rationale for the methodology used in this study is based upon the naturalistic paradigm as presented by Lincoln and Guba (1985). The study developed in the following sequence: (a) Pilot interviews were conducted with four teacher education students, representing each of the major organizational stages of the program, in order to establish a grounded framework for the primary interviews. (b) The 21 respondents for the primary interviews were identified and interviewed. (c) The interviews were analyzed and preliminary themes and emerging categories were identified and defined. (d) Themes and categories were compared across individuals and groups. (e) Interview summaries were compiled and shared with individuals during a follow-up interview. (f) Themes and categories of information were reanalyzed and refined based upon the follow-up interviews; hypotheses were developed concerning them and comparisons were made within and across the respondent groups. The methods are fully described in Chapter III.

The Significance of the Study

The findings of this study may be useful on several levels. The significance of the study may be that it provides: (a) information useful to the prospective teachers, by helping them understand themselves and their own professional development; (b) a description of what actually occurs in one university teacher education program from the preservice teacher's point of view; (c) information on the effects of university teacher education on the
values, attitudes, and actions of beginning teachers; (d) information that may help teacher educators better understand the process of becoming a teacher and how teacher perspectives develop; and (e) a basis for enlightened reform initiatives in teacher education.

The Limitations of the Study

Several limitations are inherent in this study. They include: (a) Only one interviewer gathered the self-reported data. (b) The sample is small; the pilot study contained only 4 respondents and the main study contained 21. (c) The setting includes only one teacher education program area (secondary social studies education) within a large university college of education.

Steps taken to insure trustworthiness of the data include: triangulation techniques, field notes, journals, and member checks. Auditability of the study is enhanced by the use of notes and a category coding system used in the analysis of the interview data.

The Outline of the Study

This chapter has described the problem and provided the purpose, methodology, significance, and limitations of the study. The outline of the study is as follows. Chapter II, a review of the literature, presents the background for the study, examines the various frameworks available for examining the process of becoming a teacher, describes the concept of professional socialization, and reviews theoretical and research perspectives on the relationship between professional schools and socialization. Chapter III
describes the methodology and explains the rationale behind it.

Chapter IV presents the data and analysis relating to the respondent groups. Finally, Chapter V summarizes the study, presents conclusions, and provides recommendations for further study.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

Recently renewed public interest in education has raised questions regarding the professional abilities of teachers and the quality of their preparation. This investigation examines the role of university teacher education in the process of becoming a teacher. What really goes on in teacher education? How does teacher education effect the values, attitudes and behaviors of preservice teachers? These are critical questions that have yet to be fully answered. Chapter II of this study reviews four major theoretical frameworks that have been used to analyze the process of becoming a teacher, including: (a) perceived problems of beginning teachers, (b) developmental stages of concern, (c) cognitive development, and (d) teacher socialization. The teacher socialization framework is developed as the conceptualization guiding this study.

The review of literature begins with an examination of the four theoretical frameworks mentioned above. First, the perceived problems approach to the study of the early years of teaching is examined. This approach is then supplemented by three alternative perspectives on teacher development. Next, different perspectives
within the teacher socialization framework are more closely examined. The context and practice of socialization is explored. Finally, the theoretical and research perspectives related to socialization within the professions, with a special emphasis on teaching, are outlined.

**Frameworks for the Examination of the Process of Becoming a Teacher**

**Perceived Problems of Beginning Teachers Framework**

Past investigations of the impact of university training upon teachers have focused on the early induction period and the problems faced by beginning teachers. Knowledge of the problems faced by beginning teachers is an important source of information for the improvement of preservice teacher education programs (Veenman, 1984). For this reason, many studies have been conducted to determine these problems and the relationship between them and teacher education programs.

The transition from university student to classroom teacher can be traumatic, especially when the preservice teacher's ideals and expectations clash with the realities of classroom life. The inconsistency between preservice expectations and inservice realities has been labeled "reality shock" or "transition shock" by researchers in England and Germany (Veenman, 1984). German researchers, Muller-Fohrbrod, Cloetta & Dann (cited in Veenman, 1984) identified five indicators of reality shock. These indicators of reality shock include: (a) perceptions of problems—including subjectively experienced pressures and problems, complaints about
work load, stress and psychological and physical problems; (b) changes in behavior—specifically, teaching behavior that contradicts with personal beliefs; (c) changes in belief systems—such as a shift from progressive to conservative attitudes with respect to teaching methodology; (d) changes in personality and self-concept; and (e) disillusionment that results in the beginning teacher leaving the profession prematurely.

There is no single cause of the experience of reality shock. Possible causes have been speculated by Muller-Fohrbrodt et al. (cited in Veenman, 1984), Ryan (1970; 1979) and McDonald and Elias (1983). Muller-Fohrbrodt et al. categorize the causes as personal and situational. Personal causes of reality shock include: improper attitudes, unsuitable personality characteristics, and a wrong choice for the teaching profession. Situational causes may be inadequate preservice preparation or problematic school situations (shortage of materials, inadequate staffing, and authoritarian, bureaucratic, and hierarchical relationships, etc.). Ryan's (1979) first-year teacher studies point to preservice teacher education as the primary cause of problems faced by beginning teachers. Ryan notes that teachers experience difficulty because of undertraining for the demands of their work, lack of selection criteria in preservice teacher education, and general training instead of training for specific jobs in specific schools. The simultaneous initiation to the adult world and the profession of teaching poses a complex situation for beginning teachers (Ryan, 1970; Ryan et al.,
1980; McDonald & Elias, 1983). Most first-year teachers have to adjust, not only to the demands of a new profession, but also to the new demands of the adult world. For many beginning teachers, the new responsibilities of life after college create added pressures that contribute to reality shock.

It is evident that university teacher education has an important role to play in the extent to which reality shock is experienced by beginning teachers. However, other factors are involved. Further investigation of what happens during teacher education, with regard to changes in preservice teachers' behaviors and attitudes, would add to our knowledge of the role and responsibility of university teacher education regarding problems faced by beginning teachers.

Veenman (1984) reviewed 83 studies in North America and Europe reported in the literature since 1960 that focused on the perceived problems of teachers during their first two years in the classroom. Most of the studies used the prestructured questionnaire method, asking respondents to rate on a point scale the degree to which a problem was encountered, although a few of the studies in the sample used the interview method.

From Veenman's review, general agreement emerged on the kinds of problems beginning teachers experience. The eight most often perceived problems of beginning teachers, in rank order, were (a) handling classroom discipline, (b) motivating students, (c) dealing with individual differences, (d) assessing students' work, (e)
maintaining relationships with parents, (f) organizing class work, (g) dealing with insufficient or inadequate supplies, and (h) handling problems of individual students. Veenman notes that there was a great deal of correlation between elementary and secondary teachers and that classroom discipline was by far the highest rated problem.

The studies reviewed in this first framework for studying teacher development, the perceived problems of beginning teachers framework, has produced an inventory of problems faced by neophyte teachers, but has some weaknesses when it comes to implementing corrective measures addressing these problems. In summarizing the findings of his review, Veenman (1984) points out some of the weaknesses of this research framework:

In spite of the general agreement on the kind of problems beginning teacher experience, it appears that these finding are too general in that they do not consider the various teacher characteristics or individual differences which may influence teachers' perceptions and performance. Nor do they identify and describe the context so that we can understand how environments with varying supports and challenges affect the beginning teacher. (p. 160)

There are several other approaches that can be used to analyze the process of becoming a teacher that go beyond what is found in the inventory of problems. These more recently developed frameworks are more comprehensive in their analysis of the process of becoming a teacher and therefore provide more useful guidance in the creation of interventions that might strengthen teacher education. The three alternative frameworks in the following discussion generally can be
categorized under the heading of teacher development and include (a) developmental stage concerns, (b) cognitive development, and (c) teacher socialization.

**Developmental Stage Concerns Framework**

The developmental stage concerns framework is based upon an empirically constructed theory that combines the research on perceived problems of beginning teachers with research on teacher concerns over time. Research by Fuller (1969) and Fuller and Bown (1975) examined the context of learning to teach (including peers, teacher educators, and clients) and the experience of becoming a teacher. By seeking to better understand the "teacher's life space," Fuller and Bown believed that teacher educators might learn to help the teacher change it for the pupils' benefit. Identifying phases of concerns experienced by teachers also would assist in the development of preservice and inservice interventions that were more appropriate.

Fuller and Bown (1975) describe three distinguishable "stages" or "clusters" of concerns that teachers experience over time. It is noted that these stages describe what teachers are concerned with and not what they are accomplishing. Fuller and Bown point out that there seems to be little doubt that the labels describe clusters of concerns and, consequently, provide a useful means of describing the experience of learning to teach. The first stage, survival concerns, "includes concerns about one's adequacy and survival as a teacher, about class control, about being liked by pupils, about
supervisors' opinions, about being observed, evaluated, praised, and failed" (p. 37). Preservice teachers have these concerns more than experienced teachers and Fuller and Bown speculate that these feelings are evoked by the preservice teacher's status as a student.

The second developmental stage of concerns involves the teaching situation. These are concerns such as having to work with inadequate materials, finding appropriate teaching methods, having too many students, dealing with the pressures of non-instructional duties, etc. These concerns are about the teacher's own performance and are the result of the limitations and frustrations of the particular teaching situation. Inservice teachers have this type of concern more often than preservice teachers.

The third stage of concerns focuses on the pupil. These are concerns of teachers about educational, social, and emotional needs of pupils and about relating to pupils as individuals. Both preservice and inservice teachers express deep concern about their pupils, but preservice and beginning teachers may not be able to address their concerns about pupils because of the overriding concerns about inadequacy and situational demands. The developmental experience of becoming a teacher includes passage through each of the stages of concern.

Adams, Hutchinson, and Martray (cited in Veenman, 1984), in a study of student teaching and first-, third-, and fifth-year teachers, supported Fuller and Bown's theory that self-concerns decrease as teaching experiences increase, while instructional
concerns increase with experience. Lanier (cited in Veenman, 1984) found that student teachers experienced concerns similar to those described by Fuller (1969), but they did not experience these concerns in any particular sequence. Each student teacher did resolve one concern before dealing with the next.

The developmental stage concerns framework as presented by Fuller and her colleagues provides a comprehensive conceptualization of the problems faced by beginning as well as experienced teachers. This framework allows for the incorporation of information that is personally and situationally specific and readily translatable into a conceptual base for teacher education programs (Veenman, 1984).

**Cognitive Developmental Framework**

A third approach to the study of the process of becoming a teacher is the cognitive development framework. This framework approaches the study of teacher career development by addressing the teacher as an adult learner. Theories and conceptions of cognitive development assume that human development results from changes in cognitive structures. Cognitive structures and processes change over time allowing persons at advanced stages of development to function more complexly with regard to behavioral skills, problem-solving, and human relations.

The cognitive development framework draws on the theories and concepts developed in studies of cognitive development (Piaget), moral development (Kohlberg), ego development (Loevinger), conceptual development (Hunt) and epistemological and ethical
development (Perry). All of these theories propose a sequence of stages or cognitive structures organized hierarchically from less to more complex (Veenman, 1984; Sprinthall & Thies-Sprinthall, 1983). Research on teacher effectiveness indicates that teachers with higher cognitive developmental levels function better in the classroom. They tend to be more flexible and adaptive, tolerate stress better, assume multiple perspectives, and use a greater variety of teaching techniques and coping strategies than teachers with lower cognitive developmental levels. In support of these findings, Veenman (1984) cited three studies of successful teacher education programs that were created to promote cognitive development (Glassberg & Sprinthall, 1980; Oja, 1981; Glassberg, 1980). These studies illustrate how increased understanding of cognitive development can be successfully applied in teacher education programs.

**Teacher Socialization Framework**

The fourth and final framework to be examined in this chapter, is the teacher socialization framework. This approach examines the changes in the social person during the process of becoming a teacher. Research using this approach investigates the transmission of teacher beliefs, knowledge, attitudes, and values. Research on the process of becoming a teacher is essentially concerned with how neophyte teachers acquire a "teaching culture" (Feiman-Nemser & Floden, 1984). It seems that neophyte teachers acquire this teaching culture on their own through individual development as well
as from other teachers (Feiman-Nemser & Floden, 1984). The individual development path to acquisition of the culture of teaching may be represented by the developmental stage concerns and cognitive development frameworks discussed above. The acquisition of teaching culture from others is best investigated within the teacher socialization framework.

Various definitions of socialization have been used in the literature, ranging from Merton's inclusive definition that encompasses virtually all changes in teachers through any means (Merton et al., 1957), to narrower definitions that focus on how beginning teachers develop sets of values, behaviors, and attitudes as a result of interactions with their colleagues in the schools. Most studies of teacher socialization have focused on the student teaching experience and the beginning years of teaching. These studies generally identify these periods as the most important times for neophytes in terms of acquiring the culture of teaching. Many studies present the beginning teacher as one who imitates experienced colleagues and learns from them what is acceptable and unacceptable with regard to attitudes and behavior in the school setting.

The importance of the interaction between the neophyte and the experienced teacher has long been noted. In 1932, Willard Waller summed up the importance of this interaction when he stated that, the significant people for a school teacher are other teachers, and, by comparison with good standing in the fraternity of teachers, the
good opinion of students is a small thing and of little price. Notwithstanding Waller's opinion, other factors that shape the beginning teacher's values, attitudes, and behaviors in the classroom have been investigated. Groups other than experienced colleagues that have been studied as potential influences in the socialization process of teachers include the beginning teachers' school administrators (Edgar & Warren, 1969), pupils (Anderson, 1974; Doyle, 1977; Weinstein, 1982;), previous classroom teachers (Lortie, 1975; Tabachnick, Desmone, Adler, & Evans, 1982; Wright & Tuska, 1968) and preservice teacher educators (Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981; Tabachnick, et al., 1979-80; Lacey, 1977; Power, 1981).

Consideration of the power of socialization within the larger process of becoming a teacher is important and should be thoroughly examined. The term "socialization" itself is neutral, but socialization is manifested in many ways and carries different connotations depending on what is being described. For example, the socialization of elementary school students is most often presented in a positive light (Prawat & Anderson, 1982), while teacher socialization often carries a negative connotation (Hoy & Rees, 1977; Lacey, 1977; Popkewitz, 1976; Waller, 1932). In the past, studies of teacher socialization seem to have been critiques of the undesirable effects of the school as a workplace (Feiman-Nemser & Floden, 1984).
Two explanations for the negative overtones of past research in teacher socialization are posited by Feiman-Nemser and Floden (1984). First, those who investigate teacher socialization often do not like what they find.

They [researchers of teacher socialization] believe that existing practices emphasize management and order or support current social class structures rather than their ideals of creativity, learning, and equity....Not surprisingly these investigators see socialization as an undesirable process because it leads to the continuation of school practices they deplore. (Feiman-Nemser & Floden, 1984, p. 56).

This contrasts with the findings of early research of professional socialization. This early research focused on the medical profession and found that the positive public image and valued position of medical doctors in the society gave socialization into the medical profession a positive image despite some undesirable practices (Becker, et al., 1961).

A second explanation for the negative connotations of teacher socialization is that the neophyte is presented as a passive entity molded by outside influences with little power or resistance of his/her own. This second point is well illustrated in the abundant research on attitude acquisition as a result of teacher education at the university.

Many studies provide evidence that students become increasingly idealistic, progressive, or liberal in their attitudes toward education and teaching during their preservice education and then shift to opposing and traditionally conservative and custodial views as they experience student teaching and the beginning years of
teaching (Day, 1959; Rabinowitz & Rosenbaum, 1960; Bucher, 1965; MacIntyre & Morrison, 1967; Hoy, 1968, 1969; Lagana, 1970; McLeish, 1970; Lacey, 1977; Hoy & Rees, 1977; and McArthur, 1981). The liberalization in attitudes that is experienced by preservice teachers can be attributed to the general effect of university study and not particularly the effect of teacher education programs (Veenman, 1984). The restructuring of attitudes is a general phenomenon that occurs at the entry level of all careers and is not restricted to teachers, according to Ulich (cited in Veenman, 1984).

The commonly accepted scenario is that the liberalizing effect that teacher education has on preservice teacher attitudes is "washed out" by the impact of everyday experience in the school. This shift in attitudes does not follow the same pattern for all groups of teachers, but depends in part on four variables that have been described in the literature. First, personal variables have an impact on the direction and intensity of attitude shifts during the beginning years of teaching. Veenman (1984) cited two German studies that found that "depressive, introverted and uncommunicative young teachers changed their attitudes in a more conservative direction than young teachers who did not possess these qualities" (Veenman, 1984, p. 146).

Second, studies by Lacey (1977) and McArthur (1981), and cited in Veenman (1984), provided evidence that preservice teachers' preferences for a particular subject matter were also important variables in the analysis of changes in attitudes toward education
and teaching. In particular, preservice and beginning science teachers were found to become more traditional/conservative in their attitudes toward pupil control than teachers educated in the social studies and humanities.

A third variable that influences the attitude acquisition and change in preservice teachers is the quality and type of program in which they are receiving their teacher education. Zeichner (1983) presents four alternative paradigms that have dominated teacher education in recent years. He acknowledges that differences within each paradigm are not inconsequential, but at the same time emphasizes that each paradigm is held together by a common set of assumptions and goals that makes each distinctive.

A paradigm in teacher education can be thought of as a matrix of beliefs and assumptions about the nature and purposes of schooling, teaching, teachers and their education that give shape to specific forms of practice in teacher education. (Zeichner, 1983, p. 3)

The first and most influential paradigm according to Zeichner (1983) is "behavioristic" teacher education. This approach is based upon positivistic epistemology and behavioristic psychology and emphasizes the specific and observable tasks of teaching that are assumed to be related to pupil learning. Criterion/Performance Based Teacher Education (C/PBTE) is the clearest example of this approach. Zeichner's second paradigm, "personalistic" teacher education, combines the principles of developmental psychology with phenomenological epistemology. Personalistic teacher education uses a "growth" metaphor as opposed to the "production" metaphor of
behavioristic teacher education. Examples of this type of program include "Humanistic Teacher Education" (Combs, Blume, Newmann, & Waas, 1974), "Personalized Teacher Education" (Fuller, 1974), and "Deliberate Psychological Education" (Sprinthall & Thies-Sprinthall, 1983). A third paradigm for teacher education is the "traditional-craft" approach, which is primarily an apprenticeship program where preservice teachers learn about teaching through a trial and error process in the classroom. A strong master teacher-apprentice relationship is the vehicle for the transmission of the tacit knowledge necessary for teachers to be successful (Tom, 1980b). The final paradigm for teacher education cited by Zeichner is the "inquiry-oriented" approach. This approach attempts to foster the development of orientations and skills of critical inquiry while promoting an active role for the preservice teacher in his or her own education. The goal of this approach to teacher education is the development of reflective action on the part of preservice teachers. The promoters of this approach, which include Berlak and Berlak (1981), Zeichner (1981), and Zeichner and Teitelbaum (1982), use the metaphor of liberation in their presentation of this paradigm.

The fourth and most influential variable effecting attitude acquisition and change in preservice and beginning teachers is the institutional characteristics of the school/workplace. Zeichner and Tabachnick (1981) note that there are many studies in the literature that suggest that the impact of teacher education is "washed out" as
a result of experiences in the everyday world of work in the schools. Various explanations have been offered for the shift of preservice teacher attitudes from "idealistic/progressive/liberal" to "custodial/traditional/conservative." The bureaucratic norms of schools (Hoy & Rees, 1977), the evaluative power of superiors such as cooperating teachers and principals (Edgar & Warren, 1969; Edgar & Brod, 1970), the structural characteristics of schools and teachers' work (Dreeben, 1973), the ecology of the classroom, (Copeland, 1980; Doyle, 1977), the reference group of colleagues (Edgar and Brod, 1970), and parents and pupils (Lortie, 1975) have all been identified as playing important roles in the shift of attitudes to education displayed by beginning teachers. The theory of cognitive dissonance provides one perspective for the examination of this attitude shift (Lacefield & Mahan, 1979; Mahan & Lacefield, 1978). This theory holds that as persons experience prolonged cognitive dissonance, such as the conflict in values, attitudes, and behaviors between university teacher education and the schools, they probably will change their attitude to reduce that dissonance.

Although widely accepted, the scenario of the liberal impact of professional education and the progressive-traditional shift in teaching perspectives outlined above has been challenged by two alternative interpretations of the role and impact of the university on teaching perspectives (Zeichner, 1981). The first alternative scenario acknowledges the traditional teaching perspective that surfaces during student teaching and the induction period, but
accounts for its development in an entirely different way. Because of the low impact of professional training and the maintenance of traditional teaching attitudes throughout professional teacher education, this scenario posits that the teaching perspectives of young teachers are in place before formal teacher education.

Lortie (1975) presents the most thorough argument in support of this position. Based upon several extensive interview and questionnaire studies of teachers, Lortie concluded that the degree of the liberalizing effect of the university should be questioned and that the teacher’s personal biography, rather than formal teacher education and teaching experience, was the key element in teacher socialization. In Lortie’s view, close contact with teachers during the years spent as a student leads to the unconscious internalization of teaching models. This so called "apprenticeship of observation" is put forth as the major vehicle of teacher socialization. Formal university teacher education programs are seen as having little impact on the alteration of earlier, more traditional perspectives on teaching.

Lortie’s hypothesis—that teacher socialization is largely completed before formal teacher education—has support in the literature. Petty and Hogben (1980) have provided empirical support for Lortie’s view and several other researchers have identified major socializing influences that occur prior to university teacher education (Stephens, 1967; Wright & Tuska, 1968; Maddox, 1968; Fuller & Bown, 1975; Pruitt and Lee, 1978).
Support for both of these conflicting scenarios is found in the literature of teacher socialization. While both points of view are credible, the scenario of the liberalizing effect of the university remains the most common. In an effort to explore the apparent contradictions between these perspectives, Shipman (1967a) studied the environmental influences on teachers' responses to questions regarding their attitudes toward education. Using questionnaires and individual and group interviews, Shipman found that, "students maintained two levels of professional attitude, one for official use on stage, and one for use backstage, out of official hearing, or later on in the classroom" (1967, p. 55). Preservice teachers were found to be employing what Shipman called "impression management," which allowed them to adopt attitudes and responses that were seen as acceptable by the prevailing ideology of the teacher education program. The apparent shift in attitudes that became evident in research on beginning teachers' perspectives was the result of a veneer that had concealed traditional teaching perspectives throughout the teachers' university training.

Gibson's (1972) study of the effects of teacher education upon role-conceptions of preservice teachers lends some support to Lortie's view. Using a role definition questionnaire, Gibson found that preservice teachers' attitudes became increasingly liberal and less authoritarian in regard to some areas, especially during the first year of teacher education. But, Gibson noted a "hardening of attitudes" regarding corporal punishment and the teacher's
responsibility to students outside of the school. Differences between preservice and inservice teachers' attitudes regarding the roles of the teacher were clear from Gibson's findings, but he was unable to establish a causal relationship between the teacher education program studied and changes in preservice teacher attitudes. A comparative study of the conceptions of preservice and inservice teachers conducted by Finlayson and Cohen (1967) provided further evidence that the liberalizing impact of teacher education was incomplete and occurred for only a limited number of attitudes assessed.

In a longitudinal investigation conducted at five British colleges, Lacey (1977) found that preservice teachers in his sample experienced the usual progressive-traditional shift in attitudes. However, Lacey found that the large shifts in the mean values on his five attitudes scales were not the result of substantial changes of attitudes on the part of individuals, but rather the result of small shifts in attitudes by the majority of preservice teacher in his study. Commenting on the results of his investigation, Lacey stated that:

The major finding of this research underlies the importance of the discontinuity between training and the reality of teaching. The attitudes of beginning teachers undergo dramatic change as they establish themselves in the profession, away from the liberal ideas of their student days towards the traditional patterns in many schools. This change is complex and incomplete. Too much emphasis has been given to the obvious fact that the change occurs, and too little attention paid to the partial and incomplete nature of the change and the realization that new styles of teaching are emerging. (1977, p. 48)
Finally, a number of challenges to the validity of the instruments used to document the progressive-traditional shifts add doubts about the university's effect on the values, attitudes, and behaviors of preservice teachers. The instrument most widely used by researchers of teacher education is the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (MTAI). Cyphert (1972) noted that the MTAI was used by 30 percent of the studies of teacher education between 1955 and 1964. Zeichner and Tabachnick cite Teigland's (1966) study as an example of the problems with the use of the MTAI.

Teigland's study linking liberal movement of the MTAI to high scores on measure of deference and high grades suggest that the MTAI may measure something other than actual attitudes and lends support to Shipman's hypothesis of impression management. (Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981, p. 9)

A significant amount of evidence conflicts with the common scenario of a progressive-traditional shift in the attitudes of preservice teachers. As Zeichner and Tabachnick (1981) point out, this evidence does not support the notion that the effects of teacher education are "washed out" by experience in school. However, the arguments presented by this second scenario characterized the impact of teacher education as essentially non-existent.

A third position on the development of teacher perspectives, presents the schools and the universities as partners in the development of teaching perspectives (Mardle & Walker, 1980; Tabachnick, et al., 1979-80; Power, 1981). This scenario describes the schools and university teacher education institutions as having a significant impact on the attitudes of young teachers, but impact
that is conservative, not progressive or liberal, as described in the commonly accepted scenario.

Bartholomew (1976) argues that the universities are just as conservative and traditional as the schools with respect to the practice of teaching. The major difference between the two is that at the university, preservice teachers are encouraged to couch their statement of beliefs about teaching in liberal language and the discussions about teaching focus on settings outside the university environment. According to Bartholomew:

The key is that as a student he never experiences in practice the liberalism which he is so freely allowed to express in theory....The change to conservative attitudes merely expresses what was the position in practice all the time (1976, p. 123).

Bartholomew's analysis focuses on the separation of theory and practice at the university level. He sees this separation as the key to understanding the shift of students to traditional values when they begin full-time teaching.

Greene (1978) places teacher education in the United States within the capitalist socio-political context. In her critique, she describes teacher education and the schools as using surface realities to mask actuality, thereby keeping powerless people oppressed and unaware of the privileges of the powerful. This process is labeled mystification. Greene points out that:

It is not that teachers consciously mystify or deliberately concoct the positive images that deflect critical thought. It is not even that they themselves are necessarily sanguine about the health of the society. Often submerged in the bureaucracies for which they work, they simply accede to what is taken
for granted. Identifying themselves as spokespersons for—or representatives of—the system in its local manifestation, they avoid interrogation and critique. They transmit, often tacitly, benign or neutral versions of the social reality....they are likely to present the world around as given, probably unchangeable and predefined. (Greene, 1978, p. 56)

Greene's point is further developed by Giroux (1980). In his view, university teacher education is confounded by a paradox. On one hand, teacher education is charged with the responsibility of preparing teachers to learn the knowledge and skills necessary to build a principled and democratic society. On the other hand, teacher education plays a significant role in the reproduction and legitimation of a society that is characterized by social and economic inequalities. This paradox is particularly evident in the way knowledge is conceived in the schools and in teacher education. Zeichner and Tabachnick (1981) note that in most teacher preparation programs, valued knowledge is that which is objective or outside of the learner; it is knowledge that deals with procedures for action rather than rationales for action.

Being a teacher, then, means identifying knowledge that is certain, breaking into manageable bits, and transmitting it to students in an efficient fashion. Being a student means acquiring this knowledge and learning how to use it in a context which does not include criticism and has little patience with analysis. (Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981, p. 9)

According to this view, the effect of teacher education on preservice teachers is conservative because the university does not provide the intellectual and conceptual tools that would allow teachers to reflect upon the ideological and material conditions of
schooling (Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981).

The impact of university teacher education on neophyte teachers has been alternatively described as liberalizing, non-existent, and conservative. All three of these scenarios have considerable support in the literature, therefore, as Zeichner and Tabachnick point out, "we can no longer assume that the role of the university is necessarily a liberalizing one and that the schools are the only villain in the creation of undesirable teaching perspectives" (1981, p. 10).

**Comparison of the Frameworks**

Four frameworks for the examination of the process of becoming a teacher have been presented here. The four frameworks were labeled (a) perceived problems of beginning teachers framework, (b) developmental stage concerns framework, (c) cognitive developmental framework, and (d) teacher socialization framework. Researchers using the perceived problems of beginning teachers framework have produced general agreement on the most often perceived problems of neophyte teachers, but this approach has little to say about how context, teacher characteristics, and individual differences influence teachers' perceptions and performance. The remaining approaches provide more comprehensive alternatives, but derive their concepts and ideas from different sources.

The developmental stage concerns and cognitive developmental frameworks try to explain changes in individuals from some end state (Veenman, 1984). They provide a description of changes the
individual must go through and the mechanisms by which change occurs. The constructs developed by each of these alternative frameworks help to explain individual differences among teachers and why some teachers, at certain levels, may experience more difficulties than other teachers. These frameworks also are helpful to teacher educators and teacher supervisors because they provide a way of categorizing teachers according to how they think and what capacities they do or do not have at various stages. The categorization could be helpful in designing strategies for teacher education and induction programs (Feiman & Floden, 1980; Floden & Feiman, 1981).

Although the developmental stage concerns framework and the cognitive developmental framework provide important and useful alternatives to the perceived problems approach, they still need to be supplemented. Goodlad (1983) has identified the importance of supplementing the psychological orientation of teacher education:

Teacher education programs, virtually since their inception, have been dominated by psychological considerations emphasizing human development, learning, and teaching methods; they have slighted sociological, anthropological, and cultural phenomena, and especially the actual functioning of the schools as a social system with a larger cultural context. (Goodlad, 1983, p. 44)

The developmental frameworks consider changes in the individual as self-directed and primarily use psychological concepts in the investigation of these changes. The teacher socialization framework allows for the use of psychological concepts, but also gives attention to the changes within the context of institutional
settings. Lacey's (1977) concept of "social strategies" may provide explanations of how institutional conditions affect beginning teachers' responses to school and university norms. Lacey's social strategies include: (a) "internalized adjustment," or conformation to expectations; (b) "strategic compliance," or adjustment and conformation with reservations; (c) "strategic redefinition," or modification of expectations. These social strategies might be linked with the cognitive developmental stages of the individual taking these actions to provide a broad-ranging analysis of the effect of psychological and social factors influencing the teacher's actions. But this connection needs further investigation (Veenman, 1984; Tabachnick, Zeichner, Densmore, & Hudak, 1983).

Of the four approaches to the study of the process of becoming a teacher described in this chapter, the teacher socialization framework seems to provide the broadest-based structure for the study of the development of teacher perspectives. The teacher socialization approach allows for the inclusion of both the psychological and social factors that are at play in the developmental process of beginning teachers. Past research has outlined the problems faced by beginning teachers, but has not yielded information about the complex nature of teacher development. Research based upon an interactive paradigm, such as the teacher socialization framework, provides information about the educational situations, the psychological dimension of meanings underlying those situations, and the important personal characteristics of the
individuals that interact in these situations (Veenman, 1984).

Veenman proposes the Lewinian model, which "views behavior as a
function of the person and the environment" (1984, p. 168), as the
preferred model for the research of teacher development.

The B-P-E paradigm does not only propose to study the
behavior as an interactive function of the person and
the environment and to describe the coordination of a
person's cognitive orientation with the degree of
structure of the environment; it also tries to view the
present need for structure of the person on a
developmental continuum along which growth toward
independence and less need for structure is the long-
term objective (Hunt, 1975). (Veenman, 1984, p. 168)

Based upon the review of literature regarding the transition from
student to teacher, this study will operate within the broad
approach described here as the teacher socialization framework. The
next section of this chapter will examine the different ways of
looking at socialization, and specifically examine the context and
practice of socialization.

**The Nature, Context, and Practice of Socialization**

In the previous section of this chapter, four frameworks for
the study of the process of becoming a teacher were analyzed. One
framework, teacher socialization, was identified as the most
comprehensive and, therefore, best suited for this investigation.
In the following paragraphs, a more detailed examination of the
nature, context, and practice of socialization will be made,
including primary and secondary socialization, the nature of
professional and non-professional occupations, and the dimensions of
professional socialization.
Primary and Secondary Socialization

Sociologists differentiate between two basic types of socialization (e.g., Berger & Luckmann, 1966). Primary socialization is the socialization that takes place in primary-group relationships, most often represented by the family. Merton (1957, p. 13) has defined socialization as being, "the process by which people selectively acquire the values and attitudes, the interests, skills and knowledge—in short the culture—current in groups to which they are, or seek to become, a member." While socialization within the family or primary-group setting is significant in its influence on the individual, socialization continues beyond childhood. Secondary socialization is the process of induction into groups outside of the family. Socialization beyond childhood includes induction into adult roles such as spouse, parent, citizen, and worker.

Occupational socialization, a form of secondary socialization, is the process by which neophytes are inducted into and become acquainted with the culture of a new occupation (Corbett, 1980). Past studies of occupational socialization have focused on such diverse activities as physicians (Merton et al., 1957; Becker, et al., 1961), lawyers (Lortie, 1959), nurses (Simpson, Back, Ingles, Kerckhoff & McKinney, 1979), military cadets (Dornbusch, 1955), musicians (Kadushin, 1969), professional thieves (Sutherland, 1937) and waitresses, salesladies, and "schoolma'ams" (Donovan, 1920, 1929, 1938). As evident from the broad ranging subjects, the term
occupational socialization encompasses induction into professional, semiprofessional, and nonprofessional occupations. However, each of these occupational levels differs with regard to knowledge, orientation, and motivation required of its members (Simpson et al., 1979).

This study was concerned specifically with professional socialization as it occurs in the professional education setting. Professional socialization differs from other types of occupational socialization because the routes of entry into these roles require professional schooling (Simpson et al., 1979; Wheeler, 1966). What is it that distinguishes professions among other occupations? How do professions, semi-professions, and non-professions differ? What is the role of professional education in the creation and maintenance of professions? These questions will be discussed in the following section.

**Professionals and Professional Education**

**The Professions**

What is it that distinguishes the professions from other occupations? Hughes (1963) said, "Professions profess. They profess to know better than others the nature of certain matters, and to know better than their clients what ails them or their affairs" (p. 656). It has also been noted that the combination of three factors: (a) highly valued services, (b) authority to define the nature of the services they provide on a basis of a monopoly of specialized knowledge, and (c) self-regulation or control over their
own work, distinguishes professions from other occupations (Simpson et al., 1979, p. 17). Hughes (1958) notes that society gives professions both a license to practice and a mandate to define the nature of the practice.

Licence [sic], as an attribute of an occupation, is ordinarily thought of as legal permission to carry on a kind of work....I have something both broader and deeper, something that is sometimes implicit and of undefined boundaries....For society, by its very nature, consists of both allowing and expecting some people to do things which other people are not allowed or expected to do. All occupations—most of all those considered professions...include as part of their very being a licence to deviate in some measure from common modes of behavior. Professions also, perhaps more than other kinds of occupations, claim a legal, moral and intellectual mandate. Not merely do the practitioners, by virtue of gaining admission to the charmed circle of colleagues, individually exercise the licence to do things others do not do, but collectively they presume to tell society what is good and right for the individual and for society at large in some aspect of life. (p. 79)

When an occupation assumes broad license and mandate and the society legitimizes that license and mandate, the occupation has reached professional status. The medical profession is the prototype professional occupation, because of its exclusive license to practice and a mandate to define the practice. The nature of the problem with which the profession deals, coupled with the public's dependence on the profession's specialized and complex knowledge, leads to the granting of a broad license and mandate.

The power and status of professions are the result of possession of knowledge. Simpson et al. (1979) point out that, as a result, professional schools are powerful institutions that directly
affect the nature of a profession through its practices of selection, instruction, and socialization.

In our society, professions have a privileged position that entails institutionalized roles. Their places are secured in large part by professional schools acting as recruitment agents. The school controls the inflow of labor into its parent profession. It performs three basic tasks. It selects the persons to be admitted to the profession; it educates them in professional knowledge and skills; and it instills appropriate professional orientations. (Simpson et al., 1979, p. 17)

Simpson acknowledges that there is some disagreement over the issue of the professional school's role in the socialization of the new professionals. According to Simpson, socialization is the preparation of people to perform social roles:

It [socialization] cannot occur without an institutionalized role to perform. We assume that the privileged place of a profession is built on its institutionalized role. The role includes orientations that reflect and protect the profession's interests. (p. 17)

The belief that the professional school must instill orientations in students that are consistent with the profession's interests in the marketplace parallels the teacher education institution—school partnership scenario that attempts to explain the traditional and conservative attitudes of beginning teachers.

The Nonprofessions

Nonprofessional occupations differ from the professions in that they have limited licenses and mandates. In nonprofessional occupations, authority does not rest in the practitioners or their colleague groups. Authority for nonprofessional occupations rests
in their positions within organizations or in resources at their disposal (Simpson et al., 1979). Examples of nonprofessional occupations would be secretaries, laborers, and clerks.

The Semiprofessions

Semiprofessions deal in valued services similar to those of the professions, but lack a full mandate and sometimes lack a license. Within the medical profession, nursing is an example of a semiprofession. Other examples of semiprofessions are social work and teaching (cf. Lortie, 1975). Simpson et al. (1979) has outlined the distinguishing characteristics of a semiprofession. She notes that the work of semiprofessions is externally controlled to a significant degree. Their work is organized around bureaucracies and higher-ranked professions and there are sometime elaborate legal restrictions on the occupation that serve to define their roles and set forth rules of conduct. Unlike the professions, semiprofessions do not control the knowledge bases of their work. Semiprofessions, for the most part, use knowledge that is developed by others. This lack of control over the knowledge base serves to undermine the authority base of semiprofessions, limiting their role in making professional judgements and resulting in little autonomy for its members.

Simpson also points out that semiprofessions are limited in their ability to collectively organize and promote their own interests because of organizational differences from professions.

Occupations may be differentiated horizontally or vertically (cf. Barnard, 1938). Different work
settings, work functions, and working hours divide an occupation horizontally. Professions, when differentiated internally, get divided along such lines. Semiprofessions, in contrast, are differentiated vertically. Because their work is organized by bureaucracies and other external sources, their work roles are arranged vertically and differ in authority and prestige. These vertical differences are often reinforced by differences in educational requirements for work roles....vertical differentiation undermines collegialism through its invidious distinctions and power differences among occupational members. When workers in the same occupation differ sharply in what they do, ground for collegiality and other common interests are reduced. (p. 25)

Leaders within many semiprofessions have sought to better their occupations' standings over the years by increasing their control over their work. The route to higher status has typically been through establishing professional schools within colleges and universities, and then securing license over their work. Increased control over the selection of students and the education they receive does not guarantee control over the occupation (Simpson et al., 1979; Wilensky, 1964). "Controlling the entry and education of practitioners enhances control over the occupation most when the education given is related directly to work in the occupation, with a curriculum focused on skills and knowledge used in later practice" (Simpson, et al. 1979, p. 26). Typically, schools of semiprofessions stretch out the periods of training in order to improve their standing. They also borrow concepts and methodologies from established disciplines. This process of licensing through education is characteristic of female dominated occupations such as nursing, social work and teaching (Oppenheimer, 1970). In these
occupations, qualifications for licenses are easily obtained through education. Experience within the field adds little to a candidate's marketability. These requirements for licensing and employment meet the need of the traditionally transitory nature of the female workforce (Simpson et al., 1979).

Using Hughes' (1958) concepts of license and mandate, the categorization of an occupation as a profession or semiprofession and its schools varies. One of the key concepts in the distinction between professions and semiprofessions is the possession of knowledge or a common technical culture. Based upon this criteria, Lortie (1975) has demonstrated that teaching is a semiprofession.

Professional recognition calls for delegating state powers to a group of practitioners; it is presumed that the group possesses collective knowledge not available to "laymen." Yet teachers do not hold the beliefs necessary to assuming such responsibility; they do not claim to be common partakers in a shared body of specialized knowledge or common contributors to "the state of the art." Their depreciation of their special schooling and their individualistic conception of practice run counter to a view of the art as the common (and exclusive) property of initiates; their individualism, I believe, underlies their reluctance to press their case. (p. 80)

In the following sections of this chapter, the dimensions of professional socialization will be discussed. Past investigations of medical socialization will serve as the basis for this discussion. The research on socialization in the medical profession provides the most thorough information on this subject to date and although the semiprofession of teaching differs from the medical profession, many of the findings are transferable to teaching.
The Dimensions of Professional Socialization

Studies of socialization within the medical profession provide
the most thorough models of the professional socialization process
available. The seminal studies in this field include Becker et al.
(1961), The Boys In White, and Merton, et al., (1957) The Student-
Physician. The differing theoretical perspectives of these two
studies will be considered in another section of this chapter. The
studies of Merton and Becker paved the way for more complex and
broad ranging studies of professional socialization within medicine
and other professions. Simpson et al. (1979) studied the process of
becoming a nurse and Bucher and Stelling (1977) examined a cross-
section of medical residents in psychiatry and internal medicine,
and graduate students in biochemistry. These studies provide the
foundation for the investigation of the process of becoming a
teacher, which is the purpose of this study.

Simpson et al. (1979) define professional socialization as
having three dimensions: (a) the imparting of skills and knowledge
to do the work of an occupation, (b) the development of orientations
that inform behavior in a professional role, and (c) the creation of
identities and commitments that motivate the person to pursue the
occupation. Simpson labeled these dimensions: education,
orientations, and relatedness. In this model of socialization, the
professional education a neophyte receives is the most significant
event in the route to becoming a professional. The program of the
professional school is the "pivotal structure of the
The importance of the professional education process goes beyond the imparting of technical skills and information to the would-be professional. The professional education program provides a particular context for the formation of attitudes and values that will affect the future practice of the professional.

Education is the master socialization process, the context for forming cognitive occupational orientations and relatedness to the occupation. The school's educational program corresponds to movement up through the academic years, so that our proxy measure of the acquisition of knowledge and skills is academic class status. This status will be the context within which we observe the development of cognitive occupational orientations and personal relatedness to the occupation. (Simpson et al, p. 29)

According to the Simpson study, the cognitive role orientations that result from professional education include "orientations to the occupational role" and "orientations to a place in the occupation." Cognitive orientations to the occupational role are the orientations that neophytes develop toward a particular way of approaching and carrying out their work. In this case, the professional school is preparing the student to: (a) "see service as the performance of tasks that apply specialized knowledge" and (b) "uphold a conception of the professional role that gives the practitioner authority to make and execute decisions consistent with the occupations knowledge" (p. 30). Cognitive orientations to a place in the occupation pertain to the internal organization of the profession—its power, status, and self-governance. In this case, the
professional school prepares students to: (a) "uphold the professional group as the definer of its service and the developer and/or specifier of appropriate knowledge" and (b) "uphold the profession as the regulator and judge of professional conduct" (p. 30).

The development of what Simpson et al. term "personal relatedness to the professional role" entails something different from the creation of particular attitude and value orientations of students within professional schools. Relatedness to the professional role is a measure of an individual's motivation and interest in the profession. While considered an integral part of professional socialization, the development of orientations and relatedness are not considered derivatives of one another. Orientations that students develop during professional education provide particular standards and criteria that allow the neophyte to perceive a role and a place within the profession. Relatedness, on the other hand, is an indication of the level of connection between the the neophyte's self and the occupation.

The self is related to the occupation in three ways, according to Simpson et al. (1979): (a) status identification, (b) commitment to the occupation, and (c) attraction of the occupation. Status identification is the same concept that has been labeled as "occupational self-image" (Huntington, 1957), "public identity" (Becker, 1963), and "professional self-concept" (Kadushin, 1969). It is the result of a linkage between the students' self-image and
professional status. Professional education plays a particularly important role in the development of status identification through the sponsorship of clinical experiences that allow students to act within the professional role. Simpson points out that these experiences serve to link students with professional roles in the eyes of others creating the beginnings of a professional public identity.

The notion of occupational commitment is descriptive of how individuals take actions that limit or foreclose opportunities for future alternatives. It has been noted that in the process of making an occupational commitment, the individual makes investments in the occupational role. "These investments are made, intentionally or unintentionally, through linkage of other values and activities to the occupational role so that their realization is facilitated through its continued pursuit and would be impossible or difficult if one abandoned it" (Simpson et al., 1979, p. 38). These "linkages" are the result of interpersonal and structural arrangements within the situation in which the individual participates, which in this case is professional school.

The third and final aspect of the notion of relatedness of the self to the occupation is the attraction the occupation holds for the individual. This concept differs from occupational commitment because it is completely positive. Individuals attribute certain positive images and qualities to an occupation, leading to the attribution of values to the occupation as a whole and to its
specific activities. An individual's values and sentiments are the source of occupational attraction. Homans (cited in Simpson et al., 1979) points out that sentiments develop through interaction and common experiences with others. In order for sentiments toward an occupation to develop, there must be some type of interaction or link between the individual and the occupation. "The occupation must be clearly delineated, commonly perceived, and considered salient by the individuals with the occupational context" (Simpson et al., 1979, p. 40). Practical experiences prior to and during professional education may serve to enhance or to retard the attractiveness of an occupation.

Simpson et al. (1979) attempted to clarify the concept of occupational/professional socialization by investigating its multiple dimensions. They demonstrated that socialization involves learning the skills and the knowledge of the occupation, developing orientations to the occupational roles and to a place in the occupation, and relating the person to the occupation. Each of these dimensions is distinct and develops under different conditions. Relations among the dimensions varied, with changes not in one dimension necessarily affecting another dimension. The timing and stability of the development of each dimension was found to be significantly affected by the timing of the student's experiences during professional education. Simpson presented a multidimensional view of professional socialization that they feel merges the two major traditions of research in this field as
represented by Becker et al. (1961) and Merton et al. (1957).

Bucher and Stelling (1977) report a study of how students in professional schools cope with the last phase of their professional education before entering the professional world. In their study of psychiatric residents, internal medicine residents, and doctoral students in biochemistry, Bucher and Stelling investigated the shaping power of the institution and the creation of individual professional identities. They note that the question of how to best prepare neophytes for the professional roles requires more information about how people become professionals and the routes to the established roles, commitments, and career lines, now being followed.

Would-be professionals enter education programs with various levels of clarity, definitiveness, and commitment to the profession (Bucher & Stelling, 1977). Bucher and Stelling note that would-be professionals usually emerge from professional education with a strong sense of professional commitment. Views have become more clear and specific, skills have been acquired, and new priorities, beliefs and values have developed. The primary goal of Bucher and Stelling's research was to link the characteristics of and kinds of experiences provided by socializing institutions, such as professional schools, to the kinds of professional they produced. The basic question guiding their research was how professionals acquire particular identities, commitments, and orientations toward specific career patterns (1977, p. 20).
The two main parts of the conceptual framework provided by the Bucher and Stelling study were structural variables and situational variables. These variables were seen as the most important determinants of the socialization outcomes (professional identity, commitment, sense of career) of professional education.

The structural variables, as identified by Bucher and Stelling, included concepts pertinent to the nature and the organization of the profession and the social structure of the training institutions. The conceptual framework is based upon the concepts of "process" and "segments" (Bucher & Stelling, 1977; Bucher & Strauss, 1961; Bucher, 1965; Coe, 1970; Cafferata, 1974.) Professions are characterized as never being fixed, but always changing and in a process of development. The basic social unit of the profession is a segment. A segment is defined as subgroup within a profession that shares the same identity and similar values, beliefs, and ideas about the nature of the discipline. Six questions about the nature of professional education programs were developed by Bucher and Stelling based upon this perspective on the professions. The questions include: What is the nature of the organization housing the training program and what sorts of affiliations does it have with other institutions? What is the position of the professional staff vis-à-vis the organization? Is there only one segment, or is one segment clearly dominant over a few representatives of the others? What is the relationship of the professionals in the organization to the larger professional
community—who are their colleagues—what is the nature of their contact with them, and do the trainees have contact with these colleagues? What are the selection processes for the training program? Lastly, what activities, steps, and sequences are involved in the training program itself?

The situational variables posited by Bucher and Stelling were expected to be critical to the outcomes of the socialization process. Situational variables were also expected to be affected by changes in the larger structure of the training process. Situational variables included series of questions regarding: (a) role-playing, (b) role models, (c) peer groups, (d) coaching and criticism, (e) "conversion" experience, and (f) status passages.

The information provided by examining both the structural and situational variables of the socialization process in the Bucher and Stelling model of professional socialization provides depth as well as breadth of application.

Outcomes of Socialization

Bucher and Stelling concluded that there was evidence of a programming effect in professional education: "structural and situational variables combined to shape the professional identity and commitment developed by the trainees and to delimit their career options" (1977, p. 264). But, they also found evidence that the programming effect is not failsafe. There were trainees in the study who were "socialization failures." These individuals were small in number, but did exhibit some common characteristics.
Trainees who failed to conform to the general outcomes of the programs: (a) exhibited a relatively strong and well-defined orientation prior to training, (b) maintained support for that orientation during training, and/or (c) minimized contacts that might result in pressure to change that orientation. While the socializing process experienced by trainees did influence their perspectives on the profession and place limits on the options available to them, Bucher and Stelling found no reason to assume that the trainees would be impervious to the influence of situations and relationships in which they would subsequently become involved as professionals.

With regard to the development of professional identity and commitment, the structural variables were found to be important. The structural variables determine the program organization, the perspectives the trainees get in the field, the types of experiences trainees are allowed to have, and the skills that they acquire. These structural variables are said to set the stage for the development of a professional identity and commitment. The situational variables, however, provide the insights into how the process of socialization occurs. Among the situational variables, Bucher and Stelling found that role-playing was by far the most important in the development of a professional identity and commitment. Role-playing was seen as significant because of the part it played in developing the trainees' sense of mastery of the skills and knowledge of the field.
Until one is actually involved in doing the work of the field, it is difficult to demonstrate to oneself or to others that one has acquired the requisite skills and knowledge. It appears, also, that for role-playing activities to result in a sense of mastery, they must involve some degree of autonomy and responsibility on the part of the trainee; the trainee must, at least, perceive that he or she is acting independently, and has the responsibility for those actions. (Bucher & Stelling, 1977, p. 267)

The trainee's perception of having mastered something that laypeople or juniors do not know about or cannot do was clearly linked to commitment and identity. This sense of mastery came from a variety of sources, such as being treated as an expert by others, seeing positive results of prior practice, etc.

Bucher and Stelling note that what trainees perceive to be the knowledge and skills of professionals is the result of what they see professionals doing around them. Mastery of activities peculiar to trainees did not result in identification with professionals. Their data also suggest that the other situational variables, such as role-modeling, coaching, and peer-group relations play only a supportive role in the development of professional identity and commitment. Other situational variables had an influence, but not the overwhelming influence of role-playing.

Bucher and Stelling point out that despite the programming effect, the institution trainees still maintained an active part in the construction of their own professional development. In the role-playing process, the degree of autonomy and responsibility involved in their activities was important. Trainees were not just following orders, but were given assignments in which they exercised
a certain amount of freedom and professional judgement. Selective role-modeling provided a second set of evidence reflecting the active role of trainees in the construction of professional identity. The most prevalent form of modeling found by Bucher and Stelling involved the selecting of specific attributes of another person that the trainee admired. People who were the object of this process of selecting specific attributes were labeled as "partial models." Other types of models were identified, including "negative models" that served as examples of professionals with attributes the trainees definitely did not want to acquire. After analyzing the evidence regarding the modeling behavior, Bucher and Stelling summarized that:

[It] is apparent that these young professionals were exercising judgment, with respect to potential role models. They made choices on the basis of their own judgment, and the most frequent type of model, the partial model, indicates the selectivity of the process. The conclusion is inescapable: These people were constructing their own ideal models. They picked and chose from what they saw, and put together a composite which represented what they would like to see themselves become. (1977, p. 272)

Bucher and Stelling also found that trainees place great emphasis on their own self-evaluation and usually discount criticisms from others. They note that this may be accounted for by the fact that the trainees were not just the objects of evaluation. Trainees evaluated their evaluators as well as the activities they personally were involved in and their own performance. Second, as the trainees' sense of mastery grows, it becomes self-validating. This is an important point for the development of a theory of
professional socialization, for, as Bucher and Stelling point out, it provides a link between the structural and subjective elements of the socialization process.

It is possible for the structure of professional training programs to largely determine what kinds of professionals emerge and, at the same time, for trainees to construct their own identity—if one postulates that: (1) the subjects moving through the system are actively evaluating themselves and others, (2) that they get better at this process, and (3) they acquire a sense of mastery and can more confidently pick and choose from among the elements provided within the structure of the program and validate their own choices. (Bucher & Stelling, 1977, p. 275)

The findings and conclusions of Bucher and Stelling with regard to the active formation of professional identity in the would-be professional coincide with the basic postulate of the symbolic interactionism school of social psychology. A basic postulate of the symbolic interactionism school is that the identity emerges from interaction with others, but individuals have the capacity for self-interaction, allowing a person to participate in the active construction of meaning and identity, rather than merely responding to external forces. It is upon this interpretation that the passive vessel notion of the trainee has been rejected. This leads to a more detailed discussion of the theoretical and research perspectives found in the study of socialization, included in the following section of this chapter.
Ways of Looking at Professional Socialization—
—Theoretical and Research Perspectives

Studies of Medical Socialization

As noted above, the seminal studies of professional socialization are investigations of the medical profession. The Student-Physician (Merton et al., 1957) and The Boys In White (Becker et al., 1961) provide two different approaches to the professional socialization process. Until the publication of Becker's study, it was commonly assumed that professional schools socialized students for professional roles. Becker's study of the experience of medical students at the University of Kansas challenged the findings of Merton (1957), who studied the socialization of medical students at Western Reserve, Cornell, and Pennsylvania universities. Each of these studies established particular approaches for the investigation of the socialization process. Merton's approach to the study of socialization has been variously labeled as the induction, assimilation, normative, and Columbia approach. It focuses on professional education. Becker's approach to socialization has been labeled the reaction or situational approach and it focuses on motivations, identities, and commitments.

The Induction Approach

Simpson et al. (1979) identify four basic assumptions upon which the induction approach rests. First, a profession is an occupation that is institutionalized in society and around which a professional subculture develops. Second, the main repository of
this subculture is the professional school and its faculty, "who are charged by their parent professional with instructing students in the knowledge and skills of professional practice and, through their contact with students, with introducing them to the norms and lore of the profession" (Simpson et al., 1979, p. 7). Third, the professional school is a subsystem of the professional system. Fourth and lastly, entrance into a professional school places the individual at the level of student-professional, a transitional status where he or she is viewed as a professional in the making.

Studies employing the induction approach analyze students' experiences within the context of professional education. Socialization is presented as involving the simple acquisition of attitudes, values, skills, and behavior patterns that have been deemed appropriate for that professional role. In the induction approach, socialization involves teaching the explicit curriculum of the professional school and modeling the behavior of professionals with whom student-professionals work. Although professional socialization may not be completed during the training period, the problem of socialization is viewed as matter of transmitting the professional culture to students that have chosen to learn it. Simpson et al. (1979) note that the most basic tenet of the induction approach is that, "social learning occurs during professional education—norms are imparted, attitudes are formed to accord with the norms, and appreciation is gained of ends toward which the profession's work is directed" (p. 8-9). Examples of
research conducted from this approach include Sherlock and Morris (1967) and Kadushin (1969).

The Reaction Approach

Studies using the reaction approach view professional education as a subsystem of its parent profession. The reaction approach questions the basic assumptions of the induction approach, which include the belief that, "a professional role is institutionalized by society, that it is regulated by cultural norms shared by its practitioners, and that these norms transcend the social context where professional roles are enacted" (Simpson et al., 1979, p. 10). Instead, the reaction approach views professional education as being made up of independent groups that share common objectives.

The major difference between the reaction and induction approaches centers on the question of social control of behavior. The induction perspective views a profession as a single system, with the professional school as an agency of that system. In this view, social control arises from shared interests and viewpoints that are passed on to would-be professionals during their educations. The reaction approach conceives of social control as a matter of power. Positions differ in the amount of power they provide. As a would-be professional moves from student status to a position as a beginning professional, more behavioral options are open to that person. Changes in constraints and options for behavior require new adaptations. The focus of the reaction approach is on students and how they adapt to the immediate
situation, not on the ideal image of the professional role.
Professional education is acknowledged as an important factor in the
development of skills and behaviors, but, because the power and
status of the student changes when he or she becomes a practitioner,
the attitudes and behaviors of the individual will change. The
reaction approach is concerned with the emergent identity of the
neophyte and how he or she adapts to the immediate environment.

**Perspectives on Teacher Socialization**

**The Relationship Between the Individual and Society**

Zeichner (1980) stated that the "problem of teacher
socialization" is one part of the larger question regarding the
relationship between individuals and societal institutions. Brim
(cited in Zeichner, 1980) outlines the two major interests in the
study of the relationship between individuals and institutions:

One interest is in how individuals adjust to society
and how in spite of the influence of society on them
they manage to be creative and to transform the social
order in which they have been born. The other is the
interest in how society socializes the individual—how
it transforms the raw material of biological man into a
person suitable to perform the activities of society.
(Zeichner, 1980, p. 3)

Brim continues by recommending that, "inquiry at all times is
concerned with how society changes the natural man, not how man
changes his society" (cited in Zeichner, 1980, p. 3). The history
of research on teacher socialization reflects the influence of
Brim's recommendation and the record of research illustrates an
overwhelming interest in how society transforms the individual.
This view of the relationship between individuals and societal
institutions has been labeled the functionalist model of socialization. The work of Merton et al. (1957) and the induction approach reflect the application of this model to the analysis of professional education and its role in the socialization process.

Recent research has attempted to challenge the deterministic framework of the functionalist model of socialization. The reaction approach to the study of socialization during professional education is an example of the challenge (e.g., Becker et al., 1961; Olesen & Whittaker, 1968). These dialectical models of socialization focus on the interplay between individuals and society.

It is important to emphasize that the relationship between man, the producer, and the social world, his product, is and remains a dialectical one. That is, man (not, of course, in isolation but in his collectivities) and his social world interact with each other....Society is a human product. Society is an objective reality. Man is a social product....An analysis of the social world that leaves out any one of these three moments will be distortive. [Emphasis in original.] (Berger & Luckmann, 1966, p. 61)

Berger and Luckmann also point out that sociology has long avoided addressing the first of these "moments"—society as a human product. This avoidance has resulted in an undialectical distortion of social reality that promotes viewing society through "thing-like" categories instead of as an ongoing human production.

Dialectical models of socialization focus on the constant interplay between individuals and institutions within society that serve socializing functions. According to this view of socialization, "while social structures are compelling in the construction of identity the concept of socialization should define
people as both recipients and creators of values" (Popkewitz, cited in Zeichner, 1980, p. 4). The dialectical model attempts to provide a more comprehensive theory of socialization by acknowledging the constraints of social structures but at the same time not overlooking the active role individuals play in the construction of their own identities. Actions and beliefs of individuals that contradict the dominant norms and values that pervade a particular social setting serve as evidence that the individual is not just a passive vessel, but plays a part in the resistance to and transformation of the prevailing social structure. In the following sections, studies representing both the functionalist and dialectical models of teacher socialization will be reviewed.

**Functionalist Studies of Teacher Socialization**

The functionalist model of socialization stresses two basic points (Lacey, 1977). First, socialization is the process whereby individuals are "fitted" to society. This notion is very prevalent in accounts of primary socialization and the role of the family. One of the features of the functionalist point of view is that socialization is viewed as a process with a finite end point or final product. This final product is the result of development through a number of stages that build upon one another. The second point stressed by the functionalist model is that humans are basically passive vessels that give way to the forces of socialization, accepting without resistance the attitudes, values, and behaviors deemed appropriate by the society. This element of
the functionalist model is evident in the definition of socialization provided by Merton et al. (1957), cited in a previous section of this chapter, and in the work of Emil Durkheim, a sociologist that published his major work in the latter half of the nineteenth century.

There is a high degree of determinism within the functionalist model of socialization. In this model, individuals are portrayed as having little choice. When joining a group, the individual has only one option, that is, to accept the norms and values of the group. Lacey (1977) points out that this deterministic character is the result of the model's "emphasis on structural form and the unchanging nature of social institutions" (p. 19).

Zeichner's (1980) review of the literature on occupational socialization, and in particular the socialization of student teachers, resulted in the identification of seven "key processes" in the socialization of teachers. These key processes included: (a) an emphasis on early childhood, (b) emphasis on peer culture, (c) an emphasis on persons with evaluative power, (d) an emphasis on pupils as socializing agents, (e) an emphasis on lateral role and the socializing influence of nonprofessional agents, (f) an emphasis on the ecology of the classroom, and (g) an emphasis on the influence of a teacher subculture and the bureaucratic structure of schools.

**Emphasis on early childhood.** This position argues that the preservice teacher does not enter professional education as a tabula rasa. The major socializing experiences are found to occur at a
point prior to entrance into a formal training program. Zeichner cites the work of Lortie (1975) and Wright and Tuska (1968) as the major researchers giving primacy to this point of view.

Lortie (1975) has argued that biography rather than formal training is the key element in the socialization process of teachers. He states that, "socialization into teaching is largely self-socialization; one's personal dispositions are not only relevant, but, in fact, stand at the core of becoming a teacher" (p. 79). According to this view, the preservice teacher's "apprenticeship of observation" or the observing and internalizing of characteristics of teaching models during years as a student accounts for the major part of socialization into the teaching profession. On the basis of his extensive studies of the teaching population, Lortie concluded that teachers emphasize a certain individualism that results from a lack of pedagogical training, a reliance on personal trial and error methods in teaching, and a lack of a common technical language in teaching. Personal experience was identified by teachers as their most important teacher. Lortie's emphasis on the "apprenticeship of observation" is supported in other research in the literature (Maddox, 1968; Fuller & Bown, 1975; Pruitt & Lee, 1978; Petty & Hogben, 1980).

Wright and Tuska (1968) emphasize the importance of early childhood in the socialization of teachers, but with an explanation much different from Lortie. Using a Freudian psychological framework, Wright and Tuska argued that the choice of teaching as a
profession and behavior in the teaching role were the acting out of childhood fantasies. The views presented by Lortie and Wright and Tuska emphasize the primary role played by early childhood and present formal teacher education as having little or no effect on the beginning teacher.

**Emphasis on the influence of persons with evaluative power.**

Literature with this emphasis places the major sources of socializing influence within the formal educational process. Zeichner notes that the work of Edgar and Warren (1969), which described the role of the cooperating teacher and the college supervisor during the student teaching phase of preservice teacher education, provided the theoretical framework for most these investigations. Edgar and Warren stress the view that "power" is a key condition in occupational socialization. In their study of beginning teachers, they identified power as, "the ability of A to sanction B; control and influence then are treated as dependent upon the ability to sanction" (p. 388). The process of occupational socialization is presented as a "power process".

In the course of interaction with other persons, the individual is punished for failure to live up to the expectations of others about his performance and is rewarded for conforming to or reaching the expectations of others....These evaluations and sanctions no doubt vary with the stage of the individual's career in an organization, and the "significant others" in the occupational socialization process probably differ from stage to stage. (Edgar & Warren, 1969, p. 388)
Most of the literature that focuses on this topic has attempted to assess the influence of the cooperating teacher as a socializing agent. Corbett (1980) and Friebus (1977) have pointed out that the cooperating teacher, as the individual with the closest contact with the student teacher and as the person primarily responsible for the student teaching experience, has been the logical choice for examination. There is an overwhelming amount of literature that points to the cooperating teacher as the most influential agent in the socialization process of teachers. Much of this research has focused on the shift of attitudes and behaviors of student teachers to positions more like those of their cooperating teachers during the student teaching experience (e.g., Scott & Brinkley, 1960; Price, 1961; Iannaccone, 1963; Yee, 1969; Roberts & Blankenship, 1970; Seperson & Joyce, 1973; Zevin, 1974).

Studies of the influence of the college supervisor during the student teaching experience have shown that there is little evidence that the college supervisor is a significant agent in the socialization process (Morris, 1974; Zevin, 1974; Bowman, 1979). However, Friebus (1977) and Tabachnick et al. (1979-1980) did find that college supervisors had a limited influence with regard to practical matters of classroom teaching.

These studies place little or no emphasis on the the preservice teacher's predispositions and intentions (Zeichner, 1980). The major sources of socialization are identified as existing in the formal education process.
Emphasis on peer influence. As a result of Becker et al.'s (1961) finding that the peer subculture played a significant role in the occupational socialization process, Zeichner points out that, although they are few in number, studies have been conducted with regard to the role of peer influence in the socialization of teachers. Studies by Friebus (1977), Karmos & Jacko (1977), and Iannaccone and Button (1964) have found that peers play a limited supportive role during student teaching, however, it has been generally concluded that peer subculture is not very important because of the lack of opportunities for student teachers to interact.

Emphasis on pupils as socializing agents. Zeichner's review of the literature produced only one study that pointed toward the pupils as important socializing agents. Friebus (1977) found that pupils provide student teachers with an important source of performance evaluation indicating that pupils play an active role in the shaping of the student teacher's attitudes and behaviors as a teacher.

Emphasis on lateral roles and the influence of nonprofessional agents. In a study of student nurses, Olesen and Whittaker (1968) defined lateral roles as nonorganizational roles of the trainee, such as mother or wife. In their study, they found evidence that lateral roles created conflicts of time and interest that affected the socialization process of student nurses. However, studies of preservice teachers (Karmos & Jacko, 1977; Friebus, 1977) have
discovered that only a limited influence (both positive and negative) in the socialization process is exerted by friends, spouses, and relatives of the prospective teacher.

**Emphasis on the ecology of the classroom.** Studies that have investigated the ways in which environmental demands of the classroom limit teacher behaviors include Jackson (1968), Dreeben (1973), Sharp and Green (1975), Doyle and Ponder (1975) and Dale (1977). These studies have challenged the notion that the cooperating teacher is the primary cause of shifts that occur in the attitudes and behaviors of student teachers. Rather, factors that are not under the control or either the cooperating teacher of the student teacher, such as past experiences and aptitudes of pupils, were found to be significant influences on teacher behavior. Zeichner points out that these studies do not deny influence of cooperating teachers on student teachers, but they do question the primacy of influence in light of the ecological system of the classroom. Zeichner also states that, while presenting a more complex explanation of the socialization process, these studies view the prospective teacher as playing a passive role in the process, responding simply to the ecological demands of the situation.

**Emphasis on the influence of a teacher subculture and the bureaucratic structure of schools.** The emphasis in these studies is on the situational adjustment of the prospective teacher to the beliefs and practices of organizational norms (Zeichner, 1980). Many of the important studies in this category center around the use
of Hoy's concept of pupil control ideology. Pupil control ideology is defined along a custodial-humanistic dimension:

A custodial pupil control ideology stresses the maintenance of order, distrust of students, and a punitive moralistic approach to pupil control. A humanistic ideology emphasizes an accepting trustful view of pupils and an optimism concerning their ability to be self-disciplining and responsible. (Hoy & Rees, 1977, p. 24)

Hoy (1967, 1968, 1969) and Hoy and Rees (1977) found that the pupil control ideologies of student teachers were generally more custodial after student teaching than before. Student teachers' views also were found to become more bureaucratic by the end of student teaching (Hoy & Rees, 1977). There were instances where individuals did not fit in the general trend. In addition, Helsel and Krchniak (1972) found evidence that contradicts the finding of Hoy and Rees. In their study of preservice and inservice teachers, Helsel and Krchniak found that experienced teachers were less bureaucratic than preservice teachers.

In addition to the problem of generalization of the findings of these studies, Zeichner identifies the incongruence between beliefs and actions to be one of the major problems in this type of research. The studies of pupil control ideology were investigations of expressed attitudes. The degree of carry over of these attitudes to the classroom in the form of practice is open to question.

The transition from preservice to inservice teacher has also been the subject of investigation (Iannaccone & Button, 1964; Willower, 1969; Salzillo & Van Fleet, 1977; Polanksy & Nelson,
These studies of how neophytes are initiated into a teacher subculture are consistent with Hoy's findings on bureaucratic socialization. Zeichner (1980) concludes that although there is much empirical support for the findings of this research, it cannot be concluded that all prospective teachers become more custodial and bureaucratic in their beliefs and attitudes.

Summary and Critique of the Functionalist View of Teacher Socialization

The functionalist perspective contributed much to our understanding of the process of teacher socialization, but, as Zeichner (1980) notes, it has failed to account for the variations in teaching perspectives that are the result of the process. The emphasis in these studies of teacher socialization is on the prospective or beginning teacher as a passive entity responding to external forces.

The issue of internalization is not problematic. In the case of studies emphasizing biographical factors the student teacher is a slave to the past, while in studies emphasizing social structural elements, he/she is a slave to the present. In neither case is the trainee seen as an active force contributing to his/her own socialization. (Zeichner, 1980, p. 18).

Apple (cited in Zeichner, 1980) points out that a theory of socialization must be able to account for deviations from the norms. The functionalist model has failed to meet this requirement.

Wrong's (1961) critique of the dominant functionalist perspective in the literature characterized the emphasis on the adjustment of the individual to the situation while neglecting the active role of the individual as an "oversocialized conception of
man." This oversocialized conception is evident in the literature on teacher socialization. Olesen and Whittaker (1968) point out that, "unlike the submissive zombies of our caricature, [students] do in fact shape the role and take an active part in their own education" (p. 7).

Drawing heavily from the studies of medical socialization described above, Zeichner has identified four elements within the literature on socialization that point toward a more dialectical process of socialization. These are: (a) impression management, (b) selective modeling, (c) self-legitimation, and (d) studentship.

First, impression management is the process of controlling the images that another person has of one's performance. Becker et al. (1961) describes the process of doctors-in-training seeking out clues as to the kinds of performances faculty valued and then engaging in those behaviors regardless of whether or not they were part of the trainee's internal belief system. This process of "fronting" or "chameleonism" is evidence that the socialization process is not totally complete. There is evidence of "fronting" in supervisory interactions during student teaching (e.g., Shipman, 1967b; Sorenson, 1974; Gibson, 1976; Lacey, 1977; Tabachnick et al., 1979-1980). Shipman (1967b) posits that the behavioral conformity evident in functionalist studies is in fact only a veneer.

A second element pointing toward the dialectical nature of the process of socialization is the finding that modeling of mentors is a partial, not a global, process. The literature on the
socialization of teachers implies that the cooperating teachers is modeled indiscriminately and uncritically by the student teacher. As noted earlier in this chapter, Bucher and Stelling (1977) found evidence that the modeling process in the medical profession is by no means global. Zeichner points out that Copeland (1978) also found the modeling process to be selective in a study of the relationship between student teachers and cooperating teachers.

Thirdly, trainees were found to emphasize their own self-evaluation and to discount criticism that contradicted with their own assessments of their performance. As noted above, Bucher and Stelling (1977) found that as trainees gained greater mastery over professional tasks, their dependence on others for validation decreased. Friebus (1977) found that many student teachers function "as active contributors to their own socialization" by acting as their own source of legitimation. Because of the tacit nature of much of the knowledge about teaching (Diamonti, 1977), self-evaluation and selective acceptance of criticism is enhanced. The result of increased reliance upon self-validation on the part of the trainee is an insulation from certain forces of socialization and, therefore, increases control of the entire socialization process.

The final factor identified by Zeichner as indicative of a dialectical socialization process is "studentship." This is referred to by Olesen and Whittaker (1968) and Becker et al. (1961) as a process in which trainees pursue activities that they believe will be helpful to them in the future—that is, providing themselves
with the greatest variety of experiences. In Becker et al.'s study, this meant avoiding or de-emphasizing certain activities that were valued by the faculty (e.g., laboratory reports), but were not consistent with the trainee's priorities. Examples of "studentship" are also found in studies of student teaching. Drawing on the work of Iannaccone (1963), Hooper and Johnson (1973), Popkewitz (1977), Tabachnick (1980) and Tabachnick et al. (1979-1980), Zeichner (1980) pointed out that:

the finding that student teachers tend to develop utilitarian perspectives on teaching and focus largely on what will work to solve the immediate problem at hand rather than considering the possible ethical and long-range consequences of classroom actions is evidence that this perspective is active during the student teaching experience. (p. 24)

The evidence supporting a view of socialization as dialectical goes beyond these four elements that generally act as undercurrents and are not visible on the surface. There are also cases of active and overt resistance to dominant and accepted patterns of thought and behavior. Zeichner notes that in the studies of the socializing effect of persons with evaluative influence and the bureaucratic nature of the structure of school, "there were instances where students did not conform to the dominant patterns" (1980, p. 25). The functionalist studies examined general trends and ignored the significance of individual cases other than indicating that discrepant cases lowered statistical correlations. Functionalist studies have contributed much to the understanding of the socialization process, but they have failed to account for instances
of resistance, both overt and covert. Lacey (1977, p. 48) stated that "too much emphasis has been give to the obvious fact that change occurs, and too little attention paid to the partial and incomplete nature of the change."

The Dialectical Perspective of Teacher Socialization

The dialectical perspective attempts to construct a model of the socialization process that incorporates and at the same time goes beyond the findings of functionalist studies. Dialectical models of socialization focus on the constant interplay between individuals and the institutions into which they are socialized (Berger & Luckmann, 1966). This model views the process of teacher socialization as one in which the prospective teacher adjusts to his or her role as a teacher without deep internal changes in beliefs and attitudes.

Attempts to develop dialectical models of socialization include the theoretical framework for medical socialization developed by Bucher and Stelling (1977), Lacey's (1977) social strategies approach to teacher socialization, and the use of the construct of "perspectives" in the study of teacher socialization (Zeichner & Grant, 1981; Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1985; Tabachnick et al. 1979-1980). The latter two of these attempts will be briefly reviewed.

Lacey (1977) uses the term "social strategy" to describe a set of action-ideal systems that account for both the constraining social forces in a situation as well as the individual's purpose within that situation. This concept allows for the accounting of
different responses of individuals based upon both social structure and biography. It allows the individual to be viewed as having the freedom to manipulate the situation while at the same time being constrained by it (Zeichner, 1980). Individuals may potentially exhibit three categories of responses to social situations. Lacey labeled these responses as: (a) strategic compliance, (b) internalized adjustment, and (c) strategic redefinition.

Lacey's first two social strategies, strategic compliance and internalized adjustment, are closely related to Becker et al.'s (1964) notion of situational adjustment. Strategic compliance is defined as occurring when, "the individual complies with the authority figure's definition of the situation and the constraints of the situation but retains private reservations about them" (Lacey, 1977, p. 72). In this case, the individual merely is seen to be "good." Strategic compliance is similar to the notion of impression management and "fronting" cited earlier. Internalized adjustment represents a deeper change in the individual. In this case, "the individual complies with the constraints and believes that the constraints of the situation are the best" (Lacey, 1977, p. 72). In the case of internalized adjustment, the individual is making a value commitment, while in the first stage, strategic compliance, the behavior of the individual conforms.

The third social strategy in Lacey's model is strategic redefinition. This term is used to describe overt instances of deviance. Here, change is being brought about by individuals
without the formal power to do so by causing those with formal power to change their interpretation of what is happening in the situation. This category of response adds an "active and creative ingredient to the model of teacher socialization" (Zeichner, 1980, p. 29). The addition of Lacey's social strategies to the functionalist model of teacher socialization allows for the investigation of instances of resistance and redirection of socialization efforts by the individual. According to this view of teacher socialization, as prospective teachers proceed through their formal education there is a continual interaction between biography and social structure in the individual's choice of social strategy. While constrained by both of these elements, the individual plays an active role in his or her own professional development.

Another approach to the development of a dialectical model of teacher socialization is centered around the use of the concept of "perspectives." Zeichner and Grant (1981) question the exclusive focus on expressed attitudes and ideology in much of the functionalist literature. The mixed results from these studies and their focuses on central tendencies and "significant" results require more information than what is available through inventory surveys. The construct of "perspectives" has been identified as a useful vehicle for overcoming the limitations of studies that have focused strictly on teacher ideologies. Becker et al. (1961) first developed this construct in a study of professional socialization. The term perspective was used to refer to:
a co-ordinated set of ideas and actions a person uses in dealing with some problematic situation, to refer to a person's ordinary way of thinking and feeling about and acting in such a situation. These thoughts and actions are co-ordinated in the sense that they flow reasonably, from the actor's point of view, from the ideas contained in the perspective. (Becker et al., 1961, p. 34)

An individual's perspective may be viewed as the underlying rationale or the justification for his or her actions.

Adler (1984) outlined the notion of teacher perspectives. She notes that the construct of teacher perspectives captures the ideas, behaviors, and contexts of particular teaching acts. Perspectives differ from abstract statements of ideology because they are anchored in the world of actual situations and have reference to particular behaviors. As a result, a perspective is what amounts to an, "operational philosophy developed out of experiences in the immediate and distant past, and applied to specific situations" (Adler, 1984, p. 14). Continuing to outline the parameters of "teacher perspectives", Adler has pointed out that perspectives must be view together with the behaviors to which they lead in particular situations. Teacher perspectives then take into account a broad range of factors, including the teacher's background, beliefs, assumptions, the context of the classroom and the school, how these elements are interpreted, and the interpretation's influence on the teacher's actions.

Several studies have been conducted that rely in whole or in part on the investigation of teacher perspectives, but the body of work is still small (Adler, 1984; Gibson, 1976; Hammersly, 1977;
Iannaccone, 1963; Tabachnick et al., 1979-1980). Among other things, these studies show that the development of specific perspectives is related to biography, university teacher education programs, and the characteristics of classroom and schools used in early field experiences. Zeichner and Grant (1981) have pointed out that:

while this line of research has only just begun to articulate the linkages between the development of student teacher perspectives and the ecological and psychological contexts that predispose students to think and act in particular ways, this approach offers much potential for illuminating some of the existential reality of becoming a teachers. (p. 310-311)

Summary

This review of literature examined four alternative research frameworks for the study of the process of becoming a teacher. The teacher socialization framework was found to be the most appropriate framework for this study because of its flexibility—allowing the inclusion of important factors from each of the other frameworks—and comprehensiveness. Next, the nature, context, and practice of socialization was analyzed. The concept of professional socialization was examined and the dimensions and outcomes of socialization were described. The final section of this chapter reviewed selected theoretical and research studies of professional socialization. Studies that focused on teacher as well as medical socialization were reviewed.
Drawing upon the teacher socialization research framework several questions that need further research have been identified:

1. What do preservice social studies teachers regard as worthwhile knowledge, skills, and experiences in learning how to teach?

2. What is the nature of their teaching perspectives or underlying rationales of teaching?

3. What factors influence the formation and development of preservice teachers' perspectives?

4. What is the relative importance of each factor in the socialization process?

5. What factors might teacher educators be able to influence or control?

These questions incorporate important elements of the dialectical model of teacher socialization, as described in this chapter. The concept of "perspective," as developed by Becker et al. (1961) and extended by Tabachnick et al. (1979-1980), Zeichner & Tabachnick (1985), and S. Adler (1984), serves as the construct around which the research has been organized. Analysis of the perspective development process is guided by the theory of professional socialization as constructed by Bucher and Stelling (1977), with attention focused on both the constraints of socializing institutions and individuals' reactions to these constraints during the socialization process.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

Rationale

The rationale for choosing one methodology over another is linked to the nature of the subject being investigated and the goals of the inquiry. Because this study explored the complex processes of the socialization of preservice teachers during university training through the analysis of individual teaching perspectives, the researcher believed it was necessary to use a methodology that incorporated the ideas, actions, thoughts, and feelings of the participants themselves as the major focus for the inquiry.

Learning to teach is a very human activity. It involves teacher educators, academicians, in-service teachers, as well as preservice teachers and their families, peers, and various other actors. The assumption underlying this study is that the preservice teacher plays an active part in the process of learning to teach and is therefore an important resource in better understanding the forces at work in the teacher socialization process. What preservice teachers say about themselves and the process of learning to teach is the basic data for the inquiry.
Gaining insight into another human being's thoughts, ideas, beliefs, and actions, and the forces and factors behind them requires interaction and reflection. In this study, the investigation of teacher socialization during university training was based upon an analysis of the teaching perspectives of preservice students. Teaching perspectives, as defined by Becker et al. (1961), are a coordinated set of ideas and actions a person uses in dealing with some problematic situation. Considering that individuals' reports of their teaching perspectives is the basis of the investigation, the research methodology that seemed most appropriate was that known as the phenomenological approach (Bogdan & Biklin, 1982) or naturalistic inquiry (Guba & Lincoln, 1981; Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

A phenomenological perspective is concerned with understanding the subjects from their own point of view. Researchers that take a phenomenological stance:

attempt to understand the meaning of events and interactions to ordinary people in particular situations....What phenomenologists emphasize, then, is the subjective aspects of people's behavior. They attempt to gain entry into the conceptual world of their subjects in order to understand how and what meaning they construct around events in their daily lives. (Bogdan & Biklin, 1982, p. 32).

Guba and Lincoln (1981) refer to the naturalistic paradigm as phenomenological, anthropological, or ethnographic, and characterize it as a posture rather than a specific methodology. The naturalistic paradigm is based on a phenomenological epistemology and is a major competitor of what Guba and Lincoln have labeled the
"scientific" paradigm, which is based on a logical positivist epistemology (Guba & Lincoln, 1981). Lincoln and Guba (1985) have summarized five points of contrast between these two paradigms based upon each paradigm's assumptions about: (a) ontology, (b) epistemology, (c) generalizations, (d) causal linkages, and (e) axiology.

1. In the positivistic paradigm, there is a single tangible reality "out there" upon which inquiry can converge. That reality is fragmentable into independent variables and processes that can be studied individually without disturbing the other parts. The naturalistic paradigm holds that there are multiple constructed realities that can only be studied holistically. Inquiry into these realities will diverge as more is known (because each inquiry raises more questions that it answers) so that prediction and control become unlikely.

2. The positivistic paradigm holds that the inquirer and the object of inquiry are independent, constituting a dualism. The naturalistic paradigm holds that the inquirer and the "object" of inquiry interact and are inseparable.

3. The aim of positivistic inquiry is to develop time- and context-free generalizations. The aim of naturalistic inquiry is to develop a body of idiographic knowledge in the form of time- and context-bound "working hypotheses."
4. The positivistic paradigm holds that every action can be explained as the result of a real cause that precedes the effect or is simultaneous with it. In the naturalistic paradigm, all entities are in a state of mutual simultaneous shaping, so that it is impossible to distinguish effects from causes.

5. Positivistic inquiry is held to be value-free. The value-free nature of the inquiry is "guaranteed" by virtue of the objective methodology employed in the inquiry. Naturalistic inquiry is value-bound in several ways including the influences of the inquirer, the choice of paradigm, the choice of theory used as a guide to inquiry, and the choice of the research context.

Although the two paradigms are not methods of inquiry, the axioms of each paradigm outlined above call for different styles or modes of research. Lincoln and Guba (1985) have outlined the implications of doing naturalistic research based upon the axioms of the naturalistic paradigm as a guideline for naturalistic researchers. They describe 14 characteristics of operational naturalistic inquiry and justify these characteristics in two ways. First, the characteristics have a logical dependence on the axioms that support the naturalistic paradigm. Secondly, the characteristics display coherence and independence. Lincoln and Guba's 14 characteristics of naturalistic inquiry are:

- natural setting
- human data-gathering instrument
- utilization of tacit knowledge
- qualitative methods
- purposive sampling
- inductive data analysis
grounded theory
emergent design
negotiated outcomes
case study reporting mode
idiographic interpretation of data
tentative application of findings
focus-determined boundaries
special criteria for trustworthiness

Lincoln and Guba (1985) provide an illustration of how each of these characteristics is strongly interdependent upon the other. Each provides support of the others and the exclusion of one characteristic affects all. The naturalistic researcher is compelled to enter the natural setting because of an inability to specify an a priori theory or hypothesis and a lack of knowledge about what is necessary to control or even important to study in the setting. In these circumstances, problem identification and the focusing of boundaries of the study cannot be accomplished until the inquirer has spent time in the setting. If the theory that results from the investigation is to be grounded in data, then the data must be located and analyzed inductively. The instrument used in the collection of data, the human instrument, must be one that is adaptive and sensitive enough to identify useful sources. Methods that extend the use of the senses (interview, observation, document analysis) are most compatible with the human instrument. Lincoln and Guba (1985) point out that:

These methods result in insights and information about the sending context so that the extent of transferability and applicability in some other receiving context may be judged. No aggregations, no generalizations, no cause-effect statements can emerge, but only idiographic interpretations negotiated with knowledgeable respondents; hence an air of tentativeness surrounds any proposed application. (p. 44)
The naturalistic researcher uses a case study mode of reporting research in order to present a thick description of the research setting, which makes it possible for the reader to understand and make his or her own "naturalistic generalizations" by building tacit knowledge. Finally, conventional criteria for judging the trustworthiness of research does not fit naturalistic inquiry, therefore, unique criteria for judging naturalistic inquiry is required. The relationship of these characteristics and the flow of naturalistic inquiry is graphically illustrated in Figure 1.

Considering the purpose of this study—to investigate the processes of teacher socialization at the university and their influence on preservice teachers' perspectives—it seemed that the naturalistic research paradigm was most appropriate. Research into the socialization of medical personnel (Becker et al., 1961; Bucher, 1965; Olesen & Whittaker, 1968) has demonstrated that qualitative research methods and a naturalistic theoretical perspective allow unanticipated phenomena to be investigated as they emerge. Freibus (1977) notes that "results of these (medical socialization) studies using flexible field work methodologies have led to the development of an image of socialization as an ongoing negotiated reality based on a complex set of interactions among a variety of individuals" (p. 264).

Because this inquiry sought to identify an emic, or inside, perspective on the process of becoming a teacher, the respondents played an important role in determining the boundaries of the
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Figure 1: Lincoln and Guba's Representation of the Flow of Naturalistic Inquiry
An exogenous research stance, where virtually all of the aspects of research are or have been predetermined by the researcher, would be inappropriate. The naturalistic paradigm allowed the respondents to take equal responsibility in establishing the boundaries of the research.

Design of the Study

This study, done from a naturalistic perspective, was concerned with how individual preservice teachers view the process of becoming a teacher. It was an exploratory study, and the design emerged as the study developed. The study and the design depended on several factors:

- the development of an appropriate interview plan based upon a prior ethnography (Corsaro, 1980)
- the willingness and availability of individuals to participate
- the nature of previously grounded theory in professional and teacher socialization.

As the design of the study emerged, constant revisions and adjustments were made based upon the judgment of the researcher and input of the respondents.

A pilot study was conducted with four respondents each at different stages in their teacher preparation. These pilot interviews were open-ended and loosely structured. Based upon previous ethnographic research into the processes of professional and teacher socialization (Becker et al., 1961; Lortie, 1975), several areas of interest were identified by the researcher for investigation. These areas included: general schooling background,
significant influences in the decision to teach, and general knowledge of teaching. It should be noted, though, that these areas were tentative; other areas of interest were expected to emerge during the course of the research as respondents made their personal perspectives explicit.

Based upon the pilot study as well as previous ethnographic investigations of the professional socialization process, an interview schedule was constructed (see Appendix A). The interview questions were open-ended and included questions about (a) individual background, (b) the decision to teach, (c) models and images of teaching, (d) teacher preparation, (e) student culture in teacher education, (f) field experience, and (g) summary points. It should be noted that although an interview schedule was followed during the interviews, the questions were grounded in previous research as well as in the pilot study. The final interview schedule used to gain answers about the socialization process was simply a stimulus—a method used to set up a conversation and an interaction. It provided the framework for the individuals' discussions of their perspectives and decisions related to teaching. An effort was made by the inquirer to probe respondents' initial answers and to follow lines of questioning that were unique to individual respondents experiences.

A sample of 21 undergraduate secondary social studies education majors was selected to represent each of four distinct stages of the teacher education program in which they were enrolled. Students
were selected from each of the following levels: (a) the freshman field experience program, (b) the sophomore level general teaching methods sequence, (c) the secondary social studies methods sequence, and (d) the student teaching experience.

Guba and Lincoln (1981) draw on the work of Willems and Raush (1969) in an attempt to present a model for classification of research methodologies. Willems and Raush define a "domain of inquiry" as based on the extent to which the researcher places constraints on two dimensions of the research: antecedent conditions and outputs. Their model provides a conceptual framework for the classification of all forms of inquiry based upon these two dimensions (see Figure 2). The X axis represents the antecedent conditions (all the factors or variables that impinge upon the inquiry at the outset) and the Y axis represents the outputs (all the factors or variables to which the inquirer might attend once the inquiry is under way). The upper right hand corner of the figure represents "ideal experimental" research with a high degree of constraints on both dimensions. The lower left hand corner of the figure represents the "ideal naturalistic" research with a minimum of constraints on both antecedent conditions and outputs.

This study falls within the naturalistic area of the model although it is not an "ideal" naturalistic inquiry because some constraints are placed on both dimensions. The antecedent conditions of the research were: (a) the use of undergraduates enrolled in one university during the 1984–85 year, (b) a limitation
Figure 2: Guba and Lincoln's Representation of the Domain of Inquiry
of secondary social studies preservice teachers only, and (c) the use of an interview schedule. The constraints placed upon the antecedent conditions and the purposive sampling approach lead to a limited number of output constraints. The questions asked during the interviews limited the outputs of the study as well as the participants' response capabilities.

The Setting and Selection of Respondents

The study was conducted at The Ohio State University. The university enrolls over 55,000 students and employs over 4,000 faculty and 6,000 support personnel. The university is composed of 14 undergraduate and 5 professional colleges. The College of Education, the primary focus of the study, offers 34 majors and several special options or combined programs of study leading to the baccalaureate degree. The college is accredited by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education.

The population from which the sample was drawn included all undergraduate teacher education students that had declared their major area of concentration to be secondary social studies education and were enrolled in courses during the 1984-1985 academic year. Students are required to make application for admission to the college and to the social studies education major. Requirements for entry into the program include a 2.25 grade point average (on a 4.00 scale) after 45 credit hours of course work, the freshman field experience, and one course each from English, mathematics, and psychology. The curriculum plan for social studies majors includes
62 hours of basic education courses, (e.g. humanities, social and natural sciences) and electives (the social science courses overlap with the major requirements), 90 hours in history and the social sciences (a minimum of 30 hours in history), and 53 hours in professional education courses, including student teaching. (See Appendix C.)

The teacher education program has four distinct phases: (a) freshman field experience, (b) sophomore general methods and foundations sequences and field experiences, (c) special methods courses, and (d) student teaching. The freshman field experience allows prospective teachers the opportunity to explore teaching before actually taking courses in the College of Education. Students in this program attend weekly on-campus seminars while observing and assisting classroom teachers 16 hours a week for one quarter. After being admitted into the program, students enroll in a general teaching methods sequence (2 six-hour courses) that addresses the concepts, skills, and issues that are common in all subject matter fields and grade levels. The general methods sequence also includes 120 clock hours of clinical and field experiences. The third major phase of the teacher education program includes two special teaching methods courses in secondary social studies. The final phase of the program involves a quarter long student teaching placement at the middle or high school level.
Names of the study's participants were identified through class rosters that indicate the individual's program major—in this case social studies education. The one exception to this was the freshman field experience program. Because these students are not enrolled in the College of Education, the researcher relied on the field experience seminar leaders to identify students that were interested in social studies education. Names were randomly selected from the lists of students interested in or enrolled in social studies education. Individuals were contacted by telephone. The telephone contact generally went as follows:

Hello, my name is Wayne Ross. I am a doctoral student at Ohio State University. As part of my dissertation research, I am interested in interviewing preservice social studies teachers to learn more about their ideas, beliefs, attitudes and perspectives on teaching. Participation in the study would involve two on-campus interview sessions. Each interview will be recorded and analyzed, and the results will be shared with you at a later date.

Each person that agreed to participate received a follow-up phone call to confirm the interview place and time and address any questions the respondents may have had about the purposes of the interview. The interview process took four months to complete.

As the interviews and the selection of respondents progressed, some adjustments as to who would should be included in the study were made. Although not specifically stated as a criterion, it was assumed that the respondents would be working toward their first baccalaureate degree and of the traditional college age-group. After several interviews, it was apparent that several respondents did not meet these implicit criteria. Although taking undergraduate
level courses, several respondents had previously received undergraduate degrees. The decision was made to include these individuals as well as students beyond the traditional college age-group because these individuals represented a substantial segment of students enrolled in the social studies education program. Including these persons was necessary to gain a true picture of the preservice teaching population as it existed during the study.

Data Collection

This study sought to gain knowledge and insight into the socialization of teachers at the preservice level by interviewing individuals that were currently experiencing teacher preparation. Interviewing was the preferred research methodology in this case because it allows the researcher to discover the other person's perspective—a perspective that is assumed to be knowledgeable, meaningful and accessible. Patton (1980) supports the use of interviews as the most appropriate technique in discovering the inner perspectives of individuals. He states that:

The purpose of interviewing is to find out what is in and on someone else's mind. The purpose of open-ended interviewing in not to put things in someone's mind (for example, the interviewer's preconceived categories for organizing the world) but rather to access the perspective of the person being interviewed. We interview people to find out from them those things we cannot directly observe. The issue is not whether observational data is more desirable, valid, or meaningful than self-report data. The fact of the matter is that we cannot observe everything. We cannot observe feelings, thought, and intentions. We cannot observe behaviors that took place at some previous point in time. We cannot observe how people have organized the world—we have to ask people questions about those things. The purpose of interviewing then, is to allow us to enter into the other person's perspective. (p. 196)
Interviewing offered several other advantages over other techniques. Guba and Lincoln (1981) identify the following as positive characteristics of the interview technique: (a) There is less chance of misunderstanding between the inquirer and the respondent. (b) The questions can be tailored to fit the respondent's knowledge, degree of involvement, and status. (c) An accuracy of responses on sensitive issues is more likely. (d) A more complete and in-depth picture is provided. (e) The format is flexible. (f) A continuous assessment and evaluation of information is possible. (g) A picture of the events or thing in question is provided in the respondent's own words. (h) Maximum rapport may be built between the inquirer and the respondent.

The interview format used involved elements of what have been called "non-scheduled" as well as "non-standard" interviews. Non-scheduled interviews involve the use of non-prespecified questions and allow maximum flexibility in the pursuit and development of information that may emerge during the course of the interview. The non-standard or unstructured interview format is most appropriate when the interviewer is operating in a discovery mode rather than a verification mode—that is, when the problem of interest is expected to arise from the respondents' reaction to the issues raised in the interview (Guba & Lincoln, 1981). Dexter (1970) characterizes the non-standard interview as stressing the interviewee's definition of the situation and allowing the interviewee to make decisions as to what information is relevant. Guba and Lincoln (1981) also note
that in the non-standard interview, the respondent knows more about the topic than the interviewer, therefore the interviewee should "function in the role of the teacher" (p. 167). The non-standard and non-scheduled formats are preferred for this study because they are most profitable in circumstances where the interviewer is dealing with subjects who have special knowledge, when the interviewer is operating in a discovery mode, and when the interviewer is trying to ascribe meaning to some event or situation (Guba and Lincoln, 1981, p. 166).

The interview questions were open-ended. Open-ended questions allow the interviewer to raise issues during the interview without providing a structure for the respondent's reply. The responses are then provided from the interviewee's own frame of reference. Guba and Lincoln (1981) suggest that open-ended questions be used in interviews when the topic being investigated is "complex, the relevant dimensions are not known, or the interest of the research lies in the description of the phenomenon, the exploration of a process, or the individual's formulation of an issue" (p. 178).

The interview sessions ranged from one to two hours in length. All of the interviews were conducted on the university campus. The respondents made the decision as to when and where the interview took place.

The interview process was informal, even though the interview itself was somewhat structured. At the beginning of the interview, the respondents were asked to complete a biographical survey and a
consent form explaining that their anonymity would be protected (see Appendix A). The interviews began with a review of the information on the biographical survey in an attempt to establish a framework within which the respondent's perspective on teaching would be constructed.

The interviews attempted to construct a story of the development of each individual as a preservice teacher. The interviews were similar to what Levinson (1978) calls biographical interviews and generally followed the established interview schedule, but were sensitive to and probed individual respondents' replies. The interviews focused on the development of the individual's teaching perspectives over time, particularly during the teacher education program.

Data Analysis

After each interview was completed, the researcher wrote debriefing notes that including a general description of the interview and his immediate reactions and inferences regarding the session. These notes provided a chance for reflecting on the interview, identifying developing patterns within the individual interview and the larger context, and identifying questions to be further researched.

Throughout the data analysis process, the researcher kept notes on the insights gained and problems encountered. These field notes were recorded in a research journal. The notes focused on information and concerns such as: (a) insights, modifications, or
confirmations concerning the emergence and development of content categories, propositions, or responses; (b) connections between or among individual respondents; (c) emerging themes, patterns, categories, and perceptions; (d) questions, suggestions, and hunches concerning the emerging themes, etc.; (e) the researcher's personal insights and their impact on the process; and (f) implications for further study. These notes provided an ongoing account of the problems, insights, and decisions that the researcher faced during the course of the inquiry.

All interviews were conducted by the researcher and tape recorded (with the permission of each respondent). The tapes were coded and then transcribed. All names and places were removed to protect the anonymity of the respondents.

The transcriptions were analyzed using a modified version of the constant comparative method of analysis (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). The patterns, categories, and concepts emerging from the data were compared within and across individual respondents. The analysis took place in a two-stage process suggested by Guba and Lincoln (1981). First, individual interviews were analyzed, taking into account responses to specific questions (see Interview Schedule, Appendix A), the interaction process between the interviewer and the respondent, the respondent's personal circumstances and credibility, and the possibility of respondent bias. The goal in the first stage of the analysis was to make a judgment regarding the relative worth of the information obtained in
the interview and what additional contributions this information would make to the inquiry. The field notes of the interviewer supplied important information about the completeness of coverage of responses and inconsistencies, ambiguities, peculiarities, and affective levels, or changes in intensity and tone of feeling during the interview. The goal of the second analysis of the interview data was to situate each interview in the larger context of the inquiry.

The initial data categories were developed by combining data analysis approaches described by Miles and Huberman (1984) and Glaser and Strauss (1967). A "start list" of coding categories was created prior to the analysis of the data. This start list of codes was derived from several sources. The most important source for the construction of the start list of codes was the analysis of the pilot interviews using the constant comparative method. This empirically grounded approach allows the data to be molded in codes that represent them and is therefore context-sensitive. Other sources used in the creation of the start list of codes included: the conceptual framework of the study, research questions, hypotheses, and previously conducted grounded studies that addressed issues in professional socialization. The start list of codes was initially divided into ten master codes and 34 subcodes (see Appendix B, Table 3). As the data analysis continued the coding categories changed to better represent the data. Some new categories evolved while other categories were dropped or merged
together. (See Appendix B—Table 4 illustrates the final coding scheme and Table 5 provides the definitions of the coding categories.)

After establishing the initial categories of data, the researcher was concerned with the process of prioritizing the categories. Here, the major concern was narrowing the focus of the inquiry into a few of the many categories of data that emerged. The categories of data identified as most salient had the following characteristics: frequently mentioned by the respondents, accorded more credibility by various respondents, uniqueness, and opened inquiry into areas not otherwise accessible (Guba and Lincoln, 1981, p. 95). The final concern in this stage of the analysis was judging the completeness of the categories established. Completeness was judged in relation to four criteria: (a) The set of categories were credible to the persons that provided the information, (b) The set of categories were verifiable by another competent judge in an audit of the data, (c) There was a minimum of unassignable data, and (d) The classifications were internally consistent and externally heterogeneous.

The concern at this stage of analysis was the development of categories that took into account most of the similarities and differences between and among the respondents. Patterns were compared within the four respondent groups (freshmen, general methods, special methods, student teaching). The patterns within each group were compared between the groups, with group and
individual similarities and differences identified. The major concern was the organization of data into classes or categories that are internally homogeneous, externally heterogeneous, manageable, and illuminating. The classes or categories of information were continuously refined or linked to other classes of phenomena.

In order to add meaning and clarity to the coding process, marginal remarks were used to point out important issues that codes might have been blurring and to suggest new interpretations, leads, and connections between and among particular categories. The preanalytic remarks were used to identify the emergence of new patterns within the data and denoted areas that needed more intensive analysis. Many times, marginal remarks lead to the writing of memos by the researcher. A memo is the theorizing write-up of ideas about codes and their relationships as they strike the analyst while coding (Miles and Huberman, 1984). The memos were not intended merely to report data, but to tie together different pieces of data in patterns. Throughout the data analysis, memos were used to propose the creation of a new coding category, integrate marginal remarks and reflective comments on the data, and to develop propositions and hypotheses regarding the data.

Respondents had the opportunity to participate in one of three group follow-up interviews. During the follow-up interviews, the researcher shared with the respondents the specific patterns that emerged from the study. Respondents were given an opportunity to confirm, modify, or challenge the information in the summaries.
They were also asked to share their comments and insights on the patterns identified in the summaries.

**Trustworthiness**

As in all types of inquiry, naturalistic researchers must be concerned with the limitations of their methodologies. The basic concerns of scientific research for "rigor" are also concerns of the naturalistic researcher although the approaches to overcoming these limitations are different. Guba and Lincoln (1981) have identified the naturalistic analogues for the four major aspects of rigor that have evolved in scientific inquiry (see Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Scientific Term</th>
<th>Naturalistic Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Truth value</td>
<td>Internal validity</td>
<td>Credibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicability</td>
<td>External validity/ generalization</td>
<td>Fittingness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency</td>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Auditability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutrality</td>
<td>Objectivity</td>
<td>Confirmability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Truth Value or Credibility** In naturalistic research, the inquirer acknowledges that there is more than one reality to be investigated. Therefore, the researcher was concerned with testing the credibility of the findings and the interpretations with the
participants in the study. In order to improve and insure the probability of credible findings in this study, the researcher attempted to provide a degree of structural corroboration (Pepper, 1945; Eisner, 1979) through several methods. Structural corroboration is described by Pepper as:

the corroboration of fact with fact. It is not a multiplicity of observations of one identical fact, but an observed convergence of many different facts towards one result. We have a crude use of it in what we call circumstantial evidence, where a variety of different circumstances all point to a single conclusion. (1945, p. 7)

The major means by which credibility was achieved in this study included: (a) triangulation techniques including a variety of data sources (audio tapes, transcriptions, follow-up interviews); (b) field notes and research journal of the inquirer; (c) member checks (i.e., clarification of questions during and after the interview and sharing of transcription, interview summary, selected hypotheses, findings, and interpretations with respondents).

Applicability or Fittingness In naturalistic inquiry, the question of whether or not the findings in one situation might be applicable to other situations is meaningless. Guba and Lincoln (1981) suggest that inquiry into human behavior does not meet the context-free criteria needed for generalizing, therefore, the idea of generalizability is replaced by fittingness in naturalistic inquiry. The naturalistic inquirer then "ought to think in terms of working hypotheses and of testing the degree of fit between the context in which the working hypotheses were generated and the context in which they are to be next applied" (Guba and Lincoln,
1981, p. 120). In order for findings and interpretations to be "transferable" to other contexts, the reader of the research must be able to determine the degree of similarity between contexts. The major way to meet the criteria of fittingness or transferability is to provide enough information to allow someone else to make this determination. This was done through thick description of the entity investigated, the setting, and the conditions as well as through purposive sampling.

**Consistency or Auditability** Guba and Lincoln (1981) suggest that concern for consistency rather than reliability might be the issue for the naturalistic inquirer. "Since it is impossible to have internal validity [credibility] without reliability, a demonstration of internal validity amounts to a simultaneous demonstration of reliability" (Guba and Lincoln, 1981, p. 120). Consistency can also be demonstrated through overlap methods and auditability. Triangulation, as mentioned above, is an overlap method. An audit trail was created by using margin notes and a category coding system in the analysis of each interview. Detailed field notes and a research journal kept throughout the inquiry also enhanced auditability.

**Neutrality or Confirmability** In any inquiry, naturalistic or otherwise, the objectivity of the data is a critical concern; the data must be factual and confirmable (Guba and Lincoln, 1981, p. 125). The concern of the researcher here was that the findings be the result of the inquiry and the information provided by the
respondents and not the product of the researcher's biases. The concept of confirmability shifts the burden of proof from the researcher to the information itself. Guba and Lincoln note that:

very often objectivity is said to be a trait of the investigator....but to imagine that an [inquirer], by an act of will or by virtue of clever methodology, can rid himself of subjectivity is the worst kind of fantasy. (1981, p.126)

Confirmability is then demonstrated by the same methods for establishing credibility as noted previously: triangulation, member checks, structural corroboration, and confirmability of the audit trail.

Summary

In this chapter, the rationale for the selection of a naturalistic inquiry methodology has been explained. The development of the study (i.e., the design, setting, selection of participants, data collection and analysis) has also been described. The provisions for meeting the criteria of trustworthiness, based upon the naturalistic paradigm have been identified and described.
CHAPTER IV
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

This study investigated the relationship between participation in a university teacher education program and the development of teaching perspectives in preservice social studies teachers. The data were analyzed using a modified version of the constant comparative method of qualitative data analysis (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Miles & Huberman, 1984). Chapter IV presents the data and the analysis, which focuses on the grounded data categories, emergent themes, and the similarities and differences among groups.

Within this chapter, the presentation and analysis of data is organized in three sections: (a) overview of the setting, (b) overview of the subjects, and (c) major categories and themes emerging from the data.

Overview of the Setting

The setting of the study was the College of Education at The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio. The College of Education is one of 19 degree granting units of the university. The college, which was established in 1907, offers undergraduate majors in 34 academic areas of study, as well as several special programs of study. The college is accredited by the National Council for the
Accreditation of Teacher Education and its teacher education programs are approved by the Ohio Department of Education to offer programs leading to a four-year provisional teaching certificate. Graduates of the secondary social studies education program receive a comprehensive certificate, which allows them to teach history and the social sciences in grades 7-12. During the 1984-1985 academic year the social studies education program accounted for 7.7% (55 of 717) of the graduates of the college.

The teacher education program is heavily field experience oriented. The college offers an early experience program to provide prospective education majors the opportunity to explore teaching before applying for admission to the college. The Freshman Early Experiencing Program (FEEP) provides experience in a school setting for 16 hours a week throughout a ten week quarter. In-school experiences are supplemented by a weekly on-campus seminar. FEEP is a pre-admission requirement for most programs in the college (including social studies education).

Course requirements for entry into the social studies education program include: (a) freshman English, (b) introductory psychology, (c) FEEP, and (d) 15 additional credit hours in history and other social sciences, with at least a 2.25 cumulative point-hour ratio.

The social studies education course requirements are divided into four areas: (a) university requirements, (b) college requirements, (c) content courses in major area, and (d) professional requirements. Table 6 (see Appendix C) illustrates the
distribution of course work across these areas. The university requires that all students enrolled in undergraduate degree programs complete 45 quarter hours of basic education requirements equally divided between the humanities, social, and natural sciences. Eight hours of free elective courses also are required. The college of education requires its students to take freshman English, at least one mathematics course, and introductory psychology.

The third and largest area of course requirements for social studies education majors is the content courses in the major area. Ninety quarter hours course work in history and the social sciences are required of social studies education majors. This course work is largely, but not entirely, composed of three areas of concentration, one of which must be history. The secondary areas of concentration are chosen from five subject areas including: anthropology, economics, geography, political science, and sociology. Appendix C includes a more complete description of course work requirements, including a breakdown of content area course work requirements.

The final area of requirements is for professional education courses, which includes foundations, generic and special methods courses. Professional education course work for social studies education majors contains 53 quarter hours of credit, including eight credit hours for FEEP and 15 credit hours for student teaching. (See Appendix C for details of professional education course work.) After admission to the college, students continue
their field experience by enrolling in the Professional Introduction (PI) program. The sequence of two 6 quarter hour courses is designed to introduce students to the study of teaching at all grade levels. The emphasis of the PI program—the concepts, skills, and problems of teaching—is supplemented by 120 clock hours of field and clinical (microteaching and peer teaching) experiences. After completing the second course in the PI sequence, students are eligible to enroll in the social studies methods course sequence, which contains two 4-quarter hour courses. The distribution of course requirements at Ohio State is similar to the typical secondary education program. However, Ohio State requires more pre-student teaching field experiences, and less course work in the liberal arts and teaching field areas than the average secondary education program (Kluender, 1984). Figure 3 graphically illustrates this comparison.

**Overview of the Respondents**

The 21 respondents are briefly described in Table 2, a demographic view of the respondents organized by groups. The respondents were divided into four groups, representing each of the four major phases of the social studies teacher education curriculum at Ohio State University. The groups are: (a) Freshman Early Experiencing Program (FEEP), (b) Professional Introduction program (PI), (c) social studies methods (SSM), and (d) student teaching (ST).
Figure 3: Graphic Comparison of Ohio State University's Social Studies Education Program and Typical Secondary Education Programs
Table 2: Demographic Overview of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Code</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Attended other</th>
<th>Family in</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman Early Experiencing Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEEP/1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEEP/2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEEP/3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEEP/4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEEP/5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average FEEP age = 20.8

Professional Introduction Program |
| PI/1             | M   | 21  | No             | No        |           |
| PI/2             | M   | 32  | Yes            | Yes       |           |
| PI/3             | M   | 25  | Yes            | Yes       |           |
| PI/4             | F   | 21  | Yes            | No        |           |
| PI/5             | M   | 24  | No             | Yes       |           |

Average PI age = 24.6

Social Studies Methods |
| SSM/1            | M   | 23  | Yes            | Yes       |           |
| SSM/2            | M   | 35  | Yes            | No        |           |
| SSM/3            | M   | 25  | No             | Yes       |           |
| SSM/4            | M   | 30  | Yes            | No        |           |
| SSM/5            | M   | 26  | No             | Yes       |           |

Average SSM age = 27.8

Student Teachers |
| ST/1            | F   | 29  | Yes            | No        |           |
| ST/2            | M   | 27  | No             | Yes       |           |
| ST/3            | M   | 25  | Yes            | No        |           |
| ST/4            | M   | 23  | No             | No        |           |
| ST/5            | F   | 24  | Yes            | Yes       |           |
| ST/6            | F   | 34  | No             | Yes       |           |

Average ST age = 27

Average age of sample = 25.1
Males = 76% Females = 24%
There were five respondents in each group, with the exception of the student teaching group, which included six. During the early phase of the study, a set number of respondents for each group was not established. As the study progressed, it was found that five to six interviews provided data that saturated the categories developed during the pilot study. That is, the categories became so well defined that, when considering the resources of the study, there was no point in adding further data.

Some facts and patterns that emerge from this demographic overview of respondents include: (a) Of the 21 respondents, 16 were male (76%) and 5 were female (24%). These percentages compare to 81% male and 19% female in the social studies program as a whole during the 1984-1985 academic year. (b) The average age of the respondents was 25.1 years. (c) Slightly over half (52%) of the respondents had attended a higher education institution other than Ohio State University, for at least one quarter; and (d) nearly half the respondents had close relatives in education.

**Major Categories and Themes Emerging from the Data**

**Introduction**

Through application of the constant comparative method of data analysis a number of coding categories were generated. These categories of data were reexamined several times resulting in the merging of original categories and the creation of new ones (see Appendix B). The integration and continuous comparisons resulted in the formation of one major theme around which the data were
organized and three supportive themes. The major theme around which the data are organized is the dialectical process of teacher perspective development. The supportive themes include: (a) the elements of the teaching perspectives of respondents, (b) the curriculum for learning to teach, and (c) the active role of individuals in the construction of teaching perspectives.

This chapter presents an examination of each of these themes. The examination will include a statement of a working hypothesis regarding the theme and its relationship to the developing theory concerning the development of teacher perspectives, along with supportive illustrations provided from the interviews.

The Dialectical Process of Teacher Perspective Development

As noted in Chapter II, the problem of teacher socialization is one example of the larger question regarding the relationship between individuals and societal institutions. Within this relationship, individuals may be viewed as playing either a passive role (functionalist view) or an active role (dialectical view). Functionalist studies of teacher socialization have portrayed teachers as either slaves to their past—by emphasizing only biographical factors in the investigation of process of teacher socialization—or as slaves to the present—by focusing exclusively on the social structural factors of socialization. A dialectical theory of teacher socialization moves beyond the narrow focus of functionalist studies by incorporating the influences of biography and social structural elements along with the active participation
of the individual as a mediator of the socialization process. While constrained by the biographical and structural elements, the individual plays an active role in the socialization process by reacting to these constraints by adjusting his or her attitudes, beliefs, and actions in various ways.

The data of this study, lend support to the hypothesis that teacher socialization is a dialectical process. The development of particular teacher perspectives by preservice social studies teachers is an outcome of the socialization process and evolves from several sources of influence. A teacher's perspective, as defined by Becker et al. (1961), is a co-ordinated set of ideas and actions a person uses in dealing with some problematic situation. The term teacher perspective refers to a way of thinking and feeling about and acting in a teaching situation. A teacher's perspective serves as the underlying rationale or justification for his or her beliefs and actions.

The data suggest that the development of preservice teachers' perspectives is effected by their preservice teacher education experiences, but the changes in their beliefs and attitudes that do occur are not deep internal changes. Teachers' perspectives seem to be the result of three separate sets of variables: (a) the social structural variables prospective teachers encounter in universities and schools, (b) the individual's personal biography, and (c) the individual's active mediation of the interaction between the first
two sets of variables. The major theme that emerged from the data analysis is that:

**A teaching perspective is the product of an individual's interaction with the social structural elements of the schools, university teacher education, and his or her personal biography.**

Social structural variables determine the program organization of teacher education, the perspectives the preservice teachers are exposed to in field experiences, the type of experiences the preservice teachers are allowed to have, and the knowledge and skills they acquire during their university education. Structural variables also include experiences preservice teachers had as pupils in elementary and secondary schools, where they closely observed the actions of teachers for many years. Personal biography of the individual also functions as a structural variable, placing certain constraints on the individual's actions and beliefs in light of past experiences.

Preservice teachers were not found to be passive recipients of the constraints placed upon them by social structures. Preservice teachers were found to be mediators and creators of values, playing an active role in the construction of their own identities as teachers. Preservice teachers play a part in the resistance to and transformation of the prevailing social structures. This dialectic between individuals and social structures is illustrated by the existence of several interactional variables including: (a) role-playing, (b) selective role-modeling, (c) impression management, and (d) self-legitimation. Figure 4 provides a graphic representation
Figure 4: A Model of the Development of Teacher Perspectives
of the relationship between structural and interaction variables in a dialectical model of teacher perspective development.

Support for a dialectical model of teacher perspective development will be provided in the following sections of this chapter. These sections will address the remaining themes that emerged from the data and supply supportive evidence from the data. The themes to be addressed include: (a) the elements of the teaching perspectives of respondents, (b) the curriculum for learning to teach (social structural variables), and (c) the active role of individuals in the construction of teaching perspectives.

Elements of the Teaching Perspectives of the Respondents

The interview data produced information regarding the teacher perspectives of respondents as they related to four general areas: (a) motivations for teaching, (b) beliefs about the role, function, and practices of teachers, (c) beliefs regarding the nature and purpose of social studies, and (d) the process of learning to teach.

Motivations for Teaching

In Lortie's (1975) study of the schoolteacher, he identified six attractive elements of the work of teachers: working with young people; pride in performing important public service; ease of entry, exit, and re-entry; time compatibility; modest material benefits; and psychic rewards resulting from student achievement. Of these six motivations for teaching, only one was mentioned by more than 25% of the respondents in this study, that is, working with young people (by 61% of the respondents). Some representative comments by
respondents include the following (codes following interview excerpts identify individual respondents and their status in the program, see Table 2):

I would like to feel like I had a part in the outcome of students...that I had some kind of influence over kids. To be there when they needed someone. After all, they are in school six hours a day...I think they [the students] would become your family after a while. (FEEP/3)

[I wanted to be a teacher because] I figured a lot of students need more understanding than I received from my teachers. I thought I could offer that. (SSM/5)

I get personal gratification out of helping other people and I feel great when I help somebody else understand things....As far as the kids are concerned, I really enjoy being around people—younger kids—because the thing I have realized now that I am in college is that they are going through the same stuff that I went through and they have a lot to expect in the future. So, I'm trying to help them get their act together. (FEEP/4)

In addition to working with young people, a strong desire to stay involved with the subject area (almost always identified as history, not social studies) was expressed by the respondents.

I saw teaching as an opportunity to continue learning about history and, not only that, but, to use whatever talent I may have toward historical interpretation and to be looked upon by students who might be interested [in history] as somebody who knows something. (SSM/4)

I am interested in the subject matter....My personal library is about history and social sciences...and I've been interested in it since junior high...I've been interested in learning all my life. I don't want it to stop once I walk out of here with my diploma. I am hoping that I could give somebody a spark so they would want to learn for the rest of their life—not just in my class. (ST/1)

I just know...that the subject appealed to me and I feel strongly about it...I like talking about things and what better way to do it? (ST/2)
I guess the largest attraction was being involved in something that I enjoyed—something that I enjoyed hearing, even if I wasn't teaching the subject matter that I enjoy hearing about it. History and geography were the primary attractions. I realized there were a few things you would have to do outside the classroom preparing, but I thought that would be something I would enjoy preparing for since a lot of my spare time I spend doing that anyway. (SSM/2)

Several respondents mentioned both working with young people and the opportunity to stay involved with the study of history as important motivations for teaching. In addition to the motivations mentioned above, respondents noted opportunities to coach (28%), summer vacations (23%), and the absence of manual labor (10%) as attractions of teaching.

For most respondents, there did not seem to be any particular event or series of events that resulted in a desire to become a teacher although respondents generally described elementary and secondary school experiences as being positive, especially with regard to their success in social studies courses. Few had had experiences working with young people prior to entering teacher education. Ten of the respondents had entered college with a major other than social studies education and six of the respondents were in college to retrain, after having careers outside the field of education (including: law, communications, contracting, criminal justice, military, and machinist). For those involved in an effort to retrain for a new career, the most often cited reason for the change to education was the perceived opportunity for more job satisfaction.
It wasn't so much a negative response to the previous career, but there may have been some...I don't know....I wasn't that dissatisfied with a law career, it's just that I didn't see myself doing that for 20 years. I wanted to get something where you get more satisfaction out of [what you do]. I wasn't getting that much satisfaction...maybe it had to do with working in that segment of the law; I wasn't real satisfied with the work. (SSM/2)

[I had some motivation to] change careers after what I felt was an objective search of my values and an objective search of my talents, likes, and dislikes. I thought, well, teaching would be thing. (SSM/3)

For those changing careers to become teachers, the "eased entry" (Lortie, 1975) of the profession was certainly an asset. The relatively short time needed to become certified and the perceived arduousness of the teacher education program, combined with the perceived opportunity to work in a career that would provide professional fulfillment attracted these individuals from what were, in some cases, higher paying and more prestigious jobs.

Only a limited influence (both positive and negative) regarding the decision to become a teacher, was exerted by friends, spouses, and relatives.

My wife had her ups and downs concerning me becoming a teacher. She understood why I wanted to do it, but occasionally she would regret that we weren't going to have the income that we would have had if I stayed in law. (SSM/2)

I had a lot of people tell me I was dumb to go into education. My wife and my father were two of them. My father tried to gear me towards his business—insurance—when I told him I was fed-up with my job...but it never worked out. He wanted me to stick with the criminal justice system, but I don't think he realized the true situation....Before I came, I wasn't getting very much support, but now that I'm in here doing it, I've gotten a lot of support from friends and relatives, especially my wife. (PI/5)
In summary, the strongest motivations for becoming teachers seemed to come from the respondents' desires to continue their studies in the social sciences, particularly history. For most, there was no "conversion" experience, but past success in school, particularly in social studies classes, was a positive influence. The influence of nonprofessionals on their decisions was limited.

Beliefs About the Role, Function, and Practice of Teachers

Included in descriptions of the role of the teacher were respondents' images of themselves as teachers. These images provide an interesting linkage to the respondents' motivations for teaching, as well as the influences of the teacher education experiences and past school experiences (which will be discussed later in this chapter). The expressed images of self as teacher fall into three categories: teacher-as-counselor, teacher-as-expert, teacher-as-role model. The teacher-as-counselor image was expressed frequently by those respondents that identified the desire to work with young people as their motivation for teaching. Several descriptions of their imagined future roles as teachers are presented below.

You are with these students for six hours a day. You have got to relate to their problems. They have got more wild things coming up that you have got to be able to handle and realize...be prepared to deal with. (PI/2)

Relating to the student when you are not teaching. Being there like a...I don't want to say counselor, but someone there that they can talk to, that kind of role. Just someone there for the students to talk to. Be a type of teacher that the student can look up to. But, yet they are having a good time and they are learning right along with it. (PI/4)
I think you have to get close to the students... have more of an openness. Be on more of a personal or friendship basis. (SSM/5)

You want to make yourself available. Sometimes I feel you have got to get away from the strict teacher-student thing. You have to make yourself available for other things... to talk about other things... other problems, not always school. (SSM/1)

Sometimes surrogate parent. Sometimes priest-confessor. Disciplinarian... which is what I didn't like, but had to do several times. Authority figure... they have to have some respect for authority. I wouldn't want to be seen just as a vacuous little vehicle spitting out knowledge. (ST/1)

Other respondents imagined their role as teacher as being the person that facilitates the discovery of new knowledge on the part of students, and serves as the "expert" in his or her field.

[My role as a teacher is] basically to introduce the student to learning that particular discipline... history. To get that class or student involved in that for 48 minutes or however long. Hopefully they will come away with something. Not every student has to walk away from every subject overwhelmed with it.... I don't think it is a teacher's job to make the students feel good about themselves. That is not part of the job description in my book. (SSM/4)

Several respondents imagine their role as teacher as being a role model for the students.

Many times student see you as a role model. If you are dressed up nicely and neatly everyday... know the material and come in and act professionally. They might not get this at home and it is good for them to see a network of teachers that hopefully are like this so they will know who the professionals are in the real world and who they are. I think it is good to have people look to you as the role model. (ST/5)

I think it is a chance to mold and shape people and a chance for social immortality, that is, to pass on something of yourself to other people... to make an impression. (ST/2)
Respondents were given a sheet of paper outlining three types of roles teachers may take with regard to the school curriculum (see Appendix A). These three roles were labeled: "teacher as technician," "teacher as modifier," and "teacher as creator." When asked to identify the category that would be most descriptive of the role they would take in the classroom when they begin teaching, only three identified the "technician" and only one chose the "creator" category. Most respondents described their role as teacher regarding the curriculum as one in which they would follow the textbook and the graded course of study, supplementing where they felt the need. Respondents pointed out that being a curriculum creator would not be a realistic goal for a beginning teacher, because of a lack of confidence regarding the subject matter mastery and the fact that beginning teachers should not be viewed as "new people trying to change the system."

I like structure. I like to be in an environment where things aren't flying around. Where there is a chain of order and some guidelines pertaining to curriculum and materials, but I like to have the freedom to be able to modify and change things as I see fit. I don't want to deviate terribly from the established order or cause a revolution. (ST/2)

You have got to go a little bit by the book until you get your feet wet and see what works. I think to be truly creative you have to have been there for a while, know your work, and have seniority. I think if you go in there right away [and become a creator of curriculum] they'll say this person can't follow directions or anything. It would really be suicide in that case. (ST/5)
I would want to place myself in the curriculum creator category, but I think when I first get out I'm going to be so sacred and I'm going to be afraid to go off and do my own thing. Other teachers [may be] talking about and criticizing me. I haven't been there long enough [as a beginning teacher] to do some things that they might not approve of. I'm not that daring. Maybe later on, but I think my first year I would probably want everything just so-so and go by the book. (PI/4)

When respondents described their beliefs regarding appropriate teaching strategies for secondary social studies classroom, the emphasis was on avoiding techniques that would be "boring" for the students. The focus was on using a variety of strategies and incorporating the active participation of students through group work, simulations and games, or by allowing the students the participate in choosing the topics of study.

I would hope that I would go to other sources and get different ideas. I would not keep the class strictly structured, but allow for some change...do something new and add variety to my classes. (FEEP/3)

I think I would be a good teacher because I wouldn't stick to just one pattern. I think if you had the same thing day after day it would become the most boring thing...it would be boring for you and your students. So I would try different techniques and approaches and if something doesn't work you have to keep on going because if you are doing a lecture and you see your lecture is putting half the people to sleep, you can't be afraid to change. (ST/5)

Most respondents had a strong concern for the way in which students would react to their classroom practices and subscribed to the belief that variety in teaching strategies was an important ingredient in being a successful teacher. However, as evident from the following respondents' views on teaching practices, this was not an universal belief.
In high school...you just kick against the chalk board and really talk at their level. They are as intelligent as they want to be at that age....I would use stories or something like that to relate what I wanted them to pick up. Give them something like a joke—or something—that if they look on a test and they see that question and it clicks in their head and they remember a joke or something and remember how it ties in.... (FEEP/2)

Comparing the respondents' stated beliefs about teaching practices and an analysis of the actual teaching strategies they used during field experiences illustrates a contradiction between respondents' stated beliefs and actions. All 21 respondents relied primarily on a lecture/recitation format when teaching in university sponsored field experiences. Respondents did supplement their lectures with other methods including: films and visuals (62%), small group assignments (24%), workbooks/worksheets (19%), and simulation/inquiry methods (14%). The reasons behind this contradiction will be examined later in this chapter.1

In summary, the respondents possessed distinct images of themselves as teachers and had clear-cut ideas of the role they would play in the classroom. The most frequently described teacher images were: (a) teacher-as-counselor, (b) teacher-as-expert, and (c) teacher-as-role model. Respondents typically described their role as a teacher as being a modifier of the extant curriculum, although, many expressed the desire to develop skills that would allow them to be more creative and produce their own curriculum materials. The data also illustrated inconsistencies regarding respondents' actions in field experiences and their stated beliefs about appropriate teaching practices.
Beliefs About the Nature and Purpose of Social Studies

Throughout the interviews, respondents expressed beliefs and ideas about what social studies is and why it ought to be taught. Respondents' conceptions of the purpose of social studies in the school curriculum could generally be grouped into two categories: (a) transfer of cultural knowledge to younger generations and (b) development of students with well-rounded knowledge base and the ability to think critically. The latter of these two categories was the most commonly mentioned purpose of social studies in the curriculum. Many respondents noted that social studies held a unique and important place in the school curriculum as a forum for the expression of student ideas and beliefs and the critical examination of opinions held by other people.

One of the most essential roles for the social studies teacher is to get the students to think...not just learn whatever the subject matter is, but to think behind the causes [of an event] and how it has a bearing on our lives today. How what they learned from the past can be applied [today]...As far as getting students to think critically about society and the role of society, I guess that's primarily the responsibility of the social studies teacher. It wouldn't apply as much to math or physical education. (SSM/2)

The difference between math and history is that courses in the social studies go beyond the classroom and classroom learning. You deal with government, you deal with how you are going to relate and deal with society after you have gone out of the classroom and in that respect social studies does have a larger role and a greater responsibility than, say, a math or a science class. A social studies teacher can be a great influence on a student's way of looking at the outside world—above and beyond the other things that he is influenced by, like television, the home situation, or friends. (ST/2)
[Social studies teachers] have more of a chance to create dissonance—there is more of a chance to make the kids think, "Oh gee! Why is this happening? What can I do to change it? Why did the people let this happen?" (ST/1)

A small number of respondents (three) held to the traditional belief that the purpose of social studies in the school curriculum was to pass on the cultural content of the dominant society to the next generation. This belief about the purpose of the social studies was exemplified in the following statement made by a student in the freshman field experience program to justify the inclusion of social studies in the curriculum:

I just feel that everyone should have a certain background of the country's history, the world's history. Where we have been and where we are going and how we got there...the revolution. (FEEP/5)

As a result of his experiences in the field, one student in the social studies methods sequence decided not to teach after graduation. He expressed concern over of the belief that social studies should teach the values and morals of the dominant society.

It seems to me that you are expected to conform to a certain value system, and whether I disagree or agree with it is of no relevance. I don't like the idea of teaching people what is right and wrong....I'm not sure how to explain it....People have always expected the schools where they send their children to provide some sort of social control. I don't want to feel like I'm a factory stuffing kids into one end of a machine and having them come out like something else....Communities and school administrators—they want to teach more than just facts. They want you to teach values and morals. (SSM/4)

Respondents seemed to have more difficulty articulating a conception of what social studies is than they did in describing why social studies should be taught. This is not surprising considering
the ongoing debate among social studies scholars regarding this very question. Those respondents expressing a conception of the nature of the social studies (58%) can be categorized into four groups: (a) those who perceive the social studies as knowledge that is personally meaningful, (b) those for whom the social studies is history, (c) those who see social studies as part of an integrated curriculum, and (d) those who see social studies as citizenship education. Only one respondent expressed each of the latter two conceptions. Social studies as knowledge that is personally meaningful was a conception held by those who placed emphasis on providing the opportunity for students to explore their own opinions and the opinions of others on issues that are relevant to their lives. 2

[Social studies] lets the student think for himself. Express himself. Express his ideas, his values. Rather than [the teacher saying], "this is what it is." (SSM/5)

[Within social studies] there is so much to learn and there is so much that is applicable to real life situations. There are a lot of conflicts in society and high school kids would be more interested in something that they can see and read about every day instead of something that is cut and dried—like math. In social studies, you've got to let kids express themselves. You don't have to have a right or wrong answer. (SSM/1)

The conception of social studies as history also yielded a glimpse, not only of the nature of history as conceived by the respondents, but, also of how it should be taught.

A history teacher pretty much has it set...there is no way his lesson plans are going to change. History is history, but I think each year he should bring about a new way of doing it. Not just use the same lesson plans every year. (PI/4)
In history, there is nothing you can change. There is very little deviation. (FEEP/3)

I would say social studies is less open to question in general than is science. There are still going to be questions. There are going to be people who have never experienced the lesson. I guess with social studies you don't have to have quite as open-minded as you do in science....Social studies, I feel, is pretty much cut and dried. It has happened. It is not going to change. It has already happened, so let's work on it....The question is: How did we do it?, and What were the battles involved? (FEEP/5)

In summary, a majority of the respondents described the purpose of social studies in the school curriculum as being either (a) to transfer cultural knowledge to younger generations or (b) the development of students with a well-rounded knowledge base and the ability to think critically. Respondents experienced difficulty in describing the nature of the social studies. The two most frequent conceptions of social studies expressed by the respondents were (a) social studies as personally meaningful knowledge and (b) social studies as the study of history.

Perspectives on Learning How to Teach

Three areas stand out in the analysis of respondents' perspectives on how one learns to teach. These areas include: (a) the requisite knowledge and skills for successful teaching, (b) the personal nature of the teaching process, (c) developmental concerns, and (d) the change from a student-perspective to a teacher-perspective.
The type of knowledge considered most important for a successful and effective social studies teaching experience, by the overwhelming majority of respondents (86%), was a command of content area knowledge, particularly history and the social sciences. But many respondents also felt that a broad exposure to other content areas—in essence a liberal arts background—was a requisite for all teachers.

History teachers should know history very well. I mean it is something you should keep abreast of. Never say, "Well, I know enough. I've taught three years and I'm going to use the same outlines. Kids will ask the same questions, so I'll never have to study any differently." I think it is something you always have to update, especially with kids today getting smarter. (ST/4)

I feel that a younger teacher without a good subject background would be more apt to be criticized because of the simple reason that he might be afraid somebody might pop up a question he couldn't answer...A well prepared teacher, I feel, is more respected by the students. The students are more apt to respect and want to learn from some one that is well prepared. (FEEP/5)

While almost all the respondents were convinced of the primary importance of mastering the content area one was planning to teach, many also pointed out that expertise in a subject area did not necessarily make one an effective teacher. To illustrate this point, several mentioned university course work in which the instructor obviously had a strong grasp of the content, but was unable to convey a similar understanding to the students. The abilities to "relate to students," "have a caring attitude," or "be able to communicate ideas," were mentioned by 90% of the respondents.
as the first or second most important skills for an individual to master in order to be successful in the classroom.

I believe that being able to understand students is the most important thing because the knowledge is there in the text and I could go through a chapter and write down the notes that I would need to teach the class. You do not necessarily have to know the facts, but being able to communicate with the students—interact with the students—would be more important than just conveying facts or knowing the facts. (FEEP/1)

Respondents frequently described qualities of personality instead of specific knowledge or skills as critical to success as a classroom teacher. Qualities considered important included: tolerance of dissenting opinions, flexibility, sensitivity to others, enthusiasm about work, and creativity. Only three respondents mentioned the importance of teaching techniques used (including two student teachers and one social studies methods student) and only two mentioned the importance of classroom management abilities (one of which was a student teacher). Emerging from the respondents' discussion about the requisite knowledge and skills of teaching was the widespread belief that personality characteristics were more important to success in the classroom than any particular knowledge or skills that might be taught during teacher education.

I think your personality is going to make you a better teacher than all the knowledge in the world. I really do. It's a talent [successful teaching]; I think it's just as much of a talent as is being a musician. You can learn all kinds of technical things, but if you don't have the talent, you can go ahead and play the notes, but you're not going to hear the same soul....It doesn't matter how many times you send someone off for training...it's not going to change their personality...I don't think you can totally learn to
teach, I think that a lot of people just couldn't do it. I think it has a lot to do with your personality. You have certain potentials, certain capabilities... so if you don't have it, no matter what the university does, they're not going to make a teacher out of somebody who really should be wearing a lab coat and locked in a room somewhere with test tubes. (ST/6)

Teaching and learning to teach were portrayed as very personal, individualistic, and natural processes, therefore, respondents' reactions to teacher education were related to what they perceived as their needs at that particular time, and what was helpful to them. The key to learning to teach for most respondents was to "know yourself" and have the ability to draw upon your natural abilities (personality). 3

I think teachers should have a basic insight into themselves and other people. They have got to know themselves and know their abilities, their limitations, their prejudices and be able to effectively communicate what it is that they are suppose to teach. (SSM/4)

Personality... I know that has got to have a lot to do with being an effective teacher. A lot of the things I have done in the classroom was from my own experience as a parent. A year ago, I probably couldn't explain why I did those things. Now that I have read the textbooks for my education courses, I can give formal names to what I did. (PI/2)

They asked us what we thought a teacher should do [in certain situations] and everything everyone said was right. I agreed with everything they said. It is going to be different for everybody. No one is the same. No one is going to teach the same way. No matter how much I want to be like the cooperating teacher I had in FEEP, I'm never going to be exactly like him. (PI/4)

Adopting a new way of looking at classrooms and schools was not a task that respondents undertook without difficulty. After years of sitting in classes as students, taking on the role of teacher and
observing classroom activities from the teacher's perspective seem to be like learning to "stop on green and go on red."

I still haven't looked upon myself as being a teacher. My primary concern is still as a student. (SSM/4)

It's [teaching] hard because I when got up in from of the class I felt like I was a student too and I felt like one of them. But, I would like to think that in professional courses I would feel more like a professional. I would feel more like I was part of the work force. (FEED/3)

When I approach the classroom as a teacher, I look at things to point out to students...where as a student, I look at it as some things that I want to learn myself....You have to have a broader perspective [as a teacher]. (FEED/5)

[As a student] I would say I was just part of the crowd. I wasn't different from anybody else. Being a teacher, you are the head honcho. You are in the classroom and you've got to keep everything going. It's going to be hard for me because I am kind of shy and I kind of keep to myself. It's going to be hard letting myself out and trying to get those kids involved. I will have some problems there, but that is just going to take time. (PI/4)

I've seen things from the other side of the desk. I've seen some of the things that I thought I got away with as a student and [now] I don't think I did [get away with it]. Looking over someone's paper or passing notes or talking. Teachers are real people too. They have more going on in their lives. Teaching is a lot of hard work. It is a lot harder that I thought it would be. (ST/2)

Assuming the role of teacher prompted respondents to identify concerns they have about the future and the eventual circumstances they will have to face as beginning teachers. Their stated concerns reflect their interest in presenting a competent image as a first year teacher. Student achievement was low on their list of concerns, while "not boring students," increasing their competence in content area, and managing discipline problems headed the list.
In summary, respondents described teaching a learning to teach as a very personal and individualistic process. While acknowledging the importance of mastering content knowledge, respondents valued certain personality characteristics over mastery the knowledge base of teaching. Respondents also described events illustrative of the difficulty of assuming a teacher's perspective on schooling.

**The Curriculum of Teaching**

The preservice teachers' perspectives outlined in the previous section of this chapter were found to be the result of an interaction between the each individual's biography and opportunities they have had to learn about teaching. This section examines the structural variables that set the stage for the development of each respondents' particular perspective on teaching.

Bucher and Stelling (1977) describe structural variables that set the stage or provide the context within which individual professional identities develop. In the case of learning to teach, three major structural variables seem to set the stage for the development of teachers' perspectives. These variables are: teacher education course work, classroom experiences as a teacher, and classroom experiences as a student. In effect, these structural variables provide the curriculum of teaching. McCutcheon (1982) has defined curriculum as what students have the opportunity to learn. With this definition in mind, the curriculum of teaching, then, is what preservice teachers have the opportunity to learn about teaching. According to the respondents of this study the curriculum
of teaching has three elements: (a) teacher education course work, (b) curriculum of field experience, and (c) the apprenticeship of observation (observation of teachers while a student in school). Each of these elements will be examined in this section.

**Teacher Education Course Work**

Respondents' expectations for what they would encounter in teacher education were either non-existent or very low. These expectations were acquired from several sources including: recent reports and opinions expressed in the press, encounters with their previous school teachers, and opinions expressed by students and professors on the university campus. Lanier and Little (1986) have noted that low and/or negative expectations of teacher education, "reflect an awareness that teacher education is easy to enter, intellectually weak, and possibly unnecessary" (p. 542). Several students in this study stated that they had chosen teacher education as a major after they had had difficulty in other disciplines. Education was "supposed to be an easy major." One respondent noted that the lack of a language requirement for education majors made the major an attractive one to him.

The following statements reflect the generally low level expectations many preservice teachers had of teacher education course work prior to or upon their admission to the college of education.
I really wasn't sure what to expect. Because the more I thought about it the more I wondered what it could be all about. So I kind of went into it without expectations. (SSM/4)

Well, I think they just tell you what to expect as a teacher, how to go about being one, [how to go about] being certified, and how the public perceives you. (PI/5)

I thought [teacher education courses would be] more or less like other classrooms where we would sit down and the teacher would say, "this is what I did and this is the best way to do it." (SSM/1)

I figured...I would have to student teach. But, I...didn't think it would take so long to get the teaching certificate....It was a little surprising how many courses I had to take to get the certificate. (SSM/2)

I didn't know [what to expect]. I really didn't know. I really wasn't well grounded as to what to expect. I thought it would be a lot harder than it was. (ST/2)

I was expecting a list...a teacher should do this, a teacher should do this.... (PI/4)

It should be noted that expectations for the coursework were much lower and more negative than for other parts of the teacher education program, particularly field-related experiences. Respondents reported high expectation for student teaching as well as other field experiences. Other aspects of the curriculum of field experiences will be examined later in this section.

Reflections on the coursework in teacher education produced two very different reactions among respondents. General methods and foundations courses (such as the Professional Introduction sequence) were characterized by the majority of respondents as much less useful than the social studies methods courses. However, four respondents did point out that the general methods courses were
helpful in two ways: providing technical knowledge and serving as a forum for the exchange of ideas and beliefs.

[We worked on] lesson plans, discipline suggestions, teaching strategies and testing...it gave you some kind of background—a little bit of structure. (ST/2)

We got to speak out a lot of time about what we thought was good and bad. I think that everybody really helped out. It wasn't just one teacher [leading the class]. (ST/5)

You got to know everybody really well in the classroom and how people were really feeling and she [the teacher] wanted you to let your feelings out. We sat around in small groups a lot of the time and just talked things out...things you were scared about. (PI/4)

The major complaint regarding the foundations and general methods courses was that these classes did not provide information that was readily applicable in the secondary social studies classroom. Respondents felt that although the courses addressed important issues and illustrations of what might be done in certain situations were discussed, they had not acquired or practiced any skills that would make them adept at handling typical classroom problems and events.

I don't think I learned how to discipline in the course. We learned that it was considered the number one problem in education, but not really how to deal with it. I don't even know if it's possible to teach that....It's hard to understand how these courses relate to teaching in the classroom. Some of it seems like theories you'll never use. (PI/5)

I haven't learned a whole hell of a lot in my education classes....One class provided a perfect example of talking generically and not talking specifically. There is a potential that in my classrooms there will be children who have special needs....This was a perfect opportunity to talk to us and to say, "look—if you have got a kid who has a hearing problem, you might want to think about taking these steps"....I would have liked to have seen some things,
"Here's are signs that indicate that a child doen't hear well...," and "Here are some things that you can do to make that child's education easier..." Instead, we went through elaborate justifications for the mainstreaming law...." (SSM/3)

Other criticisms of the general methods and foundations courses included a lack of rigorousness, contradictions between principles taught and teaching practices, and redundancy of course content.

In sharp contrast to the views expressed regarding general methods and foundations courses were the attitudes expressed about the two course sequence in secondary social studies methods. An overwhelming number of respondents that had taken the courses had a positive impression of them and considered them worthwhile. Only two respondents (of ten having had the courses) had any criticisms. It seems that what was identified as missing from general methods and foundations courses was found in the social studies methods sequence, that is, practical applications, demonstration teaching, and a hands-on applications approach to learning about teaching.

They're very important [social studies methods courses]. You can see methods demonstrated. It gives you an idea that it can be done that way, it can make a class interesting, in addition to seeing how it is done....I remember a couple of classes here where the professor would come in and go along for half the class time teaching us a technique, but he would be talking about subject matter, history or whatever. Then he would tell us what he had been doing, with a certain technique. (SSM/2)

The [social studies] methods courses provided a variety of ways that you can teach...just different things that you can use, you know, just not limiting yourself to the book and maybe some type of packet. You could use the media, magazines, watching TV, or video cassettes. All different types of techniques were talked about, not just using the book and having students read. (ST/4)
If I hadn't taken social studies methods, I wouldn't have known there are a lot of choices other than [what I experienced as a student]. I would have spent too many hours trying to figure up a new way, when Bruner had already figured it out. (ST/6)

The criticisms of the social studies methods courses that were offered dealt with two issues: too much emphasis on inquiry methods to the exclusion of other techniques, and the "generic" level of instruction. Regarding the emphasis on the inquiry approach to teaching social studies, one respondent commented that:

You're not really inquiring into different methods [of teaching]. You're really focusing in on one, and I'm sure they think it's the best method. But, at the same time, you're really not inquiring about [others ways of teaching]. We did a lot of talking about how teachers were doing a bad job, but we really didn't talk about why they were teaching the way they were, other than they had taught that way for 50 years. (ST/3)

Criticism regarding the generic level of instruction in social studies methods courses was voiced by only two respondents, but when respondents were asked to describe how they might change the existing teacher education curriculum, this issue was the most frequently mentioned. Preservice teachers placed a high value on all activities that were perceived as "practical" or readily applicable to the classroom. Courses or units within courses that were "theory-oriented" were consistently labeled less useful than "practical" activities. While the social studies methods courses were generally accepted as "practical," respondents felt that they could be more so by examining specific pedagogical situations instead of focusing on theories of instruction supported by isolated examples. 5
Somewhere along the line, every social studies teachers is
going to have to teach the history of the United States....I
don't see any place in the college of education that gives
me any idea of how to do that. The college seems to be
focusing on] how to deal with teaching on a generic
level...they seem to be afraid of talking about
specifics....I want to have a methodology and its fine to
talk about reflective inquiry and give examples....But, I'm
not so sure of how to adapt that to teaching about the
American Revolution. Sure, I see a little, I see individual
things emerging—we can use a simulation—but what about
pulling it all together? I see those [examples] as little
notches along a straight path....We have to come back to
this because I haven't been taught to tie all of that
together into some kind of methodology. (SSM/3)

It's not specific enough as far as...Okay, here's a world
history unit, you can approach it this way or this
way...Okay, here's a psych unit, you can approach it like
this or you can approach it like this. I mean, you just
never get anything specific. It's just, well, you should
use some transparencies if you feel like it and there's
always film strips....In addition to having a methods
textbook that says here are some different methods, you can
apply them yourself, it would be nice to have a high school
textbook....I think if you had the kind of course work that
says here's an American history book and now we're going to
use our theoretical methods and work with this material
because it is what you have to do in real life...that would
be great! (ST/6)

I never really had a class where it says how to teach
history in high school or how to teach social studies....I
wish we had one class saying how to bring everything
together and incorporate it into your class. (ST/5)

The course work in teacher education was not considered as
significant in the process of learning to teach as were field
experiences. Respondents desired more opportunities to observe and
participate in the demonstration of methods of teaching history, but
only two felt that more teacher education courses would be
beneficial. Two of the six student teachers in the study commented
that upon completing their student teaching quarter, they had a
better understanding of the relevance of topics discussed in all of their teacher education courses. As one student teacher put it:

At the time I was taking it [teacher education course work] I didn't think I was learning that much from it. But, now that I've completed those classes and my student teaching, what was said makes so much more sense, and it helped me so much in my student teaching.... (ST/5) 6

Findings about the teacher education course work that may be regarded as significant because of their absence from preservice teachers' responses include a lack of complaints about the difficulty of teacher education courses and the lack of the perception that the teacher education courses provided them with special professional skills. These findings parallel what Lortie (1975) reported in his study of schoolteachers, "I have yet to hear a teacher complain that education courses were too difficult or demanded too much effort. Teachers do not perceive their preparation as conveying something special—as setting them apart from others" (p. 160).

Lortie (1975) also observed that there was a lack of the "shared ordeal" in teacher education, which is a powerful socializing force in other professions (Becker et al., 1961). This was found to be true in this study also. Preservice teachers progressed through the curriculum individually rather than in cohort groups. While respondents shared concerns and fears about ordeal of learning to teach, they did so individually, not collectively. This may be one reason that class time set aside to express beliefs, opinions, and concerns was perceived as an important function of
teacher education courses. Teacher education students were described as more friendly and less competitive than their counterparts in other disciplines. And, while respondents noted that teacher education courses fostered the exchange of ideas, they stated that the opinions of their classmates did not have a significant effect on their teaching perspectives. The key to learning how to teach, according to this group of preservice teachers, was through experience. The role of field experiences during teacher education will be investigated in the following section.

Overall, respondents expressed low expectations regarding the value of teacher preparation course work upon entry into the university program. Initially low expectations were not significantly transformed until students reached the special methods course work in social studies, which was the most valued portion of teacher education course work. The major criticism of teacher education course work was its lack of applicability to practice in field situations. Respondents failed to acknowledge the importance of mastering the empirical knowledge base of teaching, and expressed greater concern for the mastery of the "practical skills" involved in practicing teaching. Respondents were also found to progress through the teacher education course work in relative isolation without developing significant peer support groups.
The second, and most significant (according to the respondents), structural variable impacting on the development of teacher perspective is teaching experience gained in the field. Every respondent pointed out the importance of field experiences in learning how to teach. During the interviews, respondents were asked to describe how it is that one learns how to teach. Field experiences dominated their descriptions; course work was mentioned only as a preparatory step for field experiences.

Learning how to teach is getting actual experience—talking in front of the class of students, plus learning the right techniques that can be used. It's learning how to communicate with those students on a level they will understand. (SSM/2)

The way I learned how to teach was I had to apply what I learned in the courses. I remember reading about this and being lectured to about it and now I have to sit down and actually do it. Reading about is was good, but doing it was better. (ST/1)

I think [you learn to teach through] hands-on experience. When you get into the classroom, you just learn as you go. You can read a lot of books—I read a lot of books—and they give you a good background knowledge, but until you have a chance to apply it, I don't think it really comes to life for you. (ST/3)

The reasons given for the significance of field experiences in learning how to teach varied. Field experience provided preservice teachers with the opportunity to: (a) evaluate their interests in teaching, (b) test out and practice their abilities as teachers, (c) begin developing a teacher's view of the classroom, and (d) experience concrete situations that could be linked to the abstract notions discussed in course work. Each of the following comments
from respondents illustrates one of these reasons for the significance of field experiences.

I went into FEEP not knowing if I wanted to go into the education field or not. I just wanted to try it out. I came out of there thinking this is what I really want to do. (PI/4)

[Field experiences are significant] because there you are doing it. You learn directly from your mistakes. You see your mistakes much faster. I felt a lot of times in the classroom situation [at the university] a lot of the issues were based on opinion. Your answers were based on your opinion and it is easy to do that in a classroom. Anybody can fake that, as long as you know how to articulate in a clear-cut fashion. You can write the greatest essay in the world and it may mean nothing, but in the classroom it's a different story. There is nowhere to hide. If you goof-up, you goof-up. I think I learned faster and I realized my mistakes quicker [in the field]. I really made a lot of mistakes in the classroom in terms of opinions that weren't well grounded and I hadn't realized them yet. (ST/2)

Well, you see it from a different perspective than the students do, even thought you went there for four years in high school. And, you see a different light sitting on the side [during field experience] and not having to listen to the teacher's material. You can see what he does to handle the problems and what he's facing in grading papers and making up tests. How much material he has to cover in a certain amount of time. And, you also have the pressure of knowing the material that you have to teach. You get a close look at what they [teachers] know and what they go through. (PI/5)

During field experiences, I probably had every—well maybe not every imaginable situation occur while I was either in front of the classroom or observing a classroom. That meant something that I don't think they can teach you here [at the university]. What to do in this or that situation. It's spontaneous—you can't take the time, like in education courses, to read over someone else's notes or read a book on what they did or something like that. (SSM/1)

Field experiences were found to vary greatly from person to person, even within the same field experience programs (i.e., FEEP, Professional Introduction, and student teaching). These program
inconsistencies seemed to be a function of the particular classroom/school situation within which the experience occurred and the cooperating teacher. For example, dramatic and sweeping differences existed in responsibilities for preservice teachers in FEEP. While the official purpose of FEEP was to enable preservice teachers to observe and take on minor teaching roles (usually including clerical tasks and teaching a single lesson during the ten week experience) three of the five respondents taught between 20 and 30 individual lessons. Because of the wide range of experiences within this one program, its impact on preservice teachers' perspectives was respectively varied. For most respondents, a positive FEEP experience served to confirm a career choice, for others the experience served as evidence that they were qualified to teach. Compare the following comments on the role FEEP as assessed by two respondents; the first comment comes from an individual who had taught only one lesson during FEEP, while the latter comment was made by a respondent who had led 20 lessons.

The purpose of FEEP was just seeing if that's what we really wanted to do. It was really an exploratory experience. We had a big meeting after it was all done and a couple of people said, "I don't want to teach anymore." I thought that was an important thing to find out. (PI/5)

You can't really learn to teach out of a book. I thought it would be easy. My first lesson I had memorized. You've got to do it [teach] at least a few times before you can really master it, and then it's easy. (FEEP/2)

For most respondents, the early field experiences were significant in that from them they confirmed their career choice and gained greater confidence in their abilities to act in the teacher's role.
When teaching during early field experiences (not including student teaching), the respondents had few options other than following their cooperating teachers' guidelines. Some respondents were given the freedom to decide on the appropriate teaching strategies, but the cooperating teacher dictated the topics to be taught. While cooperating teachers did have a significant influence on the actions of preservice teachers in early field experiences, they had much less of influence on their perspectives. Respondents pointed out that in early field experiences, they followed the instructions of cooperating teachers, although, in many cases, they did not agree with them. This relationship, between student teacher and cooperating teacher will be examined later in this chapter.

The student teaching experience presented a different set of circumstances than did the early field experiences. Student teachers were allowed more independence and the experience was perceived as more evaluation-oriented than exploratory. The student teaching experience was rated as the most valuable part of their teacher education because it allowed them to try on the role of professional teacher. Several respondents noted that preservice teachers must "prove themselves" in ways unlike their counterparts in other disciplines. Student teaching, then, takes on more importance than content courses or education courses. The unique role of the education student is describe by two of the respondents in the following comments:
It's different in the sense that we have the field experience like the people that are in the college of medicine. We have to go out and prove ourselves and I know the English students don't have to do that. The history students don't either. I was kind of depressed in a way my last quarter. Most graduating seniors have a nice easy ride through their last quarter. They don't have to push a lot of subjects. They take their finals and get out. I had to go through student teaching and that weighed on me fairly heavily. Boy, what a way to get out of a place. (ST/2)

My role as a student was different. I was active in most of the methods classes...we had to do things, you couldn't just sit there and take notes...We had to actually prove ourselves, whereas in the liberal arts you really don't have to prove yourself. You read and write and that is fine. You don't have to really think, "Yeah, I can be a liberal arts major," and prove it. In teaching, if you are asked to prove it, you can. (ST/1)

Field experiences met the perceived needs of preservice teachers better than any other aspect of teacher education. It provided them with the opportunity to test their beliefs regarding teaching strategies and discipline procedures. The field experience provided a preservice teachers with an opportunity to test the depth and breadth of their content knowledge. But, most importantly, it was a real live exercise in dealing with human learning—the thing that was "just talk" at the university became the real thing in field experiences. It is not surprising that the only aspect of teacher education that the respondents did not feel there was enough of was experience in the classroom.

In summary, the curriculum of field experience was found to be the most significant experience in respondents' teacher preparation. Practical experience in the field allowed preservice teachers to address several areas of concern including: (a) testing out
interest in teaching as a career, (b) evaluating practical skills and abilities, (c) testing beliefs regarding teaching strategies and classroom procedures, and (d) providing concrete experiences to be linked with theories of education studied in course work. Individual field experiences were also found to vary greatly from situation to situation with regard to the role and responsibilities of preservice teachers.

**The Apprenticeship of Observation**

In 1975, Lortie described the years teachers spent as students in elementary and secondary schools as the apprenticeship of observation. During his or her 16 years of general schooling and over 13,000 hours of contact with classroom teachers, the prospective teacher has developed a definite idea about the nature of the teacher's role. As a result of this unique situation, in which the neophyte has developed strong preconceived notions about the nature of the professional's role, the impact of professional education is blunted. Lortie acknowledges limitations of this apprenticeship, particularly the fact that student views the teacher from one particular vantage point—a point that does not offer insight into the problems of teaching. The student is the "target" of the teacher's actions and, therefore, as Lortie points out, takes the perspective of an audience viewing a play—he or she is not privy to the goings on backstage.
This study supports much of what Lortie asserts regarding the influence of schooling on the development of teacher perspectives. This was found to be particularly true regarding the naive, simplistic, and unproblematic view of teaching respondents had upon entering teacher education. This was illustrated in the respondents' views on the requisite knowledge and skills for successful teaching (examined earlier in this chapter), which were based more on personality than on pedagogical principles. It was also illustrated, by what respondents unexpectedly discovered during teacher education field experiences, that teaching is hard work and that clerical tasks take a significant portion of the teacher's time. Excerpts from the following five interviews illustrate changes in beliefs about the nature of teaching that occurred as a result of teacher education field experiences.

I discovered the work load was a lot heavier than I thought it would be and that it takes more time that I thought it would be. It is also more stressful than I thought it would be. Even with the summer vacation, during the rest of the year you work at it seven days a week. Every night and every weekend and all day during the week. (ST/1)

I didn't realized how much paper work you had to keep on each of the students....how much busy work the record keeping is and how meticulous you have to be. You can't make a mistake on the record of a student. I didn't realize it took so much time to keep track of grades and tabulate and average and fill out reports and get homework for kids who are off for testing or something. Plus, keeping track of all the kids who are doing other things than the classwork and at the same time getting your lesson plans ready and getting ready to teach. I just didn't realize there was so much that you had to do. (ST/3)

I didn't expect the long hours a teacher really puts in. When I was doing my student teaching I was writing lesson plans and I was grading papers, getting material ready to
run off the next day, preparing tests and I just really didn't realize all that was involved—all the time....I know it is a lot harder that I first thought. At first I thought some teachers just teach strictly by the textbook—[I thought it was just] a piece of cake for them. No preparation or anything. But, the ones that were real good teachers...I could tell now the preparation they had for class and I could go back now and point out the teachers who were real good—they prepared themselves and I didn't realize that before. (ST/5)

I found out that teaching is extremely harder [than I originally thought]. I think the profession should have more status...its harder than people realize. (PI/5)

My original ideas of what a teacher does have changed....You have more responsibilities than just teaching and there are a lot of thing that I don't feel like I would fit in doing well. Things like hall monitoring, bathroom monitoring, lunchroom monitoring...monitoring anything. (SSM/4)

Preservice teachers do underestimate the problems and difficulties of teaching and this can be traced to the strong, but limited preconceived beliefs that result from the apprenticeship of observation. Lortie couples this finding with the negative evaluation of teacher preparation given by participants in his study and describes teacher education as having little impact on teachers. However, while the underestimations of the difficulties of teaching by preservice teachers supports the notion that the apprenticeship of observation is a significant force in the socialization process, it does not completely rule out the growth and development of teacher perspectives as a result of teacher education experiences. In fact, the "unexpected findings" reported above were the result of field experiences under the auspices of a teacher education program. The present study provides data that illustrate the greater pre-entry to post-entry changes in teacher perspectives than Lortie's
The data from this study indicate that although the influence of the apprenticeship of observation is strong, the growth and development of teacher perspectives during teacher education is influenced by teacher education course work, field experiences, and the active role of the individuals in mediating socialization forces, as well as the apprenticeship of observation. (The active role of the individual will be examined in the following section.)

**Active Role of the Individual in the Construction of Teaching Perspective**

The data presented in this section illustrate the dialectical nature of the teacher socialization process. Preservice teacher perspectives are not solely the result of the influences of the university teacher education program and the apprenticeship of observation. Individuals were found to have an active role in the construction of their own teacher perspectives. While university teacher education and the schools determined the organization and nature of preservice experiences, interactional variables shaped these experiences in ways that made them particular to each individual. These interactional variables illustrate how individuals express some control over socialization forces found in the university and the schools and take an active role in the construction of their socialization perspectives. These interactive variables included: (a) role-playing, (b) selective role-modeling, (c) impression management, and (d) self-evaluation.
Role-playing. Role-playing was found to be the most important of the four interactional variables discovered in the study. In the study, role-playing situations were those activities preservice teachers assumed in field experiences that were considered to be "teacher activities." The opportunities for role-playing or "being a teacher" in FEEP, the PI program, and student teaching were overwhelming considered the most significant experiences provided by the teacher education curriculum. For the development of a professional identity, Bucher and Stelling have noted the important purpose of role-playing and the opportunity to master activities that preservice professionals see professionals around them doing. Likewise, what matters to preservice teachers is what they do vis-à-vis what they see professionals around them doing. Teaching is practical work that involves "taking actions intentionally and skillfully, in a timely way, under conditions that are changeable and problematic" (Sanders & McCutcheon, 1984, p. 4). Therefore, one reason for the perceived importance of role-playing was that it provided preservice teachers with a measure of the autonomy and responsibility that is associated with the valued roles of the profession—particularly conducting lessons in a classroom situation. Role-playing allowed preservice teachers to demonstrate their abilities and prove to themselves and to others that they had mastered or were on their way to mastering the skills and knowledge that are necessary for successful teaching. Field experiences provided preservice teachers with a certain degree of autonomy and
responsibility, placed them in situations where they were treated as professionals by others, and allowed them to experience and learn from the consequences of success as well as failure in their teaching activities.

Role-playing allowed the preservice teacher to take on the centerstage activities of the teacher and move away from backstage, or preparatory activities. Preparatory activities such as lesson planning, objective writing, test construction, and discussions of various schools of thought regarding subjects such as motivation of students and classroom management were viewed as teacher education activities not professional activities. Mastery of teacher education course work did not provide a sense of mastery of the activities required of the professional teacher.

Until an individual is actually involved in the work of the field, it is difficult for him or her to demonstrate competence. Respondents stated that success in the course work portion of the teacher education program was not enough to fulfill the desired sense of mastery. Success in course work was still artificial and separated from success in the real world of teaching. As illustrated in the interview excerpts below, many respondents believed that good grades in college course work were not an indication of an individual's ability to teach.

I think field experiences are by far more important than course work. I think you learn more than you would out of a book. [In a course] you might learn the procedures—how to set up lesson plans—but there is no room for deviation in a book. When you are out there in the field, you have to react to what you see. (FEFP/3)
I would say it's through a combination of course work and field experiences [that you learn how to teach]. You really can't learn it until you have done it. So you have to have practice in the field. (FEPP/5)

It is easy to sit around and talk with a professor about the nature of the adolescent, but when one's sitting right there in front of you, it's a whole different story....It is a whole different perspective from the field. They don't give you little hints about what to look for. I mean, how you're going to see this kid's sliding down in his chair, you know. I guess they can't teach you how to notice little things about the kids while they're sitting there. I just learned everything from the field experience. [I learned everything] from the student teaching instead of the course work. (ST/6)

[In the course work] you're not experiencing it. The professor can sit there and give us a certain situation and we could tell him what we're going to do. I mean, I could tell him what I'd do, but once you get out there and there's just other things that come into play that you have to deal with...instantly. So it's [the course work] detached. [In the field] you can't just say, "Well, what should I do now?," and sit back and make up your mind—you have to do something right away...you have to. (ST/4)

In short, the opportunity to "prove" one's self as a teacher in a real classroom situation is much more important to the preservice teacher than success in the university classroom as a student. One respondent put it this way: "the important question lurking in the back of my mind all through the program was, 'Would I really be able to survive in the classroom.'"

Selective role-modeling. The second interactional variable that illustrates the active role of the individual in the construction of a teaching perspective is the process of role modeling. A described in Chapter II, much of the literature regarding role-modeling presents the preservice teacher, especially the student teacher, as indiscriminantly modeling the actions and
beliefs of the cooperating teacher. The picture that emerges from
data selective role-modeling process, in which the preservice teach
draws specific attributes from many different role-models instead of
globally modeling one individual.

Respondents identified people from a number of different
occupational roles as partial role-models, including: their former
school teachers (mainly from secondary grades), university
professors of history or the social sciences, teacher educators, and
cooperating teachers. The two excerpts below illustrate the kinds
of comments respondents made regarding the importance of role-
modeling.

I'm taking a course right now in American history that deals
with the period from colonization to reconstruction. I'll
say that the instructor in the history department is going
to have more of an influence on how I teach the American
Revolution than all of my education courses and professors
combined. He's giving me one example of a scope, a
sequence, and a methodology for teaching the American
Revolution. (SSM/3)

I had a wonderful high school teacher who was really
innovative and who was actually one the teachers that I try
to pattern myself after. He wasn't afraid to try something
out of the ordinary to make you remember. He did a lot of
games and simulations with us. We had a mock trial and
wrote our own [legislative] bills. We had to play the stock
market, and to this day I remember those classes and the
content better than classes with just straight lecture.
(ST/5)

Preservice teachers were highly selective in the way they modeled
these individuals. They chose specific qualities from different
individuals and attempted to blend them together into an ideal
model, which they considered appropriate to themselves. This
process of role-modeling did not produce the "cloning" effect
described in early investigations of student teacher role-modeling. Based upon their own judgment, the respondents selected specific attributes from other people that they desired to incorporate into their own teaching perspective. The most frequently mentioned attributes or qualities respondents selected from their role-models were: mastery of content knowledge, fairness in dealing with pupils, trustworthiness, humor, concern regarding the holistic needs of pupils, outgoing/enthusiastic nature, use of teaching techniques that emphasized pupil participation, and clarity of instruction.

The selective role-modeling process is described by several respondents below.

I carry my past experiences with me, but at the same time I'm kind of picking and choosing...it's like I'm picking things that I think will fit in with me and I'm rejecting others. (ST/3)

Initially [in early field experiences] I mimicked the instructors who were in the schools...later on I modeled their tone rather that specific actions. (SSM/3)

As I progressed in the teacher education program, I started to look at teachers here at the university a lot differently. I started critiquing them based upon what I was learning. I started to measure the good ones against the bad ones...I tried to pick up the good things—the good points that teachers use—and incorporate them into my own strategies and at the same time stay away from things that I didn't like. (SSM/1)

It seems like I kind of modeled upon other people, not in terms of the methods they used, but in terms of the goals of my teaching. (SSM/5)

I didn't look at one person and make myself a carbon copy of them, but I think it is good to listen to other people's ideas. They might have a real good idea you never thought of or give you a new approach that you never thought of. (ST/5)
Respondents not only had partial role-models, but also negative role-models. Negative role-models were those persons possessing characteristics or ways of doing things that respondents did not want to acquire. These were characteristics that they were actively seeking to avoid.

To tell you the truth, some of the worst teachers I had were my history teachers in high school. I think the reason...was because they were coaches. They were the most boring teachers I ever had. Everything came straight from the book....It was just so dull. They just basically said, "Turn to Chapter eight, read section one, answer the questions at the end." I don't want to be like that. (ST/5)

I had a social studies football coach and I think some people get more impressed with the coach rather than the guy's teaching ability. They might sit there talking about the game for an hour in my history class. Even as important as it may have been for the school atmosphere, I didn't care for that. (PI/2)

My high school government class was the most boring class that I ever had....He [the teacher] was pretty boring. You went into class and he stood up there for 45 minutes and we took notes and had tests on Fridays and that was it. I'm not going to be like that. (ST/4)

My [high school] history teacher did a good job, but my government teacher—I think he was out to impress us and be a joke. He wanted to be known as a funny man. All he ever did was crack jokes. He got along with the guys and he would tease the girls a lot. I didn't learn anything—I mean, I learned from him, but I didn't enjoy myself when I was in there. (PI/5)

I didn't like the teachers I had [in high school]. They showed a lack of concern—coming in on Friday just to get their checks and giving the students busy work. Some of the teachers I had didn't want to teach. In government class one teacher had euchre tournaments in the class. (SSM/5)
From the above examples, it is evident that respondents felt they were the architects of their ideal model. The picked and chose from the various attributes they had had an opportunity to observe during their years as pupils and synthesized them into a model of what they would like to become.

Impression management. A third example of the dialectical nature of the teacher socialization process is the strategies employed by individuals when reacting to the constraining effects of a socializing institution. Becker et al. (1961) described how medical students sought cues from their instructors and actively engaged in activities to please faculty members, even when that activity was not part of their belief system. This process of "impression management" has also been found in studies of student teacher's relations with cooperating teachers (Shipman, 1961; Lacey, 1977; Gibson, 1976). Lacey (1977) developed a category system that describes three types of social strategies individuals use in reaction to constraints placed upon their behavior by social structural and biographical limitations. The three strategies described by Lacey are: (a) internalized adjustment—behavioral conformity with an underlying value commitment; (b) strategic compliance—behavioral conformity without an underlying value commitment; and (c) strategic redefinition—active engagement in attempts to change the range of acceptable behaviors within an institution. The data regarding respondents' actions in field experience to not provide evidence of internalized adjustment or
strategic redefinition. However, many respondents described instances during field experiences, in which they interpreted events and their meanings in such a way that strategic compliance was exercised. In some cases, behavioral conformity was motivated either by the desire to please persons with evaluative power (i.e., cooperating teacher or university supervisor) or by the idea that behavioral conformity was in the best interest of the pupils. In either case, the respondents harbored reservations about their actions and stated that they would not take them without the influence of situational constraints. Here are some examples:

I felt that if it was a class of mine, I might have handled it differently. But, it is hard to come in when the teacher already has a certain schedule and change it....It was really hard to get the kids motivated. They always had to sit in their seats and keep quiet, so it was impossible to do group work or anything constructive. If it had been my class, it would have been structured completely different. I would have kept trying [to motivate the kids]. I would have tried different things, until I got through to them. I thought it was ridiculous to give up....The teacher told me to forget it, he said it [trying to motivate the students] was a waste of time....I felt like I couldn't say anything to him, because it wasn't my classroom. I was just in FEEP....I felt like he was evaluating me. (FEEP/3)

I tried to follow the routine of the teacher. My lesson plan was a bit different actually, but I tried to keep the continuity [with what the cooperating teacher had done before]. I tried to use good judgment and do something that the cooperating teacher would have wanted....I tried to do what they wanted. I didn't want to rock any boats....I'm not one that never wants to rock the boat, but I think in that type of situation, you give in because you are taking someone else's class and it could be a real awkward situation, especially if you didn't get along with this person. (PI/3)

I was locked into it for weeks, and I guess the reason I felt that locked in is because I hated to go from one type of thing to another right off the bat. You know, make a
straight cut. The kids are going to be confused; they won't know what's going on. I don't think I have had enough experience where I was allowed to use new techniques—to see how they affected kids. At Harding, I was very locked in to using the same techniques she [the cooperating teacher] was using and using the same materials she was. I really didn't experiment, because I had to keep pace with her classes....I was bored. I thought it was kind of a waste of time....I didn't want to work with those kids that way because it was failing with them. (ST/4)

I developed a lesson plan that I knew would pass. Because the lesson plan I knew was going to be graded and so I wrote out a very precise lesson plan. It had to deal with every second because that was what this guy [university supervisor] wanted. So I did that and then I got up in front of the class...I used the lesson plan as a point of reference, in that, first I should go over this point and then go over that part. I kind of winged it as to how I was going to handle it—what questions I should ask. (SSM/4)

The important point about the use of a social strategy such as strategic complicity is that it illustrates how the individual can manipulate a situation while still being constrained by it. Despite structural constraints during field experiences, these respondents were able to play an active role in the events that occurred.

Self-evaluation. The fourth and final action illustrative of the individuals' active role in the development of teacher perspectives is the process of self-legitimation or self-evaluation. The data indicate that preservice teachers, when judging their own performance and competence as teachers, placed a great emphasis (but not all) on their self-evaluation. When asked about how one validates him or herself as a teacher—that is who they look to for cues about their performance—there were two patterns that emerged. First, some respondents relied on their judgment of what their pupils thought of their performance. These judgments were not based
upon systematic written or verbal evaluations, but rather upon the "mood" or the "reaction of the students to the lesson." The second pattern was for the respondents to evaluate their classroom performance based upon their own sense of competency or their own self-perceptions. There were exceptions to these patterns that emphasized self-evaluation, particularly in cases where the respondents admired the abilities of their cooperating teacher, but these were in the minority of cases. In one case, negative cues from the cooperating teacher were discounted because the negative cues conflicted with the respondent's own evaluation of the event. Just as preservice teachers made judgments regarding positive and negative attributes of role models, they made judgments regarding their own attributes and actions. Respondents' beliefs that the knowledge base of teaching is founded upon tacit or personalistic knowledge seems to have promoted the legitimacy of self-evaluation of classroom performance. The following comments are illustrative of the process of self-legitimation as evidenced in the interview data:

I would say that your own self-evaluation is most important. You've got to wake up and look at yourself in the mirror and if you lie to yourself...then so be it. Hopefully you would realize it. I would think in teaching you are going to have some problems....But 12 years from now will you be able to look at yourself in the mirror and be so confident in what you have done that you can't have any critical self-analysis? Or be so blind to what you have done that you just can't see it yourself. The bottom line is my opinion. Somewhere I try to eliminate my mistakes. I guess in the classroom, you have to look for yourself. There is so much time when you wouldn't have anybody else [to evaluate your performance]. (PI/2)
My cooperating teacher's opinions were important, but my internal sense of what was going on was probably the most important. Because in spite of the fact that I thought I did a good job [during student teaching], I didn't want to teach any more. I don't feel that I'm that great of a teacher, and I don't think that I would do that well. So I guess it is just more of an internal sense of what was going on. In spite of the fact that my cooperating teacher and the university supervisor said I did a good job, my own evaluation was more important. (ST/1)

I judge myself based upon the student's reaction. I felt that the students paid attention to a majority of the lessons that I taught....I think the final evaluation will come from the students themselves...if they are going to accept you as a teacher or not. [If the students do not accept you, then] no matter what your certification says, then you are not teaching. (SSM/4)

I looked to the kids primarily...whether they were involved in the lesson. (SSM/2)

I basically considered it a good lesson if the kids were into it...if they were taking notes and asking intelligent questions. I know that a lot of them could care less about how many tomatoes they grow in the Soviet Union and Europe, but if they were understanding some of the concepts I was trying to get across [I felt I was doing a good job]....You could tell if they were listening to you and understanding it rather than writing notes to their friends or talking to other people the entire lecture. You could tell that right away from the looks on their faces and the eye-to-eye contact. (ST/5)

My evaluation of my teaching is the most important opinion....If I had not just stuck to that plan, but I allowed the students to interact, to participate and we got something unique going at the end—that's great! If the kids are really enjoying it and they're learning something from it. I'd say that's how I evaluate my teaching. As long as the kids get something from it—some understanding of what I'm trying to teach them—that's it. (ST/4)

In this section the dialectical process of teacher socialization was illustrated through the presentation of data supporting the active role of the individual in the construction of his or her teaching perspective. Four interactive variables
demonstrating how individual respondents exerted control over the direction of socialization forces found in teacher education and in the schools were described. These four interactive variables included: (a) role-playing, (b) selective role modeling, (c) impression management, and (d) self-evaluation.

Summary

This chapter presents the data analysis findings. The constant comparative method of qualitative data analysis (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) was used to develop the themes and categories of organization. The context in which the study took place was established through a description of the institutional setting and an overview of the teacher education program in which the respondents were enrolled during the study.

The major theme that emerged from the analysis was that teacher perspective development is a dialectical process. The three supportive themes that emerged included: (a) the elements of the teaching perspectives of the respondents, (b) the curriculum for learning to teach, and (c) the active role of the individual in the construction of teacher perspectives. The following chapter presents the summary, conclusions, and recommendations of the study.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of the Study

The need for a study of the relationship between university teacher education and the development of teacher perspectives was proposed in Chapter I. The main objective of the study was to construct a composite picture of the teacher perspectives of the preservice social studies teachers participating in the study and to examine processes through which the perspectives were created. The study proposed to answer the following questions concerning the process of becoming a teacher and the development of teacher perspectives:

1. What do preservice social studies teachers regard as worthwhile knowledge, skills, and experiences in learning how to teach?

2. What is the nature of their teacher perspectives or underlying rationales of teaching?

3. What factors influence the formation and development of preservice teachers' perspectives?

4. What is the relative importance of each factor in the socialization process?

5. What factors might teacher educators be able to influence or control?
The literature review, presented in Chapter II, established the conceptual framework of the study. After an examination and comparison of four sociological and psychological frameworks used in past studies of the process of becoming a teacher, the teacher socialization framework was chosen as the most appropriate for the study of the development of teacher perspectives.

Chapter III provided a description of the research design chosen for the study. The research was designed and carried out from the naturalistic or phenomenological perspective. The design was emergent and the goal was to develop grounded theory regarding the development of teacher perspectives.

Chapter IV presented the emergent themes that resulted from the data analysis. The data were analyzed using a modified version of the constant comparative method of qualitative data analysis (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Miles & Huberman, 1984). The data suggest that teacher perspectives are the result of a dialectical process that includes interaction between the individual and his or her biographical background and the social structural elements of schools and university teacher education. Patterns that emerged, based upon the respondents' beliefs, attitudes, and self-reported actions, support the hypothesis that the formation and development of teacher perspectives is dialectical in nature.
Conclusions

The emergent categories, patterns, and themes are first presented as they relate to the initial questions the study investigated:

What do preservice social studies teachers regard as worthwhile knowledge, skills, and experiences in learning how to teach?

What is the nature of their teacher perspectives or underlying rationales of teaching?

The respondents' teacher perspectives were comprised of beliefs, attitudes, and practices regarding four general areas: (a) motivations for teaching, (b) the role, function, and practices of teachers, (c) the nature and purpose of social studies, and (d) the process of learning to teach.

Motivations for teaching. The most frequently mentioned motivations for becoming a teacher were a desire to continue studying history (or the social sciences) and the opportunity to work with young people. Nearly two-thirds of the respondents mentioned either one or both of these motivations. Smaller percentages of students identified the following as attractions of teaching: opportunities to be involved in athletics (28%), summer vacations (28%), and "white collar" labor (10%). There was no evidence of a "conversion" experience leading to the decision to become a teacher. The prospective teachers generally reported successful experiences in elementary and secondary school; most described high school social studies as a successful and enjoyable part of their student experience. Six respondents
had had careers in other areas and were in school to retrain for a new career. Friends and relatives had a limited effect (both positive and negative) regarding the decision to enter the teacher education program.

**Beliefs about the role, function, and practice of teachers.** Preservice teachers' images of the role and function of teachers paralleled their motivations for wanting to teach. The teacher-as-counselor and the teacher-as-expert were the two most frequently described images. The teacher-as-counselor image was one in which the teacher is presented as trustworthy, accessible, and willing to assist pupils in dealing with, not only their academic, but, also, their personal problems. The teacher-as-expert image placed the teacher in the role of content authority and source of information and guidance regarding the study of history and/or the social sciences. (It is interesting to note that most of the respondents expressing this image referred to themselves as history teachers not social studies teachers.) A smaller group of respondents believed the role of the teacher was to provide a model of the good citizen for pupils to look up to.

With regard to specific teaching practices, respondents believed that the teacher should be a modifier of curriculum. That is, the teacher should actively supplement the textbook and other curriculum materials when considered necessary, but without straying far from the specific graded course of study or the outline of the textbook. Implementing a more creative approach
to teaching, such as inquiry-oriented instruction, was viewed as a desirable, but unrealistic goal for the beginning teacher. In field experiences all 21 respondents relied upon a lecture/recitation format as their primary teaching strategy, although, during the interviews, variety in the teaching repertoire and student participation oriented teaching techniques were described as important to successful and effective teaching. Respondents felt that the early years of teaching should be devoted to "establishing" or "proving" one's self by following a more traditional teaching practice. However, being a creator of curriculum and using innovative teaching practices was looked upon as positive long term goal.

Beliefs about the nature of purpose of social studies. The purpose of social studies in the school curriculum was usually characterized as an attempt to foster critical thinking or to provide a forum for expression and analysis of pupils' beliefs and opinions regarding social issues. While this was the most commonly stated purpose of the social studies, respondents' actions in field experience situations were not reflective of this purpose. Based upon self-reported information, the goal of preservice teachers' instruction was "to cover the content." It should be noted that in some cases, the respondents focused on content coverage in their field experiences in order to meet the expectations of their cooperating teachers. These cases are
explored more fully in the conclusions regarding the influence of field experiences.

Respondents seemed to have difficulty articulating their conception of the nature of the social studies. As pointed out in Chapter IV, this is not surprising considering the ongoing debate among social studies scholars regarding this point. Most respondents' conceptions of the nature of social studies fell into two categories: (a) social studies as personally meaningful knowledge, and (b) social studies as history.

Perspectives on learning how to teach. The requisite knowledge and skills of teaching were conceived as being highly personal and individualistic. That is, respondents viewed the knowledge base of teaching as being relativistic and individualistic. A utilitarian perspective dominated the respondents' beliefs regarding teaching. The attitude expressed was, "what is right is what works for you and what you feel comfortable doing." This attitude seemed to be encouraged by the discussions often held in teacher education courses where students freely expressed their beliefs and ideas regarding teaching and learning without critical examination of their expressions from the instructor or other prospective teachers. Field experiences also contributed to this point of view by encouraging an apprenticeship orientation to the classroom which stressed mastery of instructional and management techniques while de-emphasizing the formal principles of education.
After constructing a representative picture of the respondents' teacher perspectives the analysis addressed the following questions posed at the beginning of the investigation:

What factors influence the formation and development of preservice teachers' perspectives?

What is the relative importance of each factor in the socialization process?

It was found that the co-ordinated set of beliefs, ideas, and actions a person uses in teaching situations (i.e., teaching perspective) was the result of three separate but interactive sets of variables: (a) the social structural variables prospective teachers encounter in universities and schools, (b) the individual's personal biography, and (c) the individual's active mediation of the interaction between the first two variables. The structural variables determined the organization of their professional education, and the types of experiences prospective teachers would have during their education, as well as the knowledge and skills important to teaching. Personal biography also functioned as a structural variable because past experiences as a pupil in elementary and secondary school influenced individuals' conceptions of the role and responsibilities of teachers. The structural variables were identified as the "curriculum of teaching" and contained three elements: (a) teacher education course work, (b) curriculum of the field experience, and (c) the apprenticeship of observation.
Preservice teachers were not found to be passive recipients of the constraints placed upon them by the curriculum of teaching. They functioned as active mediators in their relationship with the socializing institutions as represented by the curriculum of teaching, and therefore had an active role in the construction of their own identities as teachers. The dialectic between the individuals and the socializing institutions was illustrated in several ways: (a) role-playing, (b) selective role-modeling, (c) impression management, and (d) self-legitimation.

**Teacher education course work.** Preservice teachers place a high value upon all activities perceived to be "practical" or readily applicable to teachers activities in classroom situations. Therefore, course work was generally approached with low expectations and seen as less useful than field experiences. Generic methods and foundations courses were generally perceived as only minimally useful, while the social studies methods courses were described as more practical in orientation. Social studies methods courses were reported to be influential in providing a wide variety of alternative teaching strategies. Despite the overwhelmingly positive acceptance of experiences in social studies methods courses, respondents still believed that these courses could have better prepared them for teaching by "being more specific." When probed for ideas on how course work might be improved, respondents called for more opportunities to
work and experiment with alternative teaching strategies by applying them to specific content from secondary curriculum materials, such as textbooks, prior to their student teaching. The findings failed to yield any complaints regarding the difficult of teacher education course work as a whole and respondents described themselves as progressing through the program without significant peer group support.

**The curriculum of the field experience.** Respondents identified field experiences as the most significant experiences during teacher education. Field experiences gave preservice teachers a chance to participate in role-playing and allowed them to: evaluate their true interest in the profession, practice and evaluate their teaching skills, begin to develop a teacher-oriented perspective on what occurs in classrooms, and link concrete experiences with the abstract theories discussed in teacher education course work. The emphasis on field experiences, along with a lack of co-ordination between campus-based and field-based activities in teacher education, resulted in preservice teachers relying upon the "trial and error" method of learning about teaching rather than careful consideration and study of the scholarly literature on teaching and learning. Once again a utilitarian perspective was evidence. In field experiences what was considered most important by respondents was whether a particular technique or approach seemed to lead to
"success." The importance of the role-playing aspect of the field experience will be discussed later in this chapter.

The apprenticeship of observation. Time spent observing teachers in elementary and secondary school played an important role in the formation of preservice teacher perspectives on teaching. This influence was particularly evident in the perspectives of respondents in the two categories representative of the earliest stages of teacher education, FEEP and PI. As a result of their apprenticeship of observation the teacher perspectives of students in the earliest stages of teacher education were more naive, simplistic, and unproblematic. Preconceived ideas and beliefs, based upon the apprenticeship of observation, lead the respondents to underestimate the problems and difficulties of teaching. During their years as pupils, respondents had constructed an image of the work of teachers based solely upon teachers' actions that were readily observable to pupils. Experiences gained in teacher education course work and through field experiences provided preservice teachers with a more realistic understanding of the nature and constraints of the teacher's job.

The active role of the individual in the development of teacher perspectives. The role of the preservice teacher in the dialectical process of teacher perspective development is illustrated by four interactional variables: (a) role-playing, (b) selective role-modeling, (c) impression management, and (d)
self-evaluation. The opportunity for role-playing in FEEP and PI field experiences, as well as student teaching, was found to be the most important of the interactional variables. These role-playing experiences allowed preservice teachers to participate in and master activities that preservice teachers have only observed inservice teachers doing. Role-playing allowed preservice teachers to demonstrate their abilities and to prove to themselves and to others that they had mastered or were on their way to mastering the skills and knowledge that are necessary for successful teaching. Teacher education course work was viewed as artificial and separated from the reality of the school classroom. Field experiences allowed preservice teachers a certain degree of autonomy and responsibility, placed them in situations where they were treated as professionals by others, and allowed them demonstrate and evaluate their teaching abilities.

The segregation of theory and practice in teacher education is not a newly discovered problem (cf. Dewey, 1904/1964). The practical nature of the work of teaching is not easily replicated in the university classroom, therefore, opportunities to role-play provide the only way in which preservice teachers can confront the complexity and uniqueness characteristic of the teaching situation. Prospective teachers enter teacher education with certain theories regarding what actions will be most effective for them as teachers. These theories of action are the
conceptual structures and visions that provide reasons for actions taken in a particular situation and are chosen to enhance effectiveness of those actions (Sanders & McCutcheon, 1984). While theories of action may be added to as a result of teacher education course work and other experiences, the major source of their development is through practical inquiry—comparing actual practices to a vision of what is believed to be effective and by experimenting with actions and weighing the consequences (Sanders & McCutcheon, 1984). Theories of action are developed, then, as a result of actions taken while in the teacher's role.

Teachers develop internalized, trusted theories of action as the residue of a series of small specific experiences that have the character of small studies or investigations. While few teachers have been trained explicitly to do this kind of inquiry, they engage in it informally as an implicit facet of their work. Through such a process of inquiry, teachers develop theories of action. (Sanders & McCutcheon, 1984).

Role-playing in field experiences provides the only outlet for practical inquiry into teaching and as result is a highly valued experience for preservice teachers.

Preservice teachers were found to draw upon a number of "partial role-models" in the construction of their teaching perspectives. These partial models included former schoolteachers, university professors, and cooperating teachers. The respondents used a selective process in which they chose specific attributes from individuals and attempted to blend them together into an ideal model. Respondents also reported identifying and actively avoiding attributes associated with negative role-models. Selective role—
modeling illustrates one way in which respondents were architects of their own teacher perspective.

Preservice teachers were found to be actively resistant to situational constraints encountered during field experiences. Using Lacey's (1977) categorization of individual reactions to institutional constraints, many examples of strategic compliance were discovered. In these cases, overt behavioral conformity on the part of the preservice teacher was not accompanied by changes in their internal beliefs systems. Preservice teachers admitted that they harbored reservations about some of their actions in field experience but conformed in order to meet the expectations of persons in evaluative positions (cooperating teachers and university supervisors). In many cases, respondents reported attempting to subvert the constraints of the situation. The application of this strategy on the part of the preservice teacher illustrated how an individual can manipulate a situation while still being constrained by it.

Finally, the data indicate that when judging their competence as teachers, preservice teachers placed a great emphasis on their own self-evaluations. Just as preservice teachers made judgments regarding the positive and negative attributes of role-models, they made judgments regarding their own attributes and actions. Preservice teachers' beliefs that the knowledge base of teaching was founded upon tacit or personalistic knowledge seem to have promoted the legitimacy of self-validation and simultaneously resulted in the
selective acceptance of criticisms. Preservice teachers experienced an increasing sense of mastery as they gained more experience in the field. This sense of mastery also contributed to more reliance upon their own judgment, and decreased reliance upon the opinions and criticisms of others. As a result, preservice teachers became to rely more and more on self-evaluation. Exceptions to this pattern were found in situations where the preservice teacher and the sources of external evaluation, either the cooperating teacher or the university supervisor, had similar teaching perspectives.

Recommendations

Drawing policy implications from research such as this must be done tentatively. The study has investigated a sample of preservice teachers from one program area in a single university and it has not been the researcher's intention to make precise statements regarding external validity in the traditional sense. It has been the task of the researcher to provide an index of transferability, that is, the researcher has attempted to provide the detailed description necessary to enable the reader to reach understandings regarding the conclusions, implications, and recommendations that can be transferred to another context.

This study did not intend to examine the complete process of teacher socialization and perspective development. The study has examined one setting in which preservice teachers are engaged in particular roles. There are other more broad ranging sources of influence that play a part in the development of teacher
perspectives that have not been addressed in this research (i.e.,
the selection of teachers, economic factors, etc.). However, based
upon the findings of this research, there are several recommendation
that can be made. The final question posed at the beginning of this
research was:

What factors might teacher educators be able to influence or
control?

This question will serve as a guide for the recommendations that
focus on action that teacher educators might consider based upon
the conclusions of this research.

First, the dialectical process of teacher perspective
development illustrated in this research should be taken into
account by reform-minded teacher educators when planning
revisions of the present curriculum of teacher education. A
better understanding of the dynamic of learning to teach, based
upon the insights gained from preservice teachers, can assist
reformers in the creation of a teacher education curriculum that
is more meaningful to the prospective, as well as the practicing,
teacher.

Second, a central problem of preservice teacher education,
as it is presently organized, seems to be that its value depends
upon the preservice teacher being properly prepared to learn from
it. It has been illustrated in this study that preservice
teachers are not passive recipients of knowledge, but that they
are actively engaged in the construction of meanings. By
acknowledging the active role of the individual in the process of
learning to teach, preservice teacher education may be able to provide preservice teachers with ways in which they can become reflective practitioners, that is, more critical and analytical in their assessments of themselves and others.

Course work in teacher education should aim to make preservice teachers more aware of their own past experiences and preconceived beliefs about teaching in order to subject them to scrutiny. The goal would be not to disprove the relevancy of past experiences, but simply to expose individual beliefs to critical examination and discourage "personalized" versions of the teaching truth. Teacher educators should work to break down what Lortie (1975) described as the "intellectual segregation" between scientific reasoning and pedagogical practice. Based upon the findings in this research, it seems that teacher education has failed to meet the ideal expressed by Dewey (1904/1964) that, "criticism should be directed to making the professional student thoughtful about his work in light of principles, rather than to induce in him a recognition that certain special methods are good and certain other special methods bad" (p.335).

Third, the role and purpose of field experiences in teacher education also must be critically examined. Because of the importance of role-playing in the professional development of teachers, field experience-based learning is the most significant event in the preservice teacher's professional preparation.
However, field experiences pose several difficulties for teacher educators. As illustrated in this research, field experiences promote a utilitarian perspective in preservice teachers. This utilitarian perspective is demonstrated in a "trial and error" approach to teaching. Sanders and McCutcheon (1984) point out that teachers rarely take actions that do not make sense to themselves, but that preservice teachers are faced with two significant limitations when performing in the field: "(1) they are not able to perceive and interpret the professionally significant features of the situation, and (2) they lack the knowledge that enables the practitioner to choose actions appropriate in these circumstances for the purpose of producing desired consequences" (pp. 4-5).

For many preservice teachers, the broader questions of the field, such as the nature of learning or the role of the school in society, are artificial and separated from the real world activities of the teacher and activities involving these broader questions are viewed as only important as part of meeting teacher education course work requirements. This divorce between the scholarship and method of teaching should be addressed through close coordination of the field and course work components of teacher education. Dewey (1904/1964) noted that the twin problems of developing an intellectual method of applying subject-matter and mastering techniques of class instruction and management are not independent and isolated problems.
Unfortunately, the present organization of the teacher education program encourages the separation of these problems into theory-oriented course work and management-oriented field experiences. Teacher educators should strive to link the goals of mastery of teaching techniques and provide a foundation for professional development.

Meeting this goal would require changes in the curriculum and learning experiences provided in preservice teacher education. While recent comprehensive plans for the reform of teacher education have addressed the integration of theory and practice (Joyce & Clift, 1984; Holmes Group, 1986), the following selected recommendations regarding the implementation theory and practice in teacher education are made as a result of the findings of this research. First, teacher education should provide opportunities for the study and application of action research methods by preservice teachers. The action research cycle involves discourse (planning and reflection) and practice (observation and action) and provides a structure for integrating theoretical and practical inquiry into teaching. Recent literature on reflective or inquiry oriented teacher education attempts to combine the elements of action research with teacher education (Ross & Hannay, 1986; Tom, 1985). Second, organization of teacher education classes into cohort groups would provide a support network that respondents reported missing from their teacher education experience as well as a context within which to
Fullan (1985) suggests that, "stimulating individual reflection in relation to action, and collective (two or more people) sharing of an analysis of this practice based reflection is at the heart of reforms in teacher education" (p. 205). Lastly, a laboratory or clinical approach to teacher education would allow preservice teachers in methods and/or subject courses to work closely with classroom teachers and university teacher educators in integrating the theory and practice of teaching. The goal of laboratory/clinical teacher education would not be to give working command of the necessary tools of teaching (i.e., techniques of instruction and management), but rather to provide opportunities for action and reflection (Dewey, 1904/1964).

There are major barriers to be overcome if these curriculum changes are to be implemented and have a lasting impact on the profession, including: (a) time constraints of baccalaureate teacher education programs, (b) establishment of collaborative relationships between universities and the schools, (c) reallocation of resources and responsibilities necessary to establish laboratory/clinical settings for teacher education, (d) staff development programs to provide training for university professors and classroom teachers work in the laboratory/clinical settings, (e) gradual induction teaching, and (f) career-long professional development.
These recommendations represent minimal issues for consideration in light of the conclusions of this study and future actions of teacher educators. What should no longer be ignored is the active role of the individual in mediating the curriculum of teaching. Excellence in the schools cannot be achieved without quality teachers and quality teachers must have a platform for professional growth. By recognizing this fact and providing preservice teachers with the initial tools for professional growth and a support network for continued growth, an important step can be taken towards the goal of excellence in the schools.

**Concluding Statement**

Recent reports sponsored by the Holmes Group (1986) and the Carnegie Forum on Education and The Economy (1986) suggest that the occupation of teaching is in a transition stage between semiprofession and profession. As teaching moves closer to attaining the status of a profession, there is an increasing need for knowledge of the process of occupational socialization in teaching. This investigation of the development of teaching perspectives during preservice teacher education found that individuals are actively involved in the construction of their own "teaching identities." Recommendations regarding how teacher educators might respond to the findings of this study have been outlined in this chapter. An extension of this investigation might address some of the following questions:
How does the setting in which teacher education occurs influence the development of teaching perspectives? Do preservice teachers exhibit similar patterns of teaching perspective development in teacher education programs that operate under differing paradigms (i.e., tradition-craft oriented teacher education versus inquiry teacher education)?

How does the level of cognitive and/or moral development of preservice teachers influence the formation and development of teaching perspectives?

In the present study, role-playing, selective role modeling, impression management, and self-evaluation were found to be the most common actions representative of the active role of the individual in the socialization process. In what other ways do individuals exert their influence in the socialization process?

How might the dialectical model of professional socialization be applied in the development and delivery of staff development and inservice teacher education programs?

How can knowledge of the how teaching perspectives are formed and developed assist teacher educators in the developing a teacher preparation curriculum that combines reflective practice, the study of schooling, pedagogy, and the development of appropriate dispositions, professional values, and ethical responsibilities?

The preceding questions represent only a fraction of the issues that surround the study of how an individual becomes a teacher. The number of studies addressing teacher socialization issues has grown in recent years, but as the occupation of teaching attempts to transform itself into a true profession, much remains to be discovered about the process of socialization in the occupation of teaching.
ENDNOTES

1 At the time of the follow-up interviews several respondents had advanced from their course work into student teaching. As a result, the follow-up interviews provided more information regarding teaching practices of these respondents. Of the five respondents in this category, three identified inquiry as a primary teaching strategy used during student teaching.

2 During the follow-up interviews, respondents were presented with sample descriptions of the nature of social studies, which had been drawn from the initial interview, and asked to comment on them. Several of the respondents who had previously equated social studies and history, restated their conceptions of social studies as an integration of the social sciences and history, with the latter serving as the foundation or organizer of the curriculum.

3 The individuality of the process of learning to teach was reconfirmed during the follow-up interviews. However, respondents did acknowledge the existence of a systematic knowledge base of teaching. The persistence of the individualistic path to learning how to teach was described as the result of the separation theory and practice experienced in teacher education. The lack of cohesion between experiences in the teacher education course work and in the field, left students "on their own" to synthesize and apply the established knowledge base of teaching.
This criticism of social studies methods courses was restated by three other respondents during follow-up interviews.

The recommendations to make social studies methods course work more application oriented through laboratory-type curriculum exercises was enthusiastically supported by all respondents when it was presented in the follow-up interviews.

The observation that information presented in teacher education course work became more meaningful after having experienced student teaching, was supported by every respondent that had completed or was currently involved in student teaching at the time of the follow-up interviews. This finding highlights the importance of the issue regarding the readiness of preservice teachers to understand and appreciate the content of teacher education course work at the time it is presented.

Follow-up interviews revealed that peer influence was usually limited to the borrowing of successful or "exciting" teaching ideas. However, the expression beliefs, values, and opinions by peers frequently played an important role in confirming personal beliefs about teaching held by individual preservice teachers.
APPENDIX A

MATERIALS PREPARED FOR INTERVIEWS
Interview Schedule

General Background

1. How did you come to attend Ohio State?
2. What courses and field experiences in education have you had at Ohio State?
3. What courses and field experiences in education have you had at other colleges?
4. Have you had any education related jobs since your graduation from high school? (Camp counselor, day care center, private tutor ...)

Decision to Teach

1. When did you decide to enter teaching?
2. How did you happen to choose teaching?
3. Did you ever seriously consider any other kind of work? What kind?
4. What were the attractions of teaching for you?
5. Did any one or any particular event influence you in your decision to become a teacher?
6. Do you have any friend, relatives, or whatever who are teachers?
   (If "yes," as questions #8 & #9.)
7. What influence have they had on your ideas about teaching?
8. What have you learned about teaching from talking with these people?
9. What qualities, knowledge, or abilities did you feel made you suited for teaching?
10. What do you think attracts and keeps people in the teaching profession?

Models of Teaching

1. What was school like for you, as a student?
2. What image would you like to present as a teacher?
3. Of the teachers you had yourself at one time or another, which do you consider were outstanding?

4. What kind of knowledge do you think a teacher must possess—what does s/he have to know—to be able to do a good job of teaching?

5. What must a teacher be able to do—what skills must s/he possess—to do a good job of teaching?

6. What are the essential roles of the teacher, in you view?

7. Is the role of the social studies different from that of other teachers?

8. Give respondent description of "Teachers' Roles and the Curriculum." Ask respondent to categorize him/herself according to the descriptions.

9. Have you ever experienced anything that might be called a "turning point" where you knew you had become a "better" teacher?

10. How are you like and different from your imaged teaching ideal?

**Teacher Education**

1. How would you describe the process of learning how to teach?

2. What experiences do you think have been or will be the most influential in learning how to teach?

3. What were/are your expectations of teacher education?

4. How do you think a person improves upon his/her teaching abilities?

5. Describe what it is like being student in the college of education?

6. What type of teacher do you think this college is attempting to create? (Refer to descriptions of "Teachers' Roles and the Curriculum.") How does the college reach that goal?

7. What are the significant or important experiences you have had (or expect to have) in you teacher preparation at the university?

8. How have you made your experiences at the university relevant to your concerns about becoming a teacher?

9. Have you been able to find or create opportunities for the expression of your ideas and beliefs about teaching in the course work or field experiences in teacher education?
10. What people or experiences have played the most important role in your development as a teacher?

11. In what way does teacher education contribute to the development of the qualities, knowledge, and skills you feel are characteristic of good teaching?

12. Please respond to the following statement: "The effectiveness of a teacher has a great deal to do with his/her teacher preparation at the university."

13. How have your ideas and beliefs about teaching changed since you entered the teacher education program?

Student Culture

1. Do you do much studying or preparation with other students in the program?

2. How much assistance to you received from other students in making decisions regarding how to prepare for course work and field experiences in teacher education?

3. How important are other students views to the development of your own ideas about teaching?

4. Are you involved in any of the education student organizations?

Field Experiences

1. Do you think more time spent in the classroom makes you a better teacher?

2. Tell me about the purposes of your field experiences in teacher education.

3. Has there been a relationship between your field experiences and course work in teacher education?

4. In field experiences, how did you select the topics you would teach and decide on teaching appropriate strategies?

5. During your field experiences who had the most influence on the way you taught—the cooperating teacher, college supervisor, previous ideas about teaching?

6. Did you have the opportunity to give direction to your field experiences? How did you take advantage of these opportunities?
7. Which of the following statements is most descriptive of your teaching in field experiences:
   - I tried to change the way things were done in the class
   - I accepted the constraints of the class "routine" but with reservations.
   - I accepted the constraints of the class "routine" because I believed they were for the best.

8. What did you learn about teaching from your field experiences that you could not or did not learn in teacher education course work?

9. Who do you look to for validation as a teacher?

Summary Questions

1. Based on your field experiences and course work so far in the teacher education program, in what ways is teaching different from what you expected when you made the decision to go into the field?
   - How is it better than you expected?
   - How is it worse than you expected?

2. How would you feel about teaching subjects other than social studies?
   - Are there others you would like to teach?

3. How have your early images of teaching changed since you have been in the teacher education program?

4. What do you feel is your primary goal as a beginning teacher?
Teachers' Roles and the Curriculum

Teachers as Creators of Curriculum

Creators are risk-takers, invent materials, and develop teacher-made materials with students foremost in mind. Adroit at curriculum integration, webbing activities, and interdisciplinary approaches. Disregard or "get around" adopted texts by using them in creative ways. They find curricular potential in almost anything they run across, receive criticism from skeptical more traditional colleagues and supervisors, but are able to defend their curriculum role through their own confidence, knowing student interest, and exhibited student achievement and enthusiasm.

Teachers as Modifiers of Curriculum

Modifiers pick and choose from adopted or required texts and materials, add to and supplement required materials, but pretty much stick to the administrative flow of thing and expectations for the good of the order. They see ways to adapt material (as do creators) for their particular students' level or interests. They need some guidance, reassurance, and structure set out for them in order to deviate from or supplement curriculum. They like to know, to a high degree, that they have not deviated too much and that they are following a course of action which would be approved by most supervisors or principals. With a given structure or text, they modify as they see fit.

Teachers as Technicians

Technicians like to know exactly where they and their students are going and are expected to be. They set specific goals and arrange teaching and learning to achieve these specific goals. They rely heavily on testing to illustrate that students have learned. They are comfortable diagnosing student needs, prescribing a plan of action, and evaluating achievement. They keep accurate and detailed records (usually in the form of test scores) to guide their practice and keep tabs on student achievement and progress. They rely on texts, skill packets, and workbooks to give students adequate practice in learning new skills.
This study seeks to investigate the processes of socialization that impact on beginning teachers. Participants in the study will be interviewed about their professional development and how it relates to previous experiences, specifically in primary and secondary schools, college course work and pre-service field experiences.

Information obtained in the interviews will be confidential and anonymity is insured. Measures will be taken to prevent information from being linked with a specific respondent by coding all items. The researcher will maintain the key to the code separately from the interview transcripts and other information provided by participants. (It should be noted that anonymity cannot be absolutely guaranteed since inquiry records have no privileged status under the law and can be subpoenaed should a case emerge--quite an unlikely outcome.)

The undersigned participant has the right to withdraw from the study at any time, without justifying that action, and may have all data returned to him or her. If a participant should decide to withdraw, he or she should contact Wayne Ross at one of the two telephone numbers listed below.

Participation in this study is entirely voluntary.

The signature of the participant below signifies that he or she is in agreement with the above statement of conditions of participation for this study.

Signature of Participant

As a participant in this study, I grant permission to the researcher to quote me in the final research report, while maintaining my anonymity.

Initials of participant

Researcher seeking consent: Wayne Ross
Doctoral Candidate
Dept. of Educational Policy & Leadership
The Ohio State University

Addresses:
229A Arps Hall
1945 N. High St.
Columbus, Ohio 43210
614-422-5381

1937 Northwest Blvd.
Columbus, Ohio 43212
614-488-7106

6/85 EWR
Directions:

Please complete this brief biographical questionnaire prior to our first interview session. In this study, you are guaranteed complete confidentiality. This information will be used to describe the general characteristics and background of the research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address (Current)</th>
<th>Address (Permanent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Education:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementary School(s)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary (Jr./Sr. H.S.)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coursework in education completed at Ohio State University:

(Fill in quarter and year course was taken. Please note if you did not or will not take a course as part of your program.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEEP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education 450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education 451</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed T &amp; P 526</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed T &amp; P 527</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Education (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ed P &amp; L 650.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Philosophy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed P &amp; L 650.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(History of Ed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed P &amp; L 650.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ethics)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed P &amp; L 650.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Soc. Criticism)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List other education courses you took or plan to take as part of your program:

Field Experiences
(Please list school, grade level or subjects taught as part of each field experience program in which you participated.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Grade Level / Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEEP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education 450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education 451</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Education related work experience:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employer</th>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Family Members in Education:

- Mother
- Father
- Grandmother
- Grandfather
- Aunt
- Uncle
- Sister
- Brother
- Cousin
APPENDIX B
DATA ANALYSIS CATEGORIES
Table 3: Start List of Codes Used in Data Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND BIOGRAPHY</th>
<th>BB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DECISION TO TEACH</td>
<td>DEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC: Influential People</td>
<td>DEC-PEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC: Influential Events</td>
<td>DEC-EVT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC: Career Alternatives</td>
<td>DEC-ALT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC: Reason for Teaching</td>
<td>DEC-REA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELIEFS ABOUT TEACHING</td>
<td>BLFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLFS: Purpose of Schooling</td>
<td>BLFS-SCH/PUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLFS: Expectations</td>
<td>BLFS-EXP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLFS: Ideals</td>
<td>BLFS-IDEAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLFS: Changes</td>
<td>BLFS-CHNG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLFS: Practices</td>
<td>BLFS-PRAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLFS: Teacher Role in Curriculum</td>
<td>BLFS-TCHR/CUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLFS: Self as Teacher</td>
<td>BLFS-SELF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLFS: Knowledge/Skills Necessary to Teach</td>
<td>BLFS-KS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROLE MODELS OF TEACHING</td>
<td>RM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM: Qualities/Characteristics</td>
<td>RM-CHAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM: Negative</td>
<td>RM-NEG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNOWLEDGE AND CURRICULUM</td>
<td>KNW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*KNW: Nature of Knowledge</td>
<td>KNW-NAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*KNW: Nature of Learning</td>
<td>KNW-LRN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNW: Purpose of Social Studies</td>
<td>KNW-SS/PUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNW: Nature of Social Studies</td>
<td>KNW-SS/NAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM</td>
<td>TE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE: Expectations</td>
<td>TE-EXP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE: Goals/Purpose</td>
<td>TE-PUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE: Ideal</td>
<td>TE-IDEAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE: Significant/Important Experiences</td>
<td>TE-SIG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE: Course work</td>
<td>TE-CRWK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE: Student Culture</td>
<td>TE-STDS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
### EARLY FIELD EXPERIENCES

| EFE: Purposes/Expectations | EFE-PUR |
| EFE: Planning              | EFE-PLN |
| EFE: Responsibilities      | EFE-RESP |
| *EFE: Relations with Pupils| EFE-REL/P |
| *EFE: Relations with Cooperating Teacher | EFE-REL/CT |

### ACTIONS IN STUDENT TEACHER ROLE

| *ACT: Clinical Experiences | ACT-CLN |
| *ACT: Early Field Experiences | ACT-EFE |
| *ACT: Student Teaching      | ACT-ST |

### RESPONSES TO INSTITUTIONAL PRESSURES

| IR: Internalized Adjustment | IR-IADJ |
| IR: Strategic Compliance   | IR-STRATCOM |
| IR: Strategic Redefinition | IR-REDEF |

### CONCERNS ABOUT FUTURE

| FCN |

* Denotes codes from the start list that were dropped or merged with other codes during the data analysis.
Table 4: Final List of Codes Used in Data Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BACKGROUND BIOGRAPHY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*BB: Schooling Background</td>
<td>BB-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DECISION TO TEACH</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC: Influential People</td>
<td>DEC-P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC: Influential Events</td>
<td>DEC-E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC: Career Alternatives</td>
<td>DEC-ALT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC: Reason for Teaching</td>
<td>DEC-REA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BELIEFS ABOUT TEACHING</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLFS: Purpose of Schooling</td>
<td>BLFS-S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLFS: Expectations</td>
<td>BLFS-X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLFS: Ideals</td>
<td>BLFS-I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLFS: Changes</td>
<td>BLFS-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLFS: Practices</td>
<td>BLFS-P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLFS: Teacher Role in Curriculum</td>
<td>BLFS-T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLFS: Self as Teacher</td>
<td>BLFS-S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLFS: Knowledge/Skills Necessary</td>
<td>BLFS-K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to Teach</td>
<td>BLFS-EARLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*BLFS: Early Conceptions of Teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROLE MODELS OF TEACHING</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM: Qualities/Characteristics</td>
<td>RM-CHAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM: Negative</td>
<td>RM-NEG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*RM: Classroom Practices &amp; Actions</td>
<td>RM-PRAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*RM: Influences</td>
<td>RM-INF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KNOWLEDGE AND CURRICULUM</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNW: Purpose of Social Studies</td>
<td>KNW-SS/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNW: Nature of Social Studies</td>
<td>KNW-SS/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE: Expectations</td>
<td>TE-EXP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE: Goals/Purpose</td>
<td>TE-PUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE: Ideal</td>
<td>TE-I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE: Significant/Important Experiences</td>
<td>TE-SIG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE: Course work</td>
<td>TE-CRWK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE: Student Culture</td>
<td>TE-STDS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
EARLY FIELD EXPERIENCES
- EFE: Purposes/Expectations
- EFE: Planning
- EFE: Responsibilities
- *EFE: Actions

STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCE
- *ST: Relations with cooperating teacher
- *ST: Decision-making processes
- *ST: Actions

RESPONSES TO INSTITUTIONAL PRESSURES
- IR: Internalized Adjustment
- IR: Strategic Compliance
- IR: Strategic Redefinition

CONCERNS ABOUT FUTURE

* Denoted new codes developed during the data analysis.
Table 5: Definitions of Codes Used in Data Analysis

**Biographical Information on Respondents—BB**

| Biographical background information: BB | Biographical sketch of individual provided during interview and on an inventory. Focus is on the work experience and education background of respondent, particularly experiences completed during university teacher education. |
| Biographical background information regarding schooling: BB-SCH | Biographical sketch of experiences of respondent information regarding as a student in elementary and secondary school. |

**Making the Decision to Become a Teacher—DEC**

| Persons influencing the decision: DEC-PRO | Identification of persons that influenced the decision to teach in a positive or negative way. |
| Event chronology of decision-making process: DEC-EVT | Event chronology during the process of making the decision to teach. |
| Career alternatives respondents to teaching: DEC-ALT | Alternative careers or jobs that considered or participated in prior to decision to become a teacher. |
| Reasons for choosing teaching: DEC-REA | Reported reasons for choosing teaching as teaching as a career. |

**Beliefs About Teaching—BLFS**

| Beliefs about the purposes of schooling: BLFS-SCH/PUR | Reported beliefs about the purposes of schooling and the role of the school in society. |
Table 5 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expectations of life as a teacher:</td>
<td>Reported regarding the duties, responsibilities, rewards, etc., expected as a teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BLFS-EXP</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal circumstances:</td>
<td>Personal ideals or situations that respondents hoped to create in the school and classroom setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BLFS-IDEAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in beliefs during university training:</td>
<td>Indices of changes in respondents expectations and ideals as a result of university teacher education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BLFS-CHNG</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs regarding teaching practices:</td>
<td>Reported beliefs about the appropriate techniques, strategies, and practices to be used in secondary social studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BLFS-PRAC</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of the teacher:</td>
<td>Descriptions of the teacher's role in relation to the school curriculum and self-classification based on three definitions provided by the researcher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BLFS-TCHR/CUR</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self assessment of teaching ability:</td>
<td>Self-assessment as a teacher (strengths and weaknesses).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BLFS-SELF</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and skills of teaching:</td>
<td>Beliefs about the important knowledge and skills necessary for an individual to possess in order to be an effective teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BLFS-KS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teachers that Serve as Role Models—RM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics/qualities of role models</td>
<td>Indices of the common characteristics of teachers that respondents identify as role model teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RM-CHAR</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices/behaviors of role models:</td>
<td>Description of the classroom practices and behaviors of role models.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RM-PRAC</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles and influence of role models:</td>
<td>Descriptions of the roles and positions held by people identified as role models and their influence on respondents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RM-INF</strong></td>
<td>(table continues)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 (continued)

Knowledge and Curriculum—KNW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of knowledge:</th>
<th>Indices of respondents ideas regarding the nature of knowledge.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KNW-NAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of learnings:</th>
<th>Indices of respondents ideas regarding how learning occurs and the function of the teacher in relation to this process.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KNW-LRN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose of the social studies:</th>
<th>Respondents conceptions of the role and function of social studies in the school curriculum and the purpose of social studies instruction.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KNW-SS/PUR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of the social studies:</th>
<th>Respondents conceptions of the nature of the social studies and their perceptions of other disciplines included in the school curriculum.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KNW-SS/NAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher Education—TE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectations of teacher education experiences:</th>
<th>Descriptions of respondents expectations of course work, field experiences, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TE-EXP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals/Purposes of teacher education:</th>
<th>The goals and purpose of the teacher education program as perceived by respondents.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TE-PUR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideal teacher education experiences:</th>
<th>Respondents descriptions of what an ideal teacher education program might included and how it would differ from their present program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TE-IDEAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course work in teacher education:</th>
<th>Assessments, problems, or concerns made by respondents based on their experience in teacher education course work (excluding field experiences).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TE-CWRK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student culture in the college of education:</th>
<th>Descriptions of student relationships and assessments of the relative influence of peers on respondents teaching perspectives.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TE-STDS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Table 5 (continued)

**Early Field Experiences (prior to student teaching)—EFE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals/purposes of early field experiences: EFE-PUR</td>
<td>Reported conceptions of the purposes of early field-based teacher education experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson planning in early field experiences: EFE-PLN</td>
<td>Reported lesson planning and decision-making strategies of respondents during early field experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservice teachers' responsibilities during early field experiences: EFE-RES</td>
<td>Reported classroom responsibilities during early field experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student teacher relations with pupil during early field experiences: EFE-REL/P</td>
<td>Indices of impact of relationship with pupils on teaching perspective during early field experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student teacher relations with cooperating teachers during early field experiences: EFE-REL/CT</td>
<td>Indices of impact of relationship with cooperating teachers on teaching perspective during early field experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom actions of student teachers during early field experiences: EFE-ACT</td>
<td>Descriptions of practices and actions of student teachers during early field experiences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student teaching—ST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making during student teaching: ST-DEC</td>
<td>Reported process of decision-making during student teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student teachers' relations with cooperating teachers during student teaching: ST-REL/CT</td>
<td>Indices of impact of relationship with cooperating teacher on teaching perspective during student teaching.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Table 5 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>relations with pupils</th>
<th>Indices of impact of relationship with pupils on teaching perspectives during student teaching.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>during student teaching:</td>
<td>ST-REL/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom actions of student teachers during student teaching:</td>
<td>Descriptions of practices and actions of teachers during student teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST-ACT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Individual Responses to Institutional Pressures—IR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internalized adjustment:</th>
<th>Individual responses to pressures and constraints that resulted in a readjustment or change in respondent's perspective.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IR-IADJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic compliance:</td>
<td>Individual responses to pressures and constraints that resulted in outward compliance, but did not change the respondent's internal perspective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR-STRATCOM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic redefinition:</td>
<td>Individual responses to pressures and constraints that resulted in the respondent taking action to redefine the situation in order to more closely match his or her teaching perspective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR-REDEF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Concerns about the Future—FCN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future concerns:</th>
<th>Reported concerns or problems regarding individual teacher development respondents believed they should address.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FCN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS
Course Requirement of Secondary Social Studies Education Program

The social studies education area offers a comprehensive major that includes work in history and the social sciences. Students who complete this program are eligible for the Ohio Four-Year High School Certificate valid for the teaching of social studies in which the student has taken a minimum 18 quarter hours of credit, comprehensive social studies, and history in grades 7 through 12.

I. General University Requirements

II. General College Requirements

III. Special Area Requirements

The University Basic Education Requirement in social science is satisfied by course taken in the major.

IV. Content Courses in Major Area..........................90 hours

Course work will be distributed in the following manner, with a minimum of 25 hours to be taken in courses numbered 300 and above.

A. History.......................................................30 hours

To include basic courses in American and world history, incorporating European and non-Western history.

B. Complete 18 hours in a minimum of two of the following social sciences:

   a. Political Science         d. Geography
   b. Economics                e. Anthropology
   c. Sociology

C. Select a minimum of one course in each of the above social sciences (a through) not used as an eighteen-hour area of concentration.

D. Additional courses needed to complete the 90-hour requirement may be selected from the following areas:

   a. History                        e. Geography
   b. Political Science              f. Anthropology
   c. Economics                      g. Social Studies Program
   d. Sociology                      h. International Studies
V. Required Professional Courses

Education 450 and 451—Professional Introduction I and II
(6 credit hours each)

Education 600—Basic Media Skills in the Secondary School
(1 credit hour)

ED T & P 526—Social Studies in the Secondary School
(4 credit hours)

ED T & P 527—Curriculum Materials, Resources, and Teaching
Strategies for Secondary Social Studies Teachers
(4 credit hours)

ED P & L 650.01 - 650.04—Humanistic Foundations of Education
(3 credit hours each, 6 hours required)

ED T & P 535—Fundamentals of Secondary Reading Instruction
(3 credit hours)

or

ED T & P 656—Literature for Adolescents
(3 credit hours)
Table 6: Distribution of Course Requirements in Ohio State's Secondary Social Studies Education Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curricular Requirement</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
<th>Percent Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University/College requirements (liberal arts)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content area courses in teaching field</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional education requirements (including student teaching)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

205 credit hours 100% to graduate
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