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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Cross (1984) reports that education for adults is the most rapidly growing segment in all education. According to a National Center for Education Statistics report, enrollments of students over age 25 on American campuses have more than doubled between 1970 and 1985. The sheer number of these students present issues for study.

This group of adult students has been identified within the field of Education as "non-traditional" students (Cross, 1981; Darkenwald & Merriam, 1982). Non-traditional students bring with them a set of different life world experiences that the schools have not anticipated or that the students themselves may not have considered relevant to their life as students.

While a growing number of non-traditional adult students enroll in post-secondary courses, traditional age adult students also continue to enroll. At no other point in time of an individual's schooling is there such a diverse age population in the same classroom. The impact on classroom life by such a wide
age range of students within one setting becomes an issue and raises question for this study.

Given there is a growing body of non-traditional adult students within University classrooms, and given that many of these students are enrolling in teacher education curriculums, this study was undertaken to gain an understanding of how they perceive their role as student. The study focused on a group of adult students enrolled in a university freshman-level teacher education class. It was conducted at a time when increasing numbers of non-traditional students were enrolling in teacher education curriculums. The study explored the everyday life of the adult students with the intent of gaining an understanding of the non-traditional student.

Research on the adult learner is not new. The years 1926-1929 have been identified by Stubblefield (1981) as the "formative years of the adult education movement". However, it has been since World War II that Adult Education has developed into a strong field of study with a growing body of literature (Bergevin, 1967; Knowles, 1950). Though much has been done, much still needs to be done. It has been said that "we know more about how animals learn than about how children learn; and we know much more about how
children learn than we know about how adults learn (Knowles, 1978)."

PROBLEM STATEMENT

Based on a need to become more familiar with this growing segment of the adult student population, the general question for study became:

What is the nature of the students' world as perceived by traditional and non-traditional students as they participate in a "freshman early experience course in Education?"

This study was conceived and developed to identify perceptions held by the students as to how they see their everyday life in the classroom, and how those perceptions were similar and/or different for the traditional and non-traditional students. It was anticipated that such insights would be valuable to research into adult instruction problems. How this study differs from work already done in the field of Adult Education will be presented in the following paragraphs.

Background: The Growth of Adult Education

The social and economic trends which grew from events of World War II produced a group of adult citizens who looked to education as a vehicle for
individual change. As a result, the field of Adult Education has seen a tremendous growth in the post-war years.

Adult Education, as a field, has concentrated research on program development. Its primary focus has been the structure of learning activities and the variables which affect them (Verner, 1964; Long, 1980; Darkenwald & Merriam, 1980). This presentation of Adult Education as program-centered is evidenced in the definitions offered by scholars in the field. For instance, a 1980 National Center for Education Statistics questionnaire defined Adult Education as consisting of "courses and other educational activities, organized by a teacher or sponsoring agency, and taken by persons beyond compulsory school age (Cross, 1981, p.51)."

The 1976 definition adopted by the General Conference of UNESCO states:

"The term, adult education, denotes the entire body of organized educational processes, whatever the content, level, and method, whether formal or otherwise, whether they prolong or replace initial education in schools, colleges, and universities as well as in apprenticeship,
whereby persons regarded as adult by the society to which they belong develop their abilities, enrich their knowledge, improve their technical or professional qualifications, or turn them in a new direction and bring about changes in their attitudes or behavior in the two-fold perspective of full personal development and participation in balanced and independent social, economic and cultural development...

(UNESCO, 1977)

Brookfield offers a summary of the philosophy of adult education as one of pragmatism. He presents the education of adults as a "matter of designing, conducting, and evaluating educational experiences so as to meet the felt needs of adults (1986, p.287)".

While research in the field of Adult Education lends important insight into programs attended by adult students, it does not address classroom issues as perceived by them, and expressed through their own words.

This gap in prior research points to a need for the study of classroom life for the adult student, and
especially the non-traditional adult student as seen from their perspective. A reality of classroom life lies within student perception; "the student's intentions, decision making, perceptions, and interpretations are an important part of the reality of the classroom (Jarvis, 1980 as reported in Welch, 1988)". In order for professionals in the field of Education to meet the academic, professional and social agendas of this group of returning students, it becomes important to gain an understanding of their perceptions of life as student. How the perceptions of the non-traditional student are similar and/or different from the traditional students with whom they share instruction adds to the description of classroom life.

STATEMENT OF GOAL

The goal for this study was to investigate adult learners by engaging in a comparative study of their everyday life in a college freshman level Education class. More specifically, it was to engage in a comparison study of the everyday life of the traditional and non-traditional adult student within the same post-secondary setting with the intent of gaining insight as to how the non-traditional learner lives out the role of student in the classroom.
STUDY QUESTIONS

Given the goal of a comparative study, a guiding concern for this study was the manner in which life in the post-secondary classroom is similar and/or different for the traditional and non-traditional adult student.

The general question presented earlier was further defined and re-stated:

What are the commonalities and differences in the definition of 'student' for the members of this class? The question was studied through a culturally driven, anthropological framework which defines classroom life as a socially constructed environment in which norms and expectations, roles and relationships, rights and obligations are constructed by participants over time and which result in rules for participation within that setting. The use of this perspective identified questions for study.

1.0 What are the norms and expectations for behavior within the classroom?
   1.1 as perceived by the traditional students?
   1.2 as perceived by the non-traditional students?
   1.3 as perceived by the instructor?
   1.4 as perceived by the researcher?
2.0 What are the roles and relationships within this classroom?
   2.1 as perceived by the traditional students?
   2.2 as perceived by the non-traditional students?
   2.3 as perceived by the instructor?
   2.4 as perceived by the researcher?

3.0 What are the rights and obligations within this classroom?
   3.1 as perceived by the traditional students?
   3.2 as perceived by the non-traditional students?
   3.3 as perceived by the instructor?
   3.4 as perceived by the researcher?

A fourth question was designed to provide a comparison of perceptions. Interview, observation and questionnaire data were used to expand the lens by which perception and action became visible. Such information seen only through one of the lenses would have left much hidden. A triangulation model suggested by Morine-Dershimer (1988) was used to respond to the fourth question. A series of four triangulation points allowed data from various sources to be compared. A description of the model is found in Chapter 3.

Question 4 became:
4.0 What is the common definition of 'student' for members of this class as perceived by participants and researcher?

4.1 as perceived by students, instructor and researcher (Triangulation point 1)?

4.2 as perceived by traditional students, non-traditional students and instructor (Triangulation point 2)?

4.3 as perceived by traditional students, non-traditional students and researcher (Triangulation point 3)?

4.4 as perceived by interview, observation and questionnaire data (Triangulation point 4)?

DEFINITIONS

For this study the following definitions will be used:

Traditional student: a student for whom there has been less than eighteen months between formal schooling experiences;

Non-Traditional student: a student for whom there has been more than five years between formal schooling experiences;

Norms and Expectations: Norms and expectations are those patterns of behaviors that have come to be
accepted as the ordinary ways of behaving in the setting (Green, Kantor & Rogers, in press). They refer to the sense that participants are able to predict behavior based on the perceived ways of behaving for any particular situation within that setting.

**Roles and Relationships:** Roles are seen as the means by which participants and events encountered each other in everyday life (Greene, 1978); the function of persons, materials and events in a particular setting (Spradley, 1980). Relationships are the way in which one factor, event, person, etc. is a part of another and of each other, so that together they can be used to give a holistic view of an event or scene (Spradley, 1980).

**Rights and Obligations:** Rights and obligations refer to those behaviors in which participants are given permission to engage, and for which they are held accountable. Such behaviors may be stated or unstated, imposed, negotiated, or assumed (Edwards & Westgate, 1987; Green, Kantor & Rogers, in press; Shultz, Florio & Erickson, 1982). Obligations associated with rights bound the participant to comply or lose membership within the group (Goffman, 1967).
RATIONALE FOR DESIGN OF STUDY

Minimal attention has been given to the classroom life of the adult learner. The work that has been done has relied on statistical reviews of adult response to particular teaching techniques and what seemed to work rather than why something was or was not effective (Morris, 1977, Long, 1980).

In the 1950s Bittner asserted that the failure of adult educators to understand cultural relativity and its effect on learning would hinder the research of adult learning. The more recent acceptance by educators of the effect of culture in learning for the young student has helped pave the way for such work in adult learning.

An example is the work being done in educational settings by both educators and anthropologists. Using a culturally driven approach, researchers from both disciplines have become involved in the study of the processes of literacy, communication and socialization within the classroom setting in an effort to identify the cultural patterns of everyday life for participants in that setting (Zaharlick and Green, in press). Others have presented work investigating the role of school in the transmission of culture (Camilleri, 1986; Gearing & Sangree, 1970).
Though many studies focusing on the characteristics of classroom life have been done, they have concentrated on the young learner. Even though this work has been concentrated on the young learner, it provides a background of knowledge for use in research of the adult learner classroom.

The research process which will be presented in this chapter was based on the theoretical construct of the classroom as a culturally driven, socially constructed environment in which norms and expectations, roles and relationships, rights and obligations are developed over time, and result in the establishment of rules for participation (Goodenough, 1964; Philips, 1972; Green, 1978; Heath, 1983). Since no evidence of such work being done with the adult learner classroom could be found, findings from studies with young learner's classrooms provided a springboard for this study. An additional value of this study is its addition of the adult classroom to the body of evidence supporting the classroom as a socially constructed environment.

DESCRIPTION OF THE RESEARCH PROCESS

The goal of the research was to identify similarities and differences for classroom participation as perceived by traditional and non-
traditional students in the studied class. The goal was achieved by looking at the everyday life of the participants in this class through three sources of data: interview, researcher observation, and a post-study questionnaire. Interview data was used to gain an understanding of the student role as seen and described by the participants themselves, and as presented in their own words. Use of participant's own words is noted in work of sociolinguistics as vital in arriving at participant perceptions. Spradley (1980) stresses verbatim recording of participant talk and refers to the need to "make use of what people say in seeking to describe their culture (p.12)".

Researcher observation became a tool for describing the actions that comprised life in the classroom. Participant observation was used to confirm or disconfirm student perceptions of everyday events, and sought to note which, if any, identified differences could be seen in the actions of everyday life, or if they existed only in student perceptions.

The post-study questionnaire was sent to students in order to seek confirmation or disconfirmation of suggested findings. Limitations of the post-study questionnaire are noted and presented in Chapter 3.

In keeping with the research goal of identifying similarities and differences in participant perception
of student life in this class, it became necessary to contrast and match findings from each of the sources. A comparison study of the data was undertaken through use of a multiple perspective framework. That is, interview data gathered from participants (traditional, non-traditional students and instructor), observation data, and questionnaire data were collected and applied to a triangulated model for comparison. As a result of the comparison study, a common picture of 'student' as perceived by the participants of this class could be presented.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The researcher acknowledges the following four limitations to the study:

1. The study was conducted over a ten week period with one class of thirty seven students enrolled in a pre-professional teacher training course. Enrollment in such a specialized course identifies a particular group of students rather than a randomly selected group. The description obtained cannot be generalized beyond the time and content boundaries of the studied class. However, the findings were generated from more than one perspective and therefore could be considered a reliable description of this group of students. It is hoped that future studies focused on perceptions of adult students, and particularly non-traditional
students within other content classrooms, will be conducted which would accumulate into a significant body of literature intent on defining the role of student as perceived by this group of learners.

2. The researcher was not able to observe the students in a significant segment of the course, the field placement experience. Information relative to this segment of the course was gleaned from reporting of field activities during seminar meetings and from student interviews.

3. Student interviewees were self-selected rather than randomly chosen. The resulting group of interviewees was representative of the total class only in regards to level of schooling (i.e. number/percentage of freshmen, sophomores, etc.). However, given the focus of the study as the non-traditional student, the proportion of non-traditional students to traditional students (9 non-traditional to 28 traditional students for total class; 6 non-traditional to 7 traditional students for interviewees) was not considered inappropriate.

4. Observation was conducted by a single researcher. To reduce possibility of researcher bias the data collection was obtained through multiple sources, and selected portions of data analysis were subjected to participant checking.
SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

This was the study of a single class of students, and although the description obtained cannot be generalized beyond the time and content boundaries of the study, the work has theoretical significance. The identification of similarities and differences between traditional and non-traditional students in this classroom can contribute to a larger body of knowledge intent on understanding the nature of norms and expectations, roles and relationships, rights and obligations at work within adult student classrooms. Such understandings can have value for research into adult education issues by identifying student perceptions of the reactive/interactive relationships within the classroom. This study also adds to research conceptualized through a multiple perspective.

Since the studied class was a part of the curriculum for teacher education at the study site, suggestions for future studies in teacher education also surfaced from this study.

An additional significance of this study lies in the growing number of non-traditional students enrolling in post-secondary classes. The impact of such growing numbers on financial positions of institutions and the need for instructional development
for the teachers of these courses are issues presented during the course of this study.

ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

Chapter II is composed of three sections. The first provides a description of the adult learner as found within a body of literature of Adult Education. The second section presents a review of literature focused on the theoretical framework which guided this study, the classroom as a socially constructed environment. The third section of the literature review focuses on the use of sociolinguistics as a guide for the analysis of interview data.

Chapter III discusses the design of the study, the multiple sources of data and the analysis process. It includes the steps taken for establishing trustworthiness of data. Chapter IV presents the findings. Chapter V is a discussion of the findings in relationship to adult learner research presented in Chapter II so that life of adult learners, and especially non-traditional students, can be more fully understood from their perspective.
CHAPTER II
SEARCH OF LITERATURE

This review of literature serves to identify a relationship for adult classroom life research within the broader perspective of adult learner research currently available. In so doing, an increased understanding can be gained of what has been learned overall from research on the adult learner. This review also serves to place the current study within a research perspective in which it can be viewed in relation to other studies of classroom life as seen from the theoretical concept of classroom as a socially constructed environment.

To accomplish these two purposes, the review of literature is presented in three sections. Section One focuses on research relevant to the study of adult learners. Section Two provides information on the theoretical concept which guided this study, that of the classroom as a socially constructed environment. Section Three focuses on a description of sociolinguistics as a conceptual framework used to guide the analysis of data.
Literature resulting from research in the field of Adult Education served as a base for the adult learner search reported in this chapter. Though Cross (1981, p. 88) referred to the advantage of subjective interview data in the study of adult learners, the majority of work in Adult Education has been accomplished through survey and other quantitative tools. Exceptions are noted by Merriam, (1989) and Darkenwald (1989). Merriam wrote a review of interview and observation inquires conducted with small, non-random samples. She particularly noted Houles', *The Inquiring Mind* (1961), an interview study involving twenty two men and women "conspicuously" engaged in learning activities.

Darkenwald based a social environment study of adult classes on early work by Lewin (1934) and Murray (1938). In the work Darkenwald noted the increasing amount of work being done in social environment of the classrooms of children, but the "void of inquiry on adult classroom social environments". He used this work to develop an Adult Classroom Environment Scale to encourage further work along these lines. One of the findings from his work was a discrepancy between student's perception of ideal classroom environment and the actual experience.
The literature review is representative, not inclusive. The intent is to show that findings gathered from a culturally driven, social construction perspective can increase understanding of the adult learner by providing new insights about previously studied issues as well as issues not yet studied.

Section One

Adult Learners

Literature focusing on the adult learner will be presented from the perspective of who learns what, why and with what kind of help (Tough, 1979; Darkenwald and Merriam, 1982; Long, Hiemstra and Associates, 1980). Four topics from within the present literature will be offered as representative this perspective; 1) Descriptive characteristics of the adult learner; 2) Learning behavior preferences and practices of the adult learner; 3) Motivation for participation in organized learning experiences; and 4) Subjects studied by adult learners. These topics were selected for review because they illustrate the kinds of understandings of the complexity of classroom life that could be investigated from a social construction perspective. They look at the 'who learns what, why and with what kind of help' question. Thus findings generated from the current study regarding student
perception of their identity as student contribute to an increased understanding of what has been learned regarding the adult learner.

Long (1980) states there are several issues which makes research of the adult learner difficult. These include 1) the length of the adult life span, with its complex variables, 2) the lack of agreement within the field of what constitutes an adult learner, and 3) the lack of agreement within the field on what constitutes adult education. We will look briefly at each of the issues. First, major research issues for adult learners may span a group of learners with several decades of life experiences as well as a broad range of cultural differences. Long (1980) offers this observation as being in sharp contrast to the more restricted age range studied by researchers of childhood and adolescent learners. Developing research studies and/or instruments to investigate such a diversity of participants "is not to be taken lightly (Long, 1980, p. 8)"

A second problem within the field is the lack of agreement on what constitutes an adult learner. Some sources use age (17 and over, since compulsory school age ends at 16) to determine adulthood; some use social status (i.e., married, live on armed forces bases, self-supporting). Most use a combination of age and social
status ("eighteen through sixty living in their own homes and not in full-time residence at a school or college", Carp and Peterson as reported in Long, 1980).

The National Center for Education Statistics (1981) used age to identify this segment of learners, reporting that 18.5% of Adult Education participants in 1981 were 17 to 24 years old, and 35.3% were 25 to 34 years old. The U.S. Department of Education, in its first comprehensive survey of undergraduate and graduate college enrollment by age, concluded that roughly 60 percent of all 1987 college students were 23 or older.

Darkenwald and Merriam (1982) examine the terms 'education' and 'adult' when discussing the nature of Adult Education. For these authors, the "salience of the student role vis-a-vis other social roles" is the critical issue. Rather than use age as a defining criteria, they perceive 'adult education' students as ones for whom "the ordinary business of life continues and the role of student is subordinate to it (p.8)". This definition was visible in the studied group non-traditional students. They perceived an obligation to arrange for family duties before tending to school responsibilities. These students would miss classes when their children were ill and required care. Scheduling classes was accomplished around times to
"pick up the children from school (or dance class, or baseball practice, or see them on the bus in the morning!)

The third issue, lack of agreement of what constitutes 'adult education' makes it difficult for members of the field to communicate with each other, or to apply findings of various studies (Long, p.9).

1. Descriptive Characteristics of the Adult Learner

Characteristics other than age and social roles are used to describe adult learners. Table 1, taken from Darkenwald & Merriam, (1982, p.121) illustrates descriptive characteristics of adult learners, along with participation rate in 1975. The authors state that of these factors, the most potent one is educational attainment.

Cross (1981) offered a more complex, but comprehensive description of adult learners through use of a framework she called COR (Chain-of-Response). The purpose of this model was to explain 'who' participates in adult learning activities and 'why'. See Figure 1 (as taken from Cross, p.124).

Though Cross did not anticipate COR could be used to predict who will participate, she did propose it as a means of organizing "existing knowledge and in suggesting more sharply focused research projects to add to the gradual accumulation of knowledge (p.124)". 
Table 1
Participation Rates in Adult Education by Selected Learner Characteristics, 1975

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Participation Rate in %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-34</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-54</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55+</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schooling</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-11 yrs.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 yrs.</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 yrs. college</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 yrs. college or more</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $10,000</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000-$14,999</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000-$24,999</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 &amp; over</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4. Chain-of-Response (COR) Model for Understanding Participation in Adult Learning Activities

(A) Self-evaluation

(B) Attitudes about education

(C) Importance of goals and expectation that participation will meet goals

(D) Life transitions

(E) Information

(F) Opportunities and barriers

(G) Participation

Figure 1

Taken from: Cross, K. Patricia, Adults As Learners, 1981, p.124
Though no reports of work using the model were found in the literature search, it remains as an issue for further search. The model's demand for understanding the learner's "internal understanding" of variables follows the broad framework of the current study and increases the possibility of knowledge gained from the learner's perspective.

Knowles (1973) developed a set of adult learner characteristics. These became a theoretical framework for work within Adult Education. They include:

1. Self Concept: The adult learner sees himself as capable of self-direction and desires others to see him the same way. In fact, one definition of maturity is the capacity to be self-directing.

2. Experience: Adults bring a life-time of experience to the learning situation. Youths tend to regard experience as something that has happened to them, while to an adult, his experience is him. The adult defines who he is in terms of his experience.

3. Readiness-to-Learn: Adult developmental tasks increasingly move toward social and occupational role competence and away from the more physical developmental tasks of childhood.

4. A problem-centered time perspective: Youth thinks of education as the accumulation of knowledge
for use in the future. Adults tend to think of learning as a way to be more effective in problem solving today (p.184-185).

Robbins and Boggs (1979) presented five principles which characterize adults as learners. These include:

1. Adults want to be partners in the instruction/learning process;

2. People are interested and committed when they have been involved in deciding and planning the learning experience;

3. There are tremendous differences among adults in background, experience and environment;

4. Adults normally consider education to be foreign to their everyday lives, and are cautious when participating in educational activities; and

5. Adults can choose to make their lives a period of continued growth and development by participating in episodes of education.

In addition to Knowle's and the Robbins and Boggs descriptive characterization of adult learners, Houle, in the early 1960s, concluded there are three types of adult learners; 1) goal-oriented learners - those who have fairly clear-cut objectives; 2) activity-oriented learners - those who are interested in the activity of learning, but with minor or no connections with the purposes of the activity; and 3) learning-oriented
learners - those who pursue knowledge for its own sake (Darkenwald and Merriam, 1981). Houle's typology led to research focusing on motivational issues. A sample of such research will be presented in the section dealing with motivation factors.

Darkenwald and Merriam (1981) conclude that probably most adult learners are a "mosaic" of the three types projected by Houle. They point out that the resulting complexity of the adult learner is a feature that cannot be ignored in any description effort.

A summary of research seeking to describe adult students participating in university degree programs presents another complex picture. Aside from the general picture of adult degree seekers as "serious, upwardly mobile people from working-class backgrounds", few common descriptors can be used (Cross, p.68). Questionnaire and survey were the source of information and limited by their distribution during freshman orientation for traditional day-time students. The researchers (Solmon, Gordon, and Ochsner) cautioned readers about generalizing from the undoubtedly biased sample.

Roelfs (1975) compared older (22 and over) and younger students in community colleges. Using a more representative distribution technique, Roelfs found
that the older students are more goal oriented and
challenged rather than bored with their classes, feel
more self-confident, spend more time studying, and
express satisfaction with their classes and
instructors.

Brecht(1978) found similar characteristics when
comparing evening school students (75% were over 25
years old) and day time seniors at the university. The
older students were less critical of curriculum and
instruction than day students.

Two chapters on adult learners are found in
the Third Handbook of Research on Teaching (1986). One
review concerns Professional Education (primarily,
medical). The second chapter reviews teaching in the
Armed Forces. Both chapters present findings dealing
with a very specialized population and concentrate on
job-related skills as opposed to longer term, more
general educational goals. Both chapters focused on
teacher issues. Neither include any reference to
student perceptions of their role as student. The one
exception is when the authors recommend use of student
evaluation of instruction.

In the chapter on Research in Teaching in the
Armed Forces (O'Neil, Anderson and Freeman) the authors
point out the relationship between military training
environment and public education. Findings reveal the
biggest difference seems to be in the military training emphasis on job-related skills. Other differences include an emphasis on computer based instruction and computer-assisted instruction. These findings suggest the military programs are paving the way for use of such techniques in public education.

The second review of education issues for adult learners to be found in the most recent Handbook of Research on Teaching (1986) is a review of research on professional education (Dinham and Stritter). Though presented as a review of education for the professions, the chapter is limited to a synthesis of the field for education of medical professionals.

The omission in the Handbook of any research focusing on the adult learner within the public sector points out the separation that exists between the generic field of Education and Adult Education.

Learning Preferences and Practices of Adult Learners

The preceding review has provided a representation of literature which identified 'who' the adult learner is. The following review will present information about 'how' the adult learner prefers to engage in learning activities.

Scholars of early adult education research identified self-directed learning, discussion groups
and individual study as means of instruction most preferred by adult learners (Jackson, 1931; Snedden, 1930; Russell, 1938 as cited in Knowles, pp.32-37). More recent work seems to confirm these early findings. A 1972 study reveals learning methods preferred by participants in adult education emphasized group settings such as classrooms, and conferences (Darkenwald & Merriam, 1981). While the traditional class or lecture is the most preferred style, the authors indicate it would be "inaccurate to conclude that adults prefer passive" approaches to learning.

Penland (1979) reported adults seek help in planning learning activities from nonhuman resources (i.e. movies, audio and video taping) and one-to-one helpers. Group planners, such as in workshops or classes were preferred means of instructional help in less than 15% of the study.

Participation Training is an adult program of learning developed in the mid 1960s by Bergvinin and McKinley(1965). This technique calls for active involvement on the part of the learners through the use of small-groups. The authors make a distinction between Participation Training and the usual discussion group. Participation Training involves a trainer who helps the group "realize effective participation", and a Discussion Leader who
is a volunteer participant serving as designated leader of discussion for one or two sessions. The role of Discussion Leader is a revolving role shared by members of the group. Topics and related learning goals are determined by the participants, and each session ends with an open evaluation of the session.

Cross presented a second conceptual model to identify the adult learner. This one, CAL, (Characteristics of Adults as Learners), allowed researchers to describe adult learners using two sets of characteristics, Personal and Situational. (See Figure 2). Personal Characteristics were pictured along a continuum, each with a different shape. Figure 2 portrays the schemata as presented by Cross.

The model allowed for "incorporating the major existing theories of adult learning into a common framework, and provides a mechanism for thinking about a growing, developing human being in the context..." (Cross, 1981, p.243). This model was an attempt to know the 'what' and 'how' adults learn.

Cross (1981) distributes information on learning preferences and practices over two headings, Self-Directed learning, and participation in organized instruction. She defines 'self-directed learning' as "deliberate learning in which the person's primary
Characteristics of Adults as Learners (CAL)

Personal Characteristics

-------->Physiological/Aging -------->

-------->Sociocultural/Life Phases------->

-------->Psychological/Developmental Stages-------->

Situational Characteristics

Part-time Learning versus Full-time Learning
Voluntary Learning versus Compulsory Learning

Figure 2

Taken from: Cross, K. Patricia, *Adults as Learners*, 1981, p. 235
intention is to gain certain definite knowledge or skills (p.186)". "Participation in organized instruction" includes work done in colleges and universities, and is usually degree seeking.

Another view of adult learning, reflected in the theory of 'Andragogy', was promoted by adult education scholars as an effort to distinguish learning for adults from learning for children. Taken from a Greek language base of 'andr-' meaning man, androgogy is build on four crucial assumptions about the characteristics of adult learners. These assumptions are that, "as a person matures, 1.) his self-concept moves from one of being a dependent personality toward one of being a self-directing human being; 2.) he accumulates a growing reservoir of experience that becomes an increasing resource for learning; 3.) his readiness to learn becomes oriented increasingly to the developmental tasks of his social roles; and 4.) his time perspective changes from one of postponed application of knowledge to immediacy of application, and accordingly his orientation toward learning shifts from one of subject-centeredness to one of problem-centeredness. (Knowles, 1970)".

Literature reveals several models of instruction designed by Adult Education theorists (Knowles, p.122). These models include an andragogical design (Knowles),
a learning project model (Tough) and a more fundamental system (Houle). The andragogical design (based on the concept of Andragogy as a theory of learning) requires learners to identify goals for learning, and for the designer of instruction to select procedures and formats for learning according to the learners' readiness. The 'learning project' (Tough, 1971) is a specific type of organized learning experience. Tough describes it as "a series of related episodes, adding up to at least seven hours. In each episode more than half of a person's total motivation is to gain and retain certain fairly clear knowledge and skill, or to produce some other lasting change in himself".

The learning project model consists of a series of learning episodes or projects, each planned by learners and carried out by learner initiative. The fundamental design suggested by Houle is one managed by the educator (Knowles, pp. 74; 122). Knowles questioned the readiness of adult learners to accept the responsibilities for planning and implementing presented by the andragogical and learning project models and built a preparatory "learning how to learn" activity into his designs (Knowles, 1973 p.123).
Motivation

Four basic designs have been used for the research into motivation of adult learners. These include: (1) depth interviews (Houle, 1961, which resulted in the typology of adult learners presented in the above section); (2) statistical analysis of motivational scales (Boshier, 1971; Burgess, 1971; Morstain and Smart, 1974); (3) survey questionnaires (Carp, Peterson, and Roelfs, 1974); and (4) hypothesis testing (Aslanian and Brickell, 1980; Tough, 1968). Cross states that though none of these methods have definitively answered why adults choose to participate in learning activities, each method has contributed to a set of conclusions:

1. There are "intrinsic" (an 'itch to learn') and "extrinsic" (a need to know, or a specific reward for learning is apparent, such as certification) motivations for learning;

2. Most adults have a problem to solve;

3. To improve one's position in life is a major motivation. (Cross, pp. 96-97).

Underlying reasons for adult study are often multiple and, at times, not obvious or rational (Darkenwald and Merriam, 1981). However, in spite of such complexity, Darkenwald and Merriam conclude that a structure for determining motivation for adult learners
is recognizable. Students may become involved in
learning to satisfy a requirement, such as mandatory
continuing education; to meet diploma, certification or
degree requirements; to satisfy a need for change in
their daily lives; or to become involved with other
people. These reasons are reflective of Houle's
typology of adult learners which, as stated earlier,
spurred work in motivation.

All of the students in the current study were
seeking a college diploma and teaching certification.
What the past research techniques and current
literature fail to address is the identification of
underlying layers of motivation for the selection of
any particular route to meeting learning needs.
Without asking the participants themselves 'why?', such
layers of reason are speculative and remain hidden.

As stated earlier, Houle's typology of adult
learners became a major impetus for the study of
motivation for adult learners. An example of such
studies was done by Boshier and Collins (1985). The
Education Participation Scale was used to test the
typology as a motivational tool. Findings indicated
the goal and learning orientations were reasonably
clear as Houle had described them, but that the reality
of the activities orientation is more complicated than
Houle envisioned.
Knowles (1978) describes the adult learner as one who has a "problem-centered orientation to learning". Johnstone and Rivera (1962) concluded that the "major emphasis in adult learning is on the practical rather than the academic; on the applied rather than on the theoretical, and on the skills rather than on knowledge and information (O'Neil, Anderson & Freeman, 1986). Darkenwald and Merriam (1981) refer to this "intimate relationship between learning and living" as the "hallmark of adult education (p. 124)."

Cross believes there is a need now for "greater depth of understanding" of expectations about learning experiences (p. 142). She implies that more "insightful research" would illuminate philosophical questions regarding student expectations. Both topics would be appropriate for an exploration of student perceptions.

Subjects Chosen for Study by Adult Learners

By using the broad definition of 'self-directed' projects as presented earlier by Cross, scholars in the field acknowledge that the possible range of subject matter studied by adult learners is infinite. Literature presents evidence that attempts to classify learning projects by subject matter have been made. For example, Penland classified adult learning projects into three categories. Formal topics
such as history, mathematics and science accounted for 6.9% of adult learning; practical topics, such as business, technical and job-related work accounted for 75.9% and intra-self topics, such as sensory awareness, politics and art accounted for 17.2% (Cross, 1981, p.188). Research generally supports the notion that most adults who undertake a learning activity do so with the intention of solving a problem rather than learning a subject. Knowles remarked:

"The adult comes into an educational activity largely because he is experiencing some inadequacy in coping with current life problems. He wants to apply tomorrow what he learns today, so his time perspective is one of immediacy of application. Therefore, he enters into education with a problem-centered orientation to learning". (as found in Cross, p.189).

Some of the subject matter trends in Adult Education during the 1970s are reported by Boaz,(1978, p.24). They include: Occupational Training 48.7%; General Education 20.6%; Social Life and Recreation 15.9%; Personal and Family Living 14.8%; Community Issues 10.0%; and Other 3.2%.

The survey by Boaz followed similar trends presented by Carp,Peterson and Roelfs,(1974, pp.18-19).
Their report showed the following subject matter interest for adult learners: Vocational subjects 43%; Hobbies and recreation 13%; General education 13%; Home and family 12%; Personal development 7%; Public affairs 5%; Other 8%. This information supports the presence of the studied group of adult students in a professional training program.

**Summary**

A review of literature relevant to the adult learner has been presented. A summary of descriptive characteristics concludes adult learners are complex beings with a wide age range and multiple motivation factors. They are self-directed, but prefer learning in a setting managed by a 'significant other person'. The adult learner is problem-oriented, usually participating in learning experiences that provide specific skills and/or knowledge.

The theoretical concept of Andragogy was described as a theory of learning presented by Adult Education professionals as appropriate to adult learning. The review reveals a lack of knowledge of the everyday events of classroom life for the adult learner. It also points out the lack of information based on the learner's perception and suggests a need to explore the world of the adult learner from their perspective of classroom life.
Section Two

THE CLASSROOM AS A SOCIA LLY CONSTRUCTED ENVIRONMENT:

A social construction perspective was adopted for use in the current study because it permitted a view of the complex social and instruction processes at work in classroom life. Two purposes are served by presenting this framework: One, identification of the concept defines what is meant by the social construction perspective, and two, it allows a means for the definition of life as student within this post-secondary, teacher training class.

Guided by a culturally driven point of view, this concept perceives members of a group as needing to acquire the cultural knowledge required for appropriate behavior within that group (Zaharlick and Green, in press). It suggests members of a group construct a set of norms and expectations, roles and relationships, rights and obligations which have developed over time and which establish rules for participation (Zaharlick & Green, in press; Goodenough, 1981; Spradley, 1980; Goodman, 1967).

In order to establish 'culture' as the force guiding a theory of social construction, one needs to understand the term as used within the theory. The term itself came from the German word 'Kulture' and identified the "better educated classes of Europe" as
"more civilized." The more a society replaced superstition and ignorance with scientific and technological knowledge, the more "Kulture' it had and the more civilized it was assumed to be (Goodenough, 1981, p.48). Under this criteria, societies could be classified as to the level of "Kulture' they had achieved.

Two conceptions of "culture' are easily discernable within the literature. First is the use of the term as a descriptive tool. That is, a means of describing a set of customs and beliefs which characterize a particular group (Boas, 1978) and which serve as models for behavior (Hall, 1976; Goodman, Mary, 1967). In their work with teacher education, Goodman, Jesse (1988) and Broussear, Bock & Byers, (1988) use the word "culture' to describe a set of attitudes and beliefs found within school settings, (i.e. "school", "teacher" and "university culture").

A second conception of "culture' is as a body of knowledge needed in order for members of a group to function in an appropriate manner (Spradley, 1972; Goodenough, 1964). The need for group members to recognize this knowledge as the means for appropriate behavior is emphasized by social construction theorists. It is in this foundation that Spradley distinguishes "culture' as a set of behaviors and
meanings as interpreted by the participants (1979, p.5). This second definition of "culture" is used to explain the classroom as a socially constructed environment. Though diverse in its conceptualization of "culture", the later body of literature acknowledges it as unique to a particular group, requiring time to develop and seeking a means for transmission.

Educational researchers have developed the concept of a school/classroom culture as they study the interaction among classroom members and its relationship to learning. These studies are based on the understanding that students become part of a common classroom culture with expectations about "who can do what with whom, when, where, under what conditions, for what purposes and with what outcomes (Hymes, 1974; Green, 1983 as presented in Green, Kantor & Roger, in press). How these phenomena are played out in the adult learner classroom becomes the means of defining the student role for the studied group of learners.

To date such studies have focused on the young student. For example, Cook-Gumperz (1981) studied a pre-school class of 3 and 4 year olds to see how speech behaviors were used as a resource in social situations and learning; Hall and Guthrie (1981) studied 4 and 5 year olds' patterns of language in order to describe interactive behavior and its relationship to classroom
failure of minority children in school; Shultz, Florio & Erickson (1982) studied a class of kindergarten/first grade school children looking for similarities and differences across different interactive contexts.

Other studies with pre-school, primary and middle school age children include work done by Jacob (1974-75); Lobov (1960,1972,1977) Gumperz (1981, in Green & Wallat); Weade (1987); Mehan, (1982); and Green and Wallat (1981). All of these works looked at the use of social and academic demands, roles and expectations for behavior within the classroom, and their effect on teaching and learning for children.

Using a series of child classroom studies as research base, Green (1983) identified a series of common conversational constructs which have been applied to other research efforts in an effort to understand the use of language in the construction of classroom participation rules. Erickson (1986) discusses the importance of research concerned with the "specifics of meaning and action in social life that takes place in concrete scenes of face-to-face interaction." He envisions such research as essential to the development of a truly professional attitude toward effective teaching.

In a review of research on classroom discourse, Cazden (1986) presents work focused on classroom events
and their participation structures. In this review the author discusses the division of a classroom day and the rules and norms that guide behavior in them. The use of teacher talk to control classroom events and the role of peer interaction as important parts of classroom life is studied from the perspective of discourse practices. The author concludes the synthesis of research by noting the aim of such work is to acknowledge and "gain insight into the social events of the classroom and thereby into the understandings which students achieve." How such information is reflected within adult learner classrooms becomes an issue for this study.

Norms and Expectations: Roles and Relationships Within the Classroom

A wide variety of context have been used by researchers to identify norms and expectations, roles and relationships at work in classrooms.

The interactive behaviors are evidenced through studies in reading (Collins, 1986), mathematics (Campbell, 1986) and first graders' sharing time activities (Michaels, 1986). Linguistic events are found to set norms for participation in the construction of student behavior within these different classroom contexts. Such behaviors for school may be
different from comparable activities at home and other social settings and require students to be able to adapt to school expectations. Participation in school is influenced by expectations learned from inside and outside the classroom (Green, Kantor & Rogers, in press).

Teacher/student collaboration is recognized as heart of the social interactive nature of classroom events (Collins, 1986; Campbell, 1986; Cazden, 1986). Teacher is commonly seen as directing activities within the classroom, creating conditions that make learning possible (Collins, 1986; Gumperz, 1986; Erickson, 1986); and dominating questioning (Campbell, 1986; Cazden, 1986).

Michaels (1986) presents an additional role of the teacher as that of "holding the floor for the child" a means of assuring that students are allowed opportunity to complete their talk turn (p.99). She sees schooling as a time for children to serve an apprenticeship into the adult conversational world with teacher as role model in the structuring of the child's discourse.

Though most literature focused on interactive roles between students and teacher, there is evidence of work done on the relationship of students with other students. Cazden (1986) cites early foundations for student social interaction by Piaget and Vygotsky.
Students serving as peer tutors, both as spontaneous helpers and as part of group collaboration are roles found to be visible in classrooms.

Given that the present study is the first in the study of the adult learner to use the theoretical approach of social construction, there is no literature to review from within this field. Literature concerning adult learners is available in the context of Adult Education, as presented in Chapter 1, and is presented in Section One of this chapter, but none could be found concerning the social construction of their lives as students in the classroom. Therefore, this study has its development as an extension of the work done with children.

Though there has been no work done with adult classrooms using social construction as a theoretical framework, at least four calls for culture-based, social perspective research was found in Adult Education literature. The first was by Bittner (1950) in which he stated that the failure of adult educators to understand cultural relativity and its effect on learning would hinder the research of adult learning. A second call was noted by Robbins and Boggs, (1979) in which they asked that research in the field calls for "knowing the world in which they (adult learners) live". A third call was found by Darkenwald (as
reported in Long, 1980); "If the subject matter of the field is the process of adult education, then the actual behavior of students, teachers, and administrators and their interpretations of their experience are of central importance for developing theory and upgrading practice". The most recent call was by Darkenwald (1989) in which he emphasizes the "void of inquiry on adult classroom social environments." This study extends work on classrooms as cultures and addresses a perceived need in the adult education world.

Section Three

SOCIOLINGUISTICS AS ANALYSIS

The term 'sociolinguistics' refers to the "description and analysis of language use as it relates to cultural and social patterns (Briggs, p.15)". In this way, the technique is differentiated from the emphasis on formal grammatical features and rules of linguistics as presented by Chomsky (1965, 1968). Sociolinguistics becomes a matter of communicative competence (Hymes, 1972) in which it is important for members to know not just the grammar of language, but also the 'when to speak, when not, what to speak about, with whom, when, where, and in what manner' (Edwards & Westgate, 1987, p.18). The underlying premise of this
perspective is that conversations are more than arbitrarily chosen strings of words which are meant to exchange ideas, opinions, observations and sentiments (Green and Wallat, 1981). Rather, conversations are complex social events which are rule-governed (Green, 1983).

Much of the work done within the framework of social construction has been studied through a form of language analysis. Cazden rationalizes this means of study by saying; "Spoken language is the medium by which much teaching takes place and in which students demonstrate to teachers much of what they have learned. Spoken language is also an important part of the identities of all the participants (p. 432).

Briggs (1986) identifies sociolinguistics as the "description and analysis of language use and the way it relates to cultural and social patterns". White emphasizes the role of symbols in the transmission of culture, and "articulate speech" as the most important form of symbolic expression (p. 33). Acknowledging the classroom as a socially constructed environment then suggests that the formation, maintenance and transmission of culture through classroom events can be seen as occurring through instructional language. Sociolinguistic theorists focus on the social interaction presented through language. They present
this concept as a "how to talk about what, to whom, when and for what purpose" concept for the classroom participants (Green & Weade, 1985). The use of language, and the conversations constructed through language, then becomes a means for the analysis of classroom life.

Conversation as a means of developing social processes is seen as guided by a set of assumptions and constructs. Green (1983) presented a listing of these constructs as a guide to the study of conversational language. These include:

a. Face to face interaction is governed by context-specific rules.

b. Activities have participation structures, with rights and obligations for participation. Rules for participation are implicit, conveyed and learned through interaction itself.

c. Meaning is context specific.

d. Frames of reference are developed over time and guide individual participation.

e. Complex communicative demands are placed on both teachers and students by the diversity of classroom communicative structures and teachers evaluate students ability from observing communicative performance (1983, Table II and pp. 174-186).
Seen as a means of description for classroom communication, Wilkinson (1982) presents sociolinguistics in the following manner:

"This approach" (a sociolinguistic perspective) focuses on descriptions of students' and teachers' use of language in the classroom. The descriptions provide us with a richer understanding of the life in classrooms, revealing the diversity of students and the complexity of communication in this context (Woolfolk, TIP, Winter, 1985, p.5).

Mehan (1979), Hymes (1974) and Erickson & Shultz (1977) point out that participants are required to not only be capable of speaking and listening, but also to understanding when, where, to whom, about what and in what manner language is utilized. There is the need to recognize cues that signal what rules for communication and participation are current.

Green and Weade (1985) present three levels of meanings as being constructed simultaneously in the classroom setting; academic content, appropriate social behavior, and an awareness of the activity in which both the academic and social tasks are functioning. The authors suggest that success within the classroom setting will be strongly influenced by whether students succeed or fail in reading the cues for each of the
levels of meaning. Though the research presented by Green and Weade focused on the young learner, the conclusions may have similar implications for the adult learner.

Green and Wallat (1981) say that conversations, as part of the everyday life of the classroom, are more than content. Their research strongly suggests that social processes are "constructed as a part of the unfolding instructional conversations and frequently co-occur with the presentation of content (p.161)". The classroom becomes an "active communicative setting" and sociolinguistics can be used as a means of identifying how "teachers and learners construct both instructional and social contexts" within the classroom setting.

Gumperz (1982) states: "I believe that to understand the role of language in education and in social processes in general, we need to begin with a closer understanding of how linguistic signs interact with social knowledge in discourse (p.29)", and thus presents a rationale for the study of classroom life through sociolinguistics.

Research summary presented by Wittrock (1986) in the Third Handbook of Research on Teaching states that it is the "learners generation of meaning from the teaching that mediates the achievement (p.311)."
Researchers in the realm of sociolinguistics would argue that meaning is conveyed through the use of language, both verbal and non-verbal and that the generation of meaning comes not only from the teaching, but the social interaction of the participants within that classroom setting.

**Sociolinguistics as a Research Technique**

When utilizing the interview as a research method, Briggs argues that appraising the sociolinguistic background of both interviewer and interviewee becomes a critical issue in the gaining of valid data (1987). Goodenough states that each individual will have his own version of whatever language he speaks (1981,) and the perception of what each interviewee hears as the interview question will affect the response given (Briggs, 1986).

Though presenting many problems in the obtaining of reliable and valid data through the use of interviews, Briggs still presents the interview as the communicative device most likely to give large amounts of information in the least amount of time (p.39).

**SUMMARY**

Chapter II presented a description of the adult learner, as presented through literature of Adult Education. It suggested the need to interview and
obtain student perceptions of classroom life. It also suggested the need to engage in classroom observation in order to observe demands on the students. The review of literature also presented the theoretical frameworks by which the research questions were studied and resulting information analyzed. Chapter III presents the methodology for the study.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

The goal of the study was to undertake a descriptive study of the everyday life of non-traditional students in a selected college, freshman level teacher training class on a regional campus of a large mid-west university. The study explored the similarities and differences in participation rules for traditional and non-traditional students as perceived by the students, their instructor and the researcher. It sought to explore the definition of 'student' as seen from perceptions of the participants and researcher observation. The study used a triangulation design to obtain comparison of perspectives, and to develop an understanding of how traditional and non-traditional students view the demands of being a student.

The goal led to a series of questions and sub-questions based on the theoretical construct of the classroom as a culturally driven, socially constructed environment in which norms and expectations, roles and
relationships, rights and obligations are developed over time, and result in the establishment of rules for participation (Goodenough, 1964; Philips, 1972; Green, 1978; Heath, 1983). Given the stated goal and the theoretical foundation for the study, the central question which developed was:

What is the nature of the student's world as perceived by the traditional and non-traditional students as they participate in this course?

Observation information and interviews were collected to obtain data to explore the perspectives of those involved in everyday life of the class. The data provided a basis for comparison of the perceptions held by the non-traditional students, traditional students, instructor and researcher. Triangulation of the multiple data sources was used to provide insight to a description of student within the setting. Data sources included: observation of each of the nine weekly class meetings, interviews of seven self-selected traditional and six non-traditional students and instructor; a post-study questionnaire; and examination of a variety of artifacts including course syllabus, weekly agendas, student records, and other materials.

Research on classroom events involved the use of researcher as participant observer for each of the two hour class meetings held over a ten week academic
period. Eight of the nine two hour class meetings were audio taped and transcribed. A selected class meeting was video taped and selected portions transcribed. This particular meeting was selected for video taping because the planned lesson involved active student participation. Tapings and transcriptions were used to augment written field notes produced by the observing researcher.

Forty five minute personal interviews were held with thirteen self-selected students so that a more intense perspective of the student's world, through the use of their own words, could be gained. All student interviews were audio-taped. One sixty minute formal interview, which was audio-taped, and several informal conversations with the instructor were held. Transcriptions of interview audio-taping were used as a source of intensive reflective analysis during the study.

Work in sociolinguistics (Hymes, 1964; Goodenough, 1981; Edwards & Westgate, 1987; Gumperz, 1981; Green, Weade & Graham, 1989) was used as a framework for the analysis of data. A search of transcripts was made for common, re-occurring words and word phrases that reflected perceptions of student world (e.g. norms and expectations for participation, roles and relationships, rights and obligations
entailed by role of student). A series of domain analyses (Spradley, 1980) were undertaken to organize the information and to identify varying elements of student lifeworld: e.g. names for 'student', attributes, expectations for participation, assigned tasks, roles, obligations and function of course. This formed a foundation for the study as one in which the cultural expressions and demands perceived by the participants themselves served as the basis of study. Findings lead to implications for consideration within the theoretical constructs which initiated this study and which, in turn, lead to proposed questions for further research. Table 2 serves as a summary of the logic of this study.

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

There were six identifiable phases in the design of the research. The first phase consisted of defining the goal of the research, specifying the population to be studied and setting the focus questions. The selection of the topic, the non-traditional adult learner, was based on a professional interest developed over past work. Selection of the focus questions was a perplexing process and was not resolved until observation had been initiated. Continual questioning of early data and conversations with advisor and committee members prompted the resolution of the issue of focus questions.
Table 2 - Logic of Study

Goals of the Study

To undertake a descriptive study of the everyday life of the non-traditional student
- in a post-secondary setting
- within a selected FERP class
- on a regional campus
Through a description of the similarities and differences for participation as perceived by traditional and non-traditional students
By means of a deliberately chosen comparative model.

Review of Literature

Classroom as a socially constructed environment;
Adult learner literature

Questions for the Study

What are the norms and expectations, roles and relationships, rights and obligations for participation in this classroom as perceived by non-traditional students, traditional students, instructor, researcher.

Based on Theoretical Construct

of the classroom as a socially constructed environment in which
norms and expectations, roles and relationships, rights and obligations are developed over time to establish rules for participation.

Data Collection

Collection of naturally occurring weekly seminar meetings, 1 hour each over a ten week academic period; audio-taping of weekly seminar meetings used to expand written field notes; video taping of one selected seminar meeting;
-Simultaneous collection of individual interviews of self-selected traditional and non-traditional students
-Simultaneous collection of interview data of instructor; audio taping of interviews.

Analysis of Data

Identification of words used by members to name 'students', attributes/characteristics of students, student perception of requirements, self-selected topics used by students for written assignments, perception of rules within setting, perception of purpose/ function of class

Based on Theoretical Construct

work in sociolinguistics as framework for search of foci used for study of questions

Findings

Leads to implications
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Phase two involved collection of data. During this time, the researcher gathered observation data, interview data and collected artifacts used in analysis. Focusing of questions was an ongoing activity during the early days of Phase two.

Phase three consisted of conducting the first analysis of data. Tapes of student and instructor interviews were transcribed and field notes taken during observation of seminar meetings were expanded. Eight of the nine seminar meetings had been audio recorded, one selected activity had been video taped. These taping were used to develop the expanded field notes. This first analysis produced a suggestion of dimensions and domains as presented by Spradley (1980). It served to function as a 'guided tour' experience of the setting.

Phase four included a second analysis of the data. It provided opportunity to confirm/disconfirm dimensions and domains perceived in the first analysis. Semantic relationships and taxonomic analyses of domains resulted in a description of various levels of involvement for the participants in the class. It provided a means of identifying characteristics of traditional and non-traditional students and their perceptions of participation requirements. A post-study questionnaire was developed and mailed to the
student participants.

Phase five consisted of developing a comparative analysis. A triangulation model (Morine-Dershimer, 1988) was used to compare perceptions of traditional students, non-traditional students, instructor and researcher data. A post-study questionnaire was developed and distributed. The questionnaire provided an additional source of data.

Phase six involved the writing of the research report. Figure 3 is a graphic representation of the design of study.

Site Selection

This study required a post-secondary classroom setting populated by both traditional and non-traditional adult learners. Several sites were considered, including a local county vocational school, community technical college and a regional campus of a major mid-west university.

During the months of December, 1988 and January, 1989, the researcher approached a senior administrator of each institution to present study topic and seek entry. Each administrator was receptive to the study and suggested a classroom they believed would fit the research question.
Phase 1
Define Goal
The Adult Learner

Phase 2
Research Process
Set Focus questions

Data Collection
Class Observation
Audio/video taping
Field Notes

Participant Interviews
Participant Interviews
Audio-Taping
Artifacts

Phase 3
Analysis I
Suggested Dimensions
Suggested Domains

Phase 4
Analysis II
Confirm/Disconfirm Dimensions/Domains

Phase 5
Analysis III
Post-Study Questionnaire

Phase 6
Findings
Write Report

Figure 3
Design of Study
Neither the vocational school nor the technical college offered a class which held the mix of ages sought by the question, however. At the university there was opportunity to study classes with the required mix. Though the offer of classes would be contingent upon department and faculty willingness to cooperate, this setting was considered to best meet the needs of the study.

The class selected for study was a freshman career exploration class designed by the College of Education of the institution. The intent of the course is to allow students who are considering enrolling in the teacher training program to participate in a classroom setting before admission to the professional curriculum of the college.

This setting was selected for the study because the researcher believed it would provide a classroom environment in which the traditional and non-traditional students would both be inexperienced university students. It was expected that the students would have similar university experience but be at different stages of adult development (as reported in Darkenwald & Merriam).

**Entry**

Four levels were used in order to gain entry to
site; university dean, department coordinator, faculty and student body. The researcher made a decision that it would be more appropriate to follow this formal, structured approach for entry, using the most senior position as first passage. Table 3 is a time line for the entry process.

Table 3
Time Line for Entry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/88 - 1/89</td>
<td>Approach senior administrators of local institutions for possible sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/89</td>
<td>Selection of university site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/23/89</td>
<td>Met with department coordinator to present request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Received permission to ask instructor permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/27/89</td>
<td>Spoke with instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arranged to meet in one week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/13/89</td>
<td>Second meeting with instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Received permission for study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussed methods for collection of data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/27/89</td>
<td>initiated observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/28/89</td>
<td>Approached students for interviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Sample

The participants in this study were enrolled in a pre-teacher training course at a regional campus of a large mid-west university. The course is required for all students anticipating enrollment in the professional teacher training curricula of the university.

The course is titled, Freshman Early Experience Program, but not all the students enrolled in the course are freshman. Although some freshman students enter the university with teacher training as their goal, others make the career decision later in their university life and thereby delay taking the pre-professional course.

Level of Schooling

Of the thirty seven students in the class, seventeen (46%) were freshmen; thirteen (35%) were sophomores; six (16%) were juniors and one (3%) was considered a senior. The university considers students with fewer than 45 quarter credit hours earned as freshmen; a sophomore 45-89 hours; junior 90-135 hours. A student with more than 135 hours is considered at the senior level. One student had completed an undergraduate degree program. Thus although all thirty seven members of this study group are participating in
a course entitled 'Freshman Early Experience', they have chosen to be part of that experience at various times in their academic career.

This combination of students nullified an original expectation that the group would be freshman students inexperienced in college level course work. This reality lends support to the concept that individuals may share an experience, but not necessarily be part of a predefined group (e.g. freshmen) (Bogdan & Biklen, p.60).

Age

A study of the ages of the student participants illustrates the wide range of ages found in many post-secondary classes. Within the sample, 59% of the students were between the ages of 18 and 20. 14% were between 21 and 23 years; 5% between 24 and 26; 3% between 27 and 29; 8% were between 30 and 32 years; 8% between 33 and 35; and 3% was 42-44. Table 4 summarizes ages of the sample.
Table 4

Summary of Age Groups

N=37

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-23</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-26</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-29</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-32</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33-35</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-38</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-41</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42-44</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The study of level of schooling and ages of the class participants reveals that the anticipated relationship between age and university experience, as presented earlier in the chapter did not materialize. It had been expected that there would be a wide range of ages among the students and minimal difference in university experience. Actual relationship between the two is seen in Table 5.

Table 5  
Relationship Between Human Development and University Experience for Studied Group (N=37)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle Adulthood (40-60 yrs.) non-traditional students</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Adulthood (20-40 yrs.) non-traditional students</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescence (20 yrs. and under) traditional students</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Major Field of Study

The Freshman Early Experience course is a college requirement for all curriculum majors in the college. Therefore, both elementary and secondary students were enrolled in the course. Of the sample class, nineteen (51%) had declared elementary education as their major; eight (22%) were enrolled in various secondary education majors; one (3%) in the Special Education curriculum, and nine (24%) were undecided.

At the time of the study, the eight credit hour course was a two quarter experience. Students enrolled for four credit hours each quarter. As a result some of the participants were in the course for the first time and some for the second. This contributed to the diversity of college experience even more. A common factor for the group was that all student participants were at the same pre-professional status as Education major students. Table 6 summarizes sample information.

Collection of Data

Observation of naturally occurring class meetings and interviews of individual participants were undertaken to obtain data from a multiple perspective. This section will describe both processes.

Collection of Classroom Observation Data

The purpose for classroom observation data was to obtain data to compare participant perception with
Table 6
Sample Class Description (N=37)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-traditional</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Schooling</th>
<th>N.</th>
<th>N.T.</th>
<th>T.</th>
<th>N.T.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>freshman</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sophomore</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>junior</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>senior</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>#</th>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>#</th>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>#</th>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Secondary Educ.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T.= Traditional Student  N.T.= Non-traditional Student
actual actions. The collection of classroom observation data was accomplished through observation of all nine regular class meetings, audio taping of eight of the nine regular class meetings, field notes of naturally occurring class meetings, and video taping of a selected activity. Field notes were expanded during periods of reflective study following each observation period. A collection of artifacts used in seminar meetings provided additional sources for data.

Field Notes:
The first class meeting served as a wide focused observation exercise. Rather than concentrate on specific events at this first meeting, there was an effort to develop a 'grand tour' (Spradley, 1980) sense of the setting. No audio taping was made of this first meeting. Written field notes was the only record made of the Week 1 meeting. See Appendix F for examples of hand written and expanded field notes.

A reflective study of the Week 1 field notes was made immediately after observation. At this time a search was made for dimensions which could serve as a framework for further observations (Spradley, 1980). Actors, Space, Activity, and Time were noted as appropriate dimensions. A chart was developed to serve
as a guide for more structured observation of the following meetings. The second and third class meetings were used to verify suggestions of appropriate dimensions. Each of the following observation periods was structured according to actors, space, activity and time.

**Taping of Classroom Meetings**

Taping of classroom meetings was included to provide the researcher with additional evidence of classroom events. Listening to taping of class reveals characteristics unnoticed during classroom observation. It provides for "evidence on hand" (Edwards & Westgate, p.2) to remind the researcher of events that might have become forgotten.

Audio taping of class meetings were made of the second and all following class meetings. A micro­recorder with built in microphone was used with 90 minute tapes at 1.2 cm speed. The researcher had inquired about the best means of assuring full two hour taping with a minimum of handling technical equipment and was told this procedure would be effective. The procedure was very effective for six of the eight recorded meetings. Noise level at parts of one of the sessions prohibited effective transcription of that meeting. At a second meeting the researcher neglected to notice that tape had run out before it was changed
and part of the class meeting was not recorded. However, field notes were recorded. Field notes therefore provided a means of complete recording of days events.

The researcher located herself at a position in the back of the room. It was outside of the normal flow of traffic for the classroom area of the media center and still allowed for a clear view of the entire room. The micro-recorder was positioned on a counter to her side. Trial positioning of the recorder had been made prior to the first recording period to assure effective positioning. A single recorder was used. See map, (Figure 4), for placement of researcher and recorder.

A selected class meeting was also video taped. Selection of class for video taping was made by assessing activities planned by the instructor. A session in which the instructor anticipated active participation by the students was chosen for taping. The lesson planned for that day involved students assuming a `disagree' or `agree' position on a series of issues, moving into groups and areas of the room designated for a particular position, and defending their position to the class.
Figure 4 - Classroom Research Site
**Artifacts**

Artifacts collected during class meetings were studied for their relationship to events occurring during class. Artifacts collected included course syllabus, description of tasks, listing of possible field experiences, weekly agendas, various instructor prepared handouts, other miscellaneous pieces and brochures brought by guest presenters. See Appendix A for examples of artifacts.

**Expanded Field Notes**

At the conclusion of each observation period, the researcher typed the hand-written field notes, including personal notations resulting from post-class conversations with instructor and/or students. Audio taping was reviewed and notations hand written into the typed field notes. At another time, but before the next class meeting, three additional steps were performed in order to develop the expanded field notes. First, the typed field notes were reviewed while listening to the entire audio-taping. Then, the audio-taping was transcribed, stored in a computer program file, and printed. Thirdly, the typed field notes and printed transcription were blended to develop the expanded field notes used in analysis. This procedure was followed for all eight of the seminar meetings that were audio-taped. A similar procedure using video-
taping instead of audio was conducted for the meeting at which the video-taping was made (Week 7). The first meeting, which was not recorded, was reviewed only through typed, personally noted, field notes.

Collection of observation data occurred over the entire Spring quarter, 1989 and thus provided data from a complete instructional period. Data collection began with the opening class day, continued each class meeting, and concluded at the end of the academic quarter.

**Interviews**

**Student Interviews**

The purpose of student interviews was to gain participant perception of classroom life in the students own words.

The entire class was invited to participate in student interviews. Request for interview participation was made through a general permission form. See Appendix B.

Eleven students from the class volunteered. Two non-traditional students from a second section of the course who heard about the research study personally contacted the researcher and asked to participate. The second section was taught by the same instructor and met later in the day. Thirteen of the thirty seven students (35%) volunteered to be interviewed. Students
volunteering for interviews were contacted and interviews scheduled. Postcards were mailed to the students to confirm scheduled interview time.

All student interviews were held in an advisement area office at the campus. Interviews were scheduled for a 45 minute period. All student interviewees were presented with the same issues through a series of non-directive questions. Non-directive questions, which are relatively open-ended, allow students to freely construct their responses. Questions used to present selected issues to students are presented in Appendix C.

There were no scheduled second interviews, but several casual interviews were held during class break times and chance meetings on campus.

Instructor Interview

One scheduled interview with the instructor was held. It took place in her office on campus during the first week of the course. The researcher entered the instructor interview with a list of issues to be covered (Hammersly & Atkinson, 1983 p.113). These issues are presented within the context of questions in Appendix C. Several casual interviews were held during the quarter. Events of the seminar meetings were reviewed during these casual conversations.
Interview Sample

Table 7 summarizes descriptive characteristics of the thirteen interviewed participants. Descriptors include: level of schooling, sex, age, full-time work experience, proposed major and previous experience in the course. University records were used as the source of information for age, major and level of schooling. All interviewees had indicated through application materials that such information could be made public. Interview transcripts were analyzed for evidence of the remaining descriptors.

In an effort to determine the representativeness of the group of interviewees to the total class, a comparison of descriptors was made. Table 8 summarizes the information.

Interview issues focused on perceived requirements for participation, motive for self-selection into the course, a historical picture of academic background and a perceived sense of student characteristics. All interviews were audio-recorded using the same equipment as in the collection of observation data.

Audio taping of interviews was used to avoid what Briggs refers to as the possibility of 'blunders' in communicative analysis. Briggs defines 'blunders' as communicative problems which threaten the success of
Table 7  
Descriptive Characteristics of Interview Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Status</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Previous Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trad.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>junior</td>
<td>Soc.St.</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trad.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>fresh.</td>
<td>For.Lang.</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trad.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>fresh.</td>
<td>El.Ed.</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trad.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>fresh.</td>
<td>El.Ed.</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trad.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>soph.</td>
<td>El.Ed.</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trad.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>soph.</td>
<td>El.Ed.</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Trad.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>senior</td>
<td>El.Ed.</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Trad.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>junior</td>
<td>Soc.St.</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Trad.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>soph.</td>
<td>Eng.Ed.</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Trad.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>volunteer</td>
<td>soph.</td>
<td>El.Ed.</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Trad.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>soph.</td>
<td>El.Ed.</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Trad.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>soph.</td>
<td>El.Ed.</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Student was enrolled in a double section of the course during this single quarter.
interviews by failing to interpret responses in the context which the interviewee spoke (p.59). Such 'blunders' may occur because of researcher failure to become aware of the structure of the entire interview (p.102). Audio taping allowed the researcher an opportunity to revisit the recorded event in its entirety before following focused listening.

**Analysis of Data**

Analysis of data was conducted in three stages. Analysis I consisted of separate analyses of interview and observation data. From these analyses, suggested domains, as perceived via students and instructor interviews, and dimensions, as perceived through researcher observation, were noted (Spradley, 1980). Analysis II consisted of a blending of interview and observation data and served as the initial description of levels of involvement for participants as visualized through semantic relationships and a series of taxonomic analyses. Analysis III became the comparative analysis identifying similarities and differences for participation for the traditional and non-traditional students in this classroom. The three analyses became the source of information for response
### Table 8
A Comparison of Interview Sample to Whole Group Sample Using Selected Descriptors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Class</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=37)</td>
<td>(n=13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>(n=35%N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>28 76%</td>
<td>7 54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-traditional</td>
<td>9 24%</td>
<td>6 45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Schooling</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>freshman</td>
<td>16 43%</td>
<td>4 30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sophomore</td>
<td>6 16%</td>
<td>2 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>junior</td>
<td>3 8%</td>
<td>1 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>senior</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-traditional</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>freshman</td>
<td>8 22%</td>
<td>4 30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sophomore</td>
<td>3 8%</td>
<td>1 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>junior</td>
<td>1 3%</td>
<td>1 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>senior</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>4 11%</td>
<td>2 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>21 57%</td>
<td>5 39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-traditional</td>
<td>3 8%</td>
<td>2 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>9 24%</td>
<td>4 31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Educ.</td>
<td>19 51%</td>
<td>5 39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>misc. Secondary Ed.</td>
<td>6 16%</td>
<td>2 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-traditional</td>
<td>10 27%</td>
<td>4 31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Educ.</td>
<td>2 5%</td>
<td>2 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>misc. Secondary Ed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to the research questions. Each of these stages of analyses, and how they were used to respond to research questions will be described in the following pages.

Analysis I

A. Analysis of Naturally Occurring Classroom Events:

Analysis of classroom events was made through the use of expanded field notes from Weeks One through Nine. Analysis procedure as suggested by Spradley (1980) was used to describe dimensions of space, actor, activities and time. Spradley (1980) identifies these four dimensions as part of nine major dimensions found in all social situations (p. 78). The researcher chose to concentrate the observation on these four because they most efficiently accounted for classroom events as observed in early data. A matrix was constructed which allowed the researcher to describe "which actors participate in which events" and "in what ways events change relationships among actors (Spradley, 1980, p. 81)." That is, the question was asked, how is space used by particular actors in a particular activity at a particular time? Similar questions were asked of the other dimensions.

A matrix was developed as a summary for each of the nine week observations. A comprehensive summary matrix was then constructed for the entire instructional period. See Table 9.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPACE</th>
<th>ACTOR</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>media center</td>
<td>Teacher space front/center</td>
<td>Instructor moved equipment as appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tables/chairs</td>
<td>teacher walked among students on occasion</td>
<td>Space was used to allow students to form groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pre-arranged different each week</td>
<td>Pre-arranged tables/chairs determine student space</td>
<td>Space was shared with outside of class participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hall way/cafeteria for refreshments area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>used by others at the same time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instrucotr stands, moves around equipment; may move among students.</td>
<td>Instructor arrives before 8:00 meeting time;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students sit at pre-arranged tables/chairs</td>
<td>Students may enter late and exit early</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>are encouraged to use other areas of media center;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>may leave room for break;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students may invade instructor space at gathering time and after dismissal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTOR</td>
<td>Instructor stands, moves around equipment;</td>
<td>Instructor defines and establishes criteria for tasks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>may move among students.</td>
<td>Students respond to questions and other probes;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students sit at pre-arranged tables/chairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>are encouraged to use other areas of media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>center; may leave room for break;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students may invade instructor space at</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gathering time and after dismissal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVITY</td>
<td>Gathering, Greeting;</td>
<td>Topics selected and initiated by the instructor;</td>
<td>Gathering 'around' 8:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Announcements in classroom area; Break</td>
<td>Activities developed to the extent students participate and become involved;</td>
<td>Break 'around' 9:00 identified by instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gathering may occur in hall, classroom,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor dismissed identified by students - formalized by instructor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cafeteria; Small groups may spread over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>media center; Large group in classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gathering among students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greeting by instructor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Announcements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sharing by instructor and students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor prepared topics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Individual activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small group activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Large group activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guest presenters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Video/movie presentations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>Sense of time noted by instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Divided into 7 basic time periods:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;pushing on&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gathering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greeting or other means of beginning agenda activities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation; break</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Summary of Full Instructional Period
B. Analysis of Interview Data:

Interview transcripts were searched for words and word phrases which would serve as a basis for identification of domains for study (Spradley, 1980). Initial suggestions of domains were based on what the researcher perceived as regularly occurring words. Based on such suggestions, a hypothesis could be made that certain words and word phrases were being used as cues for the identification of norms and expectations, roles and relationships, rights and responsibilities used in the construction of participation rules within that classroom. The need to identify word patterns prompted the researcher to record commonly used words and word phrases on 3x5 index cards. These cards noted the verbatim text and source. Figure 5 illustrates the analysis process.

This procedure was used with each interview transcript. After each of the fourteen interview transcripts was studied for word patterns, the researcher proceeded to sort the 3x5 cards into categories which could be considered as cultural domains. Initial categories were 'Names for students', 'Attributes', 'Roles', 'Assignments' and 'Expectations'.

In order for categories to be considered cultural domains, three elements must be present: cover term
(category name), included terms, (smaller categories of the cover term) and semantic relationship (the linking of two categories) (Spradley, 1980, p. 89). Re-reading the transcripts allowed the researcher to determine the existence of these three elements in what were perceived to be suggested domains.

The domains which surfaced as a result of Analysis I were:

1. Terms for 'Student';
2. Attributes;
3. Expectations for Participation;
4. Assignments;
5. Roles;
6. Obligations; and
7. Function of Course

**Analysis II**

The research questions addressed the comparison of participation rules for the traditional and non-traditional students in the classroom through a description of the norms and expectations, roles and relationships, rights and obligations as perceived by its participants. Analysis I identified terms used by participants to describe their perceptions of everyday life within the setting. It also identified dimensions within the classroom as observed by the researcher. Analysis II was used to further identify the perceptions of everyday life in this classroom as held by the participants and observed by the researcher. To accomplish this several semantic relationships and
1. Search for Domains --> search for often used words

   group words into categories --> hypothesize for domains

   re-read for domains --> select domains for study

   list word cues -->

2. Organize word cues --> use 3x5 cards to record

   identify source --> group into categories for analysis

3. Develop analysis worksheets

4. Develop taxonomies --> select domain for analysis

   identify a substitution frame for analysis

   search for sub-sets

5. Establish relationships among terms

---

Figure 5
Process for Analysis of Interview Data
taxonomic analyses were conducted. The manner in which results from these analyses were used to respond to the research questions will be discussed in this section.

Foreword

It was important to this study to be cognizant of which group of student was the subject of text during analysis. Were there common terms by which students referred to themselves and to each other? What terms did the instructor use when referring to students? To discover which terms were used for traditional students and which for non-traditional students the researcher undertook a taxonomic analysis of the cover term, "Student" (Spradley, 1980). Figure 6 is a display of the taxonomic analysis.

A description of the analysis of the research questions will now be presented.

Question 1.0: What are the norms and expectations for behavior within the classroom?

1.1 as perceived by the traditional students?
1.2 as perceived by the non-traditional students?
1.3 as perceived by the instructor?
1.4 as perceived by the researcher?

To determine norms and expectations perceived by the participants of this class, the researcher undertook domain analyses of "Attributes", "Expectations for Participation", and "Assignments".
Figure 6
Taxonomy of Terms to Name 'Student'
Terms used to name 'student' as found in search of student and instructor interview transcripts.

names for non-traditional students
- used by non-traditionals
  - older students
  - many of us
  - older person
  - people
  - returning students
  - the old woman
  - non-traditional
  - a friend of mine
  - ladies
  - returning students
  - not old but older
  - people
  - them
  - older people coming back
  - grade point busters
  - older lady

names for traditional students
- used by non-traditionals
  - younger students
  - kids
  - traditional student
- used by traditionals
  - first year freshmen
  - younger kids
  - younger people
  - other kids my age
  - younger ones
  - we
- used by instructor
  - the 19 year old
  - the freshman
  - or sophomore
  - the early ones
  - young people

Names for 'Student'
The process of analysis for each of these domains follows.

**Attributes**

Attributes are the "components of meaning associated with cultural symbols (Spradley, 1979, p.174)" and serve to define characteristics which differentiate members of a category. 3x5 index cards recording words and word phrases used to identify attributes were sorted in groups of similar meaning. The sorting process revealed four categories of perceived student characteristics: Participation characteristics, Academic Practice, Affective characteristics, and Possession of Knowledge.

Each group of cards was then sorted into groups identifying terms used to characterize traditional students and non-traditional students. A taxonomic analysis worksheet was made to visually construct the relationship among terms used to identify attributes of traditional and non-traditional students. This process led to a comparison of attributes for traditional and non-traditional students and provided information regarding perceptions of norms of behavior for each group of student.

**Expectations for Participation**

To determine the perceived expectations for
participation, a domain analysis using the cover term 'Expectations' was made. Perceived expectations were categorized as to expectations for participation in the field and seminar.

A taxonomic analysis was done to distinguish the terms used by traditional students, non-traditional students and the instructor. This led to the identification of perceptions for field and seminar participation by each group of participants.

Assignments

Having determined expectations for seminar participation, the researcher could derive particular expectations for seminar assignments. Perceptions of seminar assignments were identified through a semantic relationship analysis. The semantic relationship that was used was "X is a kind of seminar assignment". A taxonomic analysis was then done to discover the expectations for the completion of each of the assignments. This analysis revealed a domain of topics used for written assignments. A further analysis was required to identify topics and ascertain which topics were used by each of the student groups.

Observation data, as recorded through patterns of activities and relationships of actors, were searched for evidence of norms and expectations
which surfaced through the domain analysis procedure. An analysis procedure as suggested by Edwards and Westgate (1987) was used with observation data to illustrate how the instructor used words to control class time. Seven of the nine meetings provided the thickest data for this study.

Questions 2.0:

What are the roles and relationships within the classroom?

2.1 as perceived by the traditional students?

2.2 as perceived by the non-traditional students?

2.3 as perceived by the instructor?

2.4 as perceived by the researcher?

To determine the kinds of roles students played in this classroom setting, the researcher conducted a domain analysis of the term 'role'. A semantic relationship worksheet using "x is a kind or role" was developed. This produced information identifying two categories of roles, social and academic. Additional semantic relationship worksheets were constructed to identify specific social and academic roles.

A study of actors and activities found in the observation matrix of dimensions data was made to identify the relationship of actors to activities. A taxonomic analysis was then conducted to visualize which roles were associated with traditional students
and which with non-traditional students.

Questions 3.0: What are the rights and obligations within the classroom?

3.1 as perceived by the traditional students?
3.2 as perceived by the non-traditional students?
3.3 as perceived by the instructor?
3.4 as perceived by the researcher?

To identify the perceptions of rights and obligations constructed in this setting domain analyses using the cover terms 'obligations' and 'rights' were made. These identified rights and obligations as location specific. That is, particular rights and obligations were perceived to be applicable to particular time, place or activity dimensions. Semantic relationships using location were developed, "X is an obligation in "y", and "x is a right in "y". A taxonomic relationship analysis was then done to identify rights and obligations sensed by traditional students, non-traditional students, and the instructor.

Observation data were analyzed in response to perceptions identified through the domain analysis procedure. That is, as perceptions were indicated, observation data were searched for additional evidence. Analysis III

Analysis III became the comparative study of the
perceptions of participants and researcher. This section of the data analysis was intended to describe similarities and differences perceived through interview and observation data.

Development of Post-Study Questionnaire:

Continuing interaction with the data and analysis suggested that some form of student feedback regarding findings would be in order. A searching of past dissertation literature revealed the use of a post-study questionnaire (Lather, 1986). Such a questionnaire was developed using suggested findings as a source for 34 questions. Respondents were asked to make a five level, forced response to each statement. A final statement asked the respondents to make any comment they would like about their experience in the course.

The researcher acknowledges several limitations in the presentation of data from this source. First, no pilot study was made. Since the conception of the questionnaire came well into the development of the research study, there was limited time to design and offer a pilot work. The researcher chose to use what time was available in the design process. In consultation with a faculty co-worker well versed in the design of questionnaires, the decision to use the
five level, forced response model was made. Statements were rephrased within the questionnaire to provide for cross-check of response data. Provision for respondent perception was made three times throughout the questionnaire. Two specific statements asked for student comment. A final statement was made requesting the respondent to make personal comments regarding any aspect of the course.

A second limitation is noted. The forced response to researcher statements limits the use of data for validation purposes. The researcher recognizes that such forced answer responses, with no immediate opportunity for explanation or clarification, can be considered to neither confirm nor reject findings and therefore present a limitation to resulting data.

Thirdly, the identification of the respondent as traditional or non-traditional, interviewee or not, seriously reduced the anonymity of the respondent. However, since the study was based on an intent to describe similarities and differences between the traditional and non-traditional students, the researcher believed it would be in keeping with the study to distinguish between traditional and non-traditional respondents.

Realizing these limitations, but considering the information to be potentially significant, the
researcher mailed the questionnaire to the 37 student participants. Using an enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope, 60% of the students returned a completed questionnaire.

**Question 4.0:** What are the similarities and differences in the definition of 'student' for the members of this class as perceived by participants and researcher?

4.1: as perceived by students, instructor and researcher (Triangulation point 1)?

4.2: as perceived by traditional students, non-traditional students and instructor (Triangulation point 2)?

4.3: as perceived by traditional students, non-traditional students and researcher (Triangulation point 3)?

4.4: as perceived by interview, observation and questionnaire data (Triangulation point 4)?

In order to respond to this question, a triangulation model was designed to compare perceptions from the sources of data and the tools for gathering data. The triangulation model was similar to one presented by Morine-Dershimer, (1988) and called for a series of four triangulation points: 1. Students, Instructor and Researcher; 2. Traditional students, non-traditional students and Instructor; 3. Traditional
students, non-traditional students and Researcher; 4.
Interview data, Observation data and Post-study
questionnaire data. Figure 7 illustrates the
triangulation design of the comparison study.

A first step in the comparative analysis was to
summarize perceptions of each of the participants and
researcher. A second summarization chart was made of
the findings of questions and sub-questions 1.0;2.0;and
3.0. With this information, a visualization of
comparisons was made following the triangulation
pattern presented.

TRUSTWORTHINESS

Credible findings are supported by trustworthiness
of the data. Three major steps were taken to establish
trustworthiness of data. First, an entire
instructional period was observed. In this way
descriptions of the initiation, continuing, and
conclusion of class permitted a study from beginning to
end, thus providing depth and the potential for
comparisons across events of the course.

The second step involved developing data from
interviews, observation and a post-study questionnaire.
This triangulation of sources provided opportunity to
"validate each against at least one other source and/or
method (Lincoln and Guba, 1985, p. 283).
Triangulation Model used for Comparison Study

Figure 7
The third step included a series of de-briefing sessions with students, instructor and noninvolved professional peers. These sessions allowed the researcher to discuss suggested findings with participants, and present questions that asked for clarification. To provide the instructor with an opportunity to correct errors in the "Development of the Instructional Period" chart, she was given a copy of the projected summary. Her response was "It certainly does map out the quarter --". See Appendix D for questionnaire and summary of results; Appendix E for Development of Instructional Period chart.

SUMMARY

Chapter III described the data collection and analysis procedures undertaken in this study. Multiple perceptions were used to gather information as perceived by traditional students, non-traditional students, instructor and researcher. These multiple perceptions became the base for a triangulation study which identified similarities and differences for participation rules for the traditional and non-traditional students within this classroom.
CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS

The general purpose of this study was to gain a better understanding of the everyday life of the adult learner enrolled in a college freshman level teacher training class. The specific intent was to compare traditional and non-traditional adult students within the same classroom setting to gain insight into the means by which non-traditional students engage in everyday life in the classroom and thereby define their life as student.

The major question of the study was: In what ways are the perceptions of 'student' similar and different for the traditional and non-traditional students in the class?

To explore this question a cognitive, anthropological definition of culture was adopted. Such a perspective defines culture as patterned ways of perceiving, believing, acting, and evaluating (Goodenough, 1981 as adopted by Green, Kantor & Rogers in print) and provides a way of examining the norms and expectations, roles and relationships, rights and obligations of being a student in this class.
By adopting this perspective, three questions were identified that permit exploration of the larger question. Each of these questions was further subdivided to explore perspectives of the different participants; traditional student, non-traditional student, instructor and researcher. Thus the series of questions were divided into subquestions that provide a means of exploring various aspects of life within this social group (the Freshman Early Experience class) (Green, Kantor & Rogers, in press).

Questions for the study became:

1.0 What are the norms and expectations for behavior within the classroom?
   1.1 as perceived by the traditional students?
   1.2 as perceived by the non-traditional students?
   1.3 as perceived by the instructor?
   1.4 as perceived by the researcher?

2.0 What are the roles and relationships within the classroom?
   2.1 as perceived by the traditional students?
   2.2 as perceived by the non-traditional students?
   2.3 as perceived by the instructor?
   2.4 as perceived by the researcher?

3.0 What are the rights and obligations within the classroom?
3.1 as perceived by the traditional students?
3.2 as perceived by the non-traditional students?
3.3 as perceived by the instructor?
3.4 as perceived by the researcher?

A fourth question was also identified to provide a means of comparison of perceptions. This comparison was used to determine ways findings supported, contradicted and supplemented each other (Morine-Dershimer, 1988). In this way, questions came full circle and returned to the driving question:

In what ways do traditional and non-traditional students differ and concur in their definition of 'student'?

Three subquestions were initially developed utilizing data derived from student interviews, instructor interviews and researcher observation. Continued interaction with the data suggested a fourth source of data and resulted in the design of a post-study questionnaire. This questionnaire, which asked for response to suggested study findings, was mailed to student participants a year after the course had been completed.

A triangulation model for the comparison of perceptions was designed following one suggested by Morine-Dershimer (1988). See Figure 7, page 97.
Sources of data for the comparison of perceptions consisted of student and instructor interviews, researcher observation, and the post-study questionnaire which was mailed to student participants. The questionnaire consisted of thirty five statements to which respondents were asked to make a forced five level response.

Four points of triangulation were used for the comparison of perceptions. They were: Triangulation point 1: perceptions of students, instructor and researcher; Triangulation point 2: perceptions of traditional student, non-traditional student and instructor; Triangulation point 3: perceptions of traditional students, non-traditional students and researcher; and Triangulation point 4: data from the three research tools, interview, observation and questionnaire.

Question 4 with its sub-questions became:

4.0 What is the common definition of 'student' for the members of this class as perceived by participants and researcher?

4.1: as perceived by students, instructor and researcher (Triangulation point 1)?

4.2: as perceived by the traditional students, non-traditional students and instructor (Triangulation point 2)?
4.3: as perceived by the traditional students, non-traditional students and researcher (Triangulation point 3)?

4.4: as perceived by interview, observation and questionnaire data (Triangulation point 4)?

This series of comparisons allowed for a multi-perspective look at the everyday life events within this setting and sought to respond to the question which shaped the study, the identity of points of commonality and differences in definition of 'student' for the members of this class.

1.0 What are the Norms and Expectations for Behavior Within the Classroom?

Data for the analysis of perceived norms and expectations by the participants in this study were gathered from a domain analysis (Spradley, 1980) of interview transcripts. A brief summary of the analysis process is presented here.

Two sets of domain analysis were used to respond to this question. One used the cover term 'attributes' and identified perceptions of student characteristics. The second used the term 'expectations' and identified student and instructor perceptions of course expectations.
From the domain analysis (Spradley, 1980), 'attributes', over 50 kinds of student attributes were identified. These included shy, opinionated, serious, experienced, talkative, have children, reluctant and involved. A semantic relationship analysis, 'x is a characteristic of y' was used to identify attributes characteristic of each of the two groups of students.

From the domain analysis, 'expectations', two major types of expectations were identified, Work and Work Quality. The semantic relationship used to uncover the included terms within 'expectations' was 'x is a type of expectation'. A multi-step analysis was conducted to discover components of each type of expectation.

These additional analyses identified expectations as perceived for the field experience, the seminar experience and seminar assignments. A taxonomic analysis was done to establish a relationship among the perceived expectations. See Figure 8.

1.1 Norms and Expectations as Perceived by the Traditional Students

Traditional students identified three categories of work expectations: Field Experience, Seminar, and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Quality</th>
<th>Basic Work Skills</th>
<th>Fulfill field responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capabilities</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Field Component</td>
<td>take initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>six hours per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lots of time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>be interested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>be ready to experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>be ready to discover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Attend Seminar</td>
<td>commit to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>speak up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>interact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>be on time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>reaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>react not report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>find incidents that move them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignments</td>
<td>observation papers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>reaction cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>five articles summaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>newspaper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>magazine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assignments. An example of the phrases used to identify categories of expectations is found in Table 10.

A. Field Experience

1) Traditional students anticipated being involved in the field placement site the required six hours per week. They also anticipated participation in additional hours through involvement in extra-curricular school activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field Experience</th>
<th>Seminar</th>
<th>Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the field component</td>
<td>attend class</td>
<td>complete all assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>get in your 6 hrs each week</td>
<td>just participate</td>
<td>observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he was open to any ideas</td>
<td>coming to seminars</td>
<td>papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had</td>
<td>be enthusiastic</td>
<td>make sure all assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we sat down with that sheet Mrs. ___ gave us</td>
<td>attendance should be important</td>
<td>are done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>try to speak up</td>
<td>assignments are done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be on time and be at class</td>
<td>explore on your own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>act like adults</td>
<td>reaction cards are good too</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I'd expect them to participate</td>
<td>a few other little activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2) Field classroom participation was the most frequently mentioned factor in the framing of norms and expectations within the field setting. The seven traditional students interviewed mentioned thirty activities in which they participated during their FEEP experiences. Activities included; making bulletin boards, grading papers, reading stories, listening to children read, playing games, developing math activities, dictating spelling test words, and accompanying class to art, music or physical education activities. Figure 9 is a taxonomy of field activities mentioned by traditional students.

Students also differentiated between cooperating teachers who allowed for student input in the determination of classroom participation activities and those who dictated the extent and kind of participation.

B. Seminar

3) Seminar attendance was identified by traditional students as a norm for behavior. Norms mentioned included 'be at class', 'attend class', 'coming to seminars'. Of the seven traditional students, two used the word 'attend' in reference to this expectation; two used the phrase 'coming to
In-Field Activities as Perceived by Traditional Students

- go to library
- be in different places
- art class
- music class
- open house

- work with individual children
- do tutoring
- fill in tests
- read to her
- help kids make up tests
- help them catch up

- make bulletin boards
- grade papers
- play games with students

- eat lunch with children
- deal with discipline
- give a survey
- do extra things
- I want to go through 'the sheet'
- figure out different things

Figure 9
class'; and one perceived it as important to "be on time and be at class".

4) Traditional students shared an expectation for participation in seminar activities as reflected in terms such as 'interacting', 'speaking up' and 'asking questions'. The expectation for seminar participation is illustrated by the following traditional student text:

1. "Just participate/ participation when we do things"
2. She wants everyone to try to speak up/ She likes to hear from everyone"
3. "Just participate/ So I guess participation and coming to seminars"
4. "Then we start interacting"

(Order of presentation does not indicate any particular position or rank of text.)

One of the seven traditional students characterized the participation activity as needing to be 'enthusiastic'. Though perceiving enthusiastic participation as an appropriate behavior for seminar meetings, the traditional students (as seen in domain and semantic relationship analyses) identified themselves as 'nervous', 'afraid' and 'easily influenced'. They expected themselves to not
participate in class discussions as actively as the non-traditional students, nor to be as sure of themselves. The traditional students anticipated that the non-traditional students would talk more in class, would "always pop off questions", and "always be the first one to raise their hand". One traditional student commented: "I don't know what I agree with yet, but you know I'm real open."

Generally, the traditional students perceived themselves as low level participants, unsure of themselves, expecting to complete assignments and needing to reflect enthusiasm. At the same time they perceived the non-traditional students as high level, confident, aggressive participants who would get higher grades and benefit from personal experiences with children. Table 11 illustrates the frequency of comments reflecting this finding.

C. Assignments

5) Traditional students anticipated the completion of seminar assignments as an expectation for behavior. The following statements illustrate this perceived expectation:

"Basically just complete the assignments"
"Make sure all the assignments are done"
"Just do your work"
Assignments were considered to be those presented on the syllabus and verbally identified by the instructor. Perceived assignments included weekly reaction cards, two observation papers and summaries of five news articles. Topics for written assignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 11</th>
<th>Frequency Table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics of Seminar Participation</td>
<td>as Perceived by Traditional Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=60 comments)</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional students as low participants</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional students as unsure of self</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to reflect enthusiasm</td>
<td>02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Traditional students as active participants</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Traditional students as confident</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Traditional students as aggressive</td>
<td>06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Traditional students as receiving better grades</td>
<td>08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Traditional students as benefitting from experiences with own children</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
were student selected. A list of phrases used to identify student selected topics for reaction cards is found in Table 12.

Twenty seven statements regarding topic selection by traditional students were noted. Of the 27 statements, 33.3% identified other people such as students, cooperating teacher and substitute teachers as their topic; 33.3% reported on various activities such as lessons, art projects and field trips; and 33.3% used reactions to self as their topics. Six of the seven (84%) traditional students wrote about personal reactions to classroom discipline strategies observed in the field classroom. The manner in which topics selected for assignments reflects their perception as student in this setting will be discussed in Chapter 5.

1.2 Norms and Expectations as Perceived by the Non-Traditional Students

Non-traditional students identified categories of work expectations similar to those of the Traditional students. An exception is involvement in field site activities, reported by the traditional, but not the non-traditional students.

A. Field Experience

1) The non-traditional student's comments about field experience focused on the amount of time and
Table 12
Phrases that identified Reaction Card Topics for Traditional Students

1. I did another one on a student in my class
2. on a kid in the class
3. the first time I got in front of the class
4. I did one on eating lunch with the students
5. I have some thoughts about/some of the students
6. it's my thoughts of the FEEP program/my thoughts of school and/stuff/and anything I see
7. oh I've used/stuff about what I want to do when I teach
8. well this quarter I'm talking about how things are going in my classroom
9. and then I watched a con/I used that as one of my reaction cards
10. I had a kid jump off a roof
11. a teacher/had a nervous breakdown/I used that for a reaction card
12. some of the disappointments I've had
13. I think I did one on the little girl with cystic fibrosis because I've never been around/ a child/who has any kind of/you know/was not normal
14. cause most of my reaction cards go back/further/ beyond our classroom
15. and on my reaction card I said that/you know/I thought Michael should have been set on the bench
16. the corporal punishment
17. the assertive discipline
18. I have reacted too to the kindergarten screening/
19. if there's a substitute/I react to the substitute
20. if there's something going on in the teacher's lounge
21. basically its our own opinions on these cards
22. I basically think when something happens during the school week/well I'll do a reaction on that
23. another reaction card idea was on drugs at school
24. one of my reaction cards was on discipline
25. my first couple were just talking about how the kids /you know/ reacted to me
26. I wrote about a young kid/and I guess he has a problem/ his mom/ he lives on medicine and he can't sit down/he can't do his work
27. I wrote I think she lays on too much homework for them in one small time
effort involved. The following phrases used by five of the six non-traditional students illustrate the role these factors played in the perception of expectations within the field setting:

1. "I put a lot of time in it"
2. "Been more work than my regular class"
3. "There is so much more involved in it than I realized"
4. "I'm so busy from the moment I walk in the door/Till I walk out"
5. "Because that's just I'm just so busy with everything she gives me"

Table 13 summarizes the frequency of terms mentioned by non-traditional students to identify perceptions of field expectations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Frequency of use (N=6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>time</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>being busy</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more work</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more involved</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
2) Cooperating teachers were perceived as controlling opportunity for classroom participation in the field, as shown in the following statements:

"Depends on the teacher how much work they give you"

"Now this quarter I'm really limited to what I can do/ because it's the end of the year; there's certain things he has to have covered so I don't have a lot of leeway in that"

"I don't/ work with students/ within a group/ unless the teacher asks"

All six of the non-traditional students (100%) made similar comments.

B. Seminar

3) Non-Traditional students expected to be actively involved in seminar activities. Statements from two non-traditional students provide a description of their involvement:

"I'm a talker; I'm always the first one to say something/So I did a lot of responding when she would throw out questions like that and there were a couple of other non-traditional students who were the same; yea maybe it was the non-traditional who was more receptive toward making comments in open discussion"
"The older students tend to be more serious about being in class"

This group of students perceived the norm of participation during seminars as active for themselves, but passive and less intense for the traditional students as seen in the following statements:

"I just see them (traditional students) as being not quite as involved in the material; I don't know why but that's what I've seen"

"I just don't think they work as hard"

"They're a little more reluctant to give any input"

"They're less inclined to go anywhere beyond just scratching the surface"

C. Assignments

4) Reaction cards, two observation papers and summaries of five news articles were acknowledged as assignments by all six of the interviewed non-traditional students. Topics for assignments were student selected. Of the thirteen statements regarding topic selection, 62% centered on reaction to activities in the field classroom such as tornado drill, field trips, a self-concept art activity, and recess; 38% selected other people such as students, cooperating teacher and substitute teachers. None of the non-traditional student topics concerned personal reaction
to self. Phrases used to identify student selected topics for reaction cards are found in Table 14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phrases that identified Reaction Card Topics for Non-Traditional Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. a little boy/its kinda disciplinary in a way/ he refused to answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. another one was the students/uh/reading/their subject/they were reading a book/a novel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. student in class/Cambodian who escaped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. this little boy/and he was hyper/extremely hyper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. these little boys coned me so bad/twice this one got me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. speed of a tornado drill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. the methods of teaching subjects/certain subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. one of my reactions was to the text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. censorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. like dress codes and stuff like that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. action with some of the students or something like that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. walking down those halls/you take your life in your hands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. one of the teachers I work with has what he calls a supper club/every other Friday</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3 Norms and Expectations as Perceived by the Instructor

Perceptions of norms and expectations derived from instructor interviews is presented in three
categories: Field Component, Seminar, and Work Quality. Table 15 identifies frequency of categories as mentioned by the instructor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency (N=15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field Component</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Quality</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Field Component

1) The instructor expected students to "fulfill their responsibilities' in the field site. She expressed concern for this issue on three occasions during the hour interview:

"The only thing I don't get pleased about is if they quit in the middle of the quarter and don't fulfill their responsibility; Well I take that really personally";

"I just don't like people who don't fulfill their responsibility";

"I don't know I just I really think that people should take responsibility"

Fulfilling their responsibility was defined by the instructor as taking an interest in learning about
teaching and demonstrating a commitment to the course. Students could demonstrate commitment by becoming involved in the activities of the field site. The instructor associated student involvement in the field sites with a concern for the image and good will relationship between the university and cooperating school districts. She also expressed concern for how student behavior in the field reflects on her personally:

"It's so embarrassing; it puts me on the spot;
It's embarrassing to me I should say;
Well ah I think it embarrasses the program; I think it makes the program; to me personally;
I think it makes it difficult to serve the program all down the line"

B. Seminar

2) The instructor believed seminar attendance was a minimum course expectation.

"The least they can do is show up
And be on time and if you can't do that
You really shouldn't even take the class"

3) Participation in seminar activities was tempered by personal, individual characteristics. The instructor anticipated that the non-traditional students would be ones "who are able to quickly apply life experiences" to class discussions and thereby
"appear more confident and adjust more quickly". They would be the ones to initiate discussion and, at times, to dominate student talk.

In spite of such outward appearances, the instructor perceived the entire class as "still real insecure" and "equally shy about their assignment". The non-traditional students' display of confidence was seen by the instructor as a 'false show'. She believed their perceived dominance of talk during discussion was an effort to conceal apprehension of their ability to succeed.

C. Work Quality

4) The instructor expected written assignments to be characterized by quality of thought and academic effort.

"And then I look for grammar and neatness People who just turn in something dashed it off Generally you know you can tell that Some kind of work quality"

"I look for things; looking for a real thing to react to; a reaction instead of a report"

1.4 Norms and Expectations as Perceived by Researcher
The observation portion of this study was conducted to gain insight into a reality of student life in this setting. In order to accomplish this intent, an observation system was designed which led to a description of the regularly occurring events of this class. The complete instructional period of nine, two hour seminar meetings for this course was observed with the researcher noting dimensions of space, actors, activities and time (Spradley, 1980). A detailed description of this process was presented in Chapter 3.

Norms and expectations for this setting are categorized into two groups; Student and Instructor. See Figure 10 for a taxonomic analysis of norms and expectations for classroom participation as perceived by the researcher. Data were examined further through taxonomic analysis and identified as those appropriate to the seminar and those appropriate to the field experience. Related to norms and expectations within the field experience is a third group, Optional Field Experiences. These are considered to be activities beyond everyday classroom ones in which the FEEP students may participate. Parent-Teacher Association meetings, Kindergarten testing and field trips were examples of such experiences. Participation in these activities was a matter of personal choice and not required.
Instructor behaviors were categorized as behaviors appropriate to the structuring of class. Figures 11 and 12 illustrate the detailed norms and expectations for students and instructor as perceived by researcher.
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Taxonomy of Norms & Expectations for Instructor as perceived by Researcher through use of Observation
A. Student Norms and Expectations

A.1 Seminar

1) Students participated in socialization activities while gathering for class, during work periods, and after dismissal of class. Such activities consisted of talk with other students, the instructor, the researcher (but only in her role as academic advisor), and with media center personnel. Minimal talk occurred during lessons unless it was of an instructional nature.

2) Students exhibited control of personal time by arriving before or after the initiation of class, and by exiting before or after the instructor dismissal of class. Arriving after the initiation of class was done only by the traditional students. Exiting before the dismissal of class by both traditional and non-traditional students was noted. See Table 16 for a summary of Student Enter/Exit Pattern. When asked if students had made arrangements to exit early, the instructor said they had not.

3) Work tasks were accomplished through whole group participation, small group and individual activities. Small groups were constructed through
Table 16
LATE ENTER/EARLY EXIT PATTERNS FOR STUDENT ATTENDANCE
as noted by Researcher Observation
(Class is scheduled 8:00 a.m. to 9:48 a.m.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Enter</th>
<th>Exit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3</td>
<td>none noted</td>
<td>1 non-traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4</td>
<td>2 enter late</td>
<td>9:30 non-traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3rd enters late</td>
<td>9:45 traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 5</td>
<td>8:10 - 8:15</td>
<td>9:20 non-traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 traditionals</td>
<td>9:30 traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:45 traditionals (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 6</td>
<td>none noted</td>
<td>9:20 non-traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:45 traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 7</td>
<td>8:20 traditional</td>
<td>no early exits noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8:25 traditional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8:30 traditional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 8</td>
<td>8:09 traditional</td>
<td>8:44 traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8:12 traditional</td>
<td>9:23 non-traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8:14 traditional</td>
<td>9:30 non-traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 9</td>
<td>8:33 traditional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8:39 traditionals (2)</td>
<td>no early exits noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8:40 traditional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not applicable as observation data due to irregularity of attendance during registration; ** No notation made in field notes.
instructor assignment and through self-selection. The instructor used field placement grade level to build grouping. No consistent pattern for self-selected grouping could be noted.

4) Students participated in whole group activities as respondents to instructor selected topics as well as student presented topics. A study of the development of instruction during the nine weeks led to an identification of the non-traditional student as initiating student discussion. It indicates that initiation of student response by the non-traditional student was noted for eight of the nine meetings. During Week One, one student remark were noted in the field notes, but it was not identified as traditional or non-traditional. Since the class had not been audio taped, no further search of evidence could be made. Weeks 3 and 7 of seminar meetings were ones in which students actively participated in interactive talk.

During the Week 3 meeting, six non-traditional student responses were noted before the first traditional response was made. By the end of class, traditional students had responded 56% of the total 71 recorded responses. A similar response pattern was recorded for Week 7. This time three non-traditional responses were noted before traditional students
responded. By the conclusion of class, traditional students had accounted for 58% of the total 50 recorded responses. Week 3 discussion topic centered on a news report of parental objection to disciplinary action taken by a neighboring school district. Week 7 discussion revolved around a series of questions on the topic of Latch Key Kids.

During those two weeks, traditional students accounted for 56% and 58% of the verbal responses, while the non-traditional students generated 44% and 42%. Of the full nine week period of instruction, traditional students made 49.7% of recorded responses, non-traditional students 44.6% and 5.7% were unidentified. See Table 17.

A.2 Field Participation

Field participation, as reflected in activities of the seminar meetings, was acknowledged as a required activity of the course.

5) Students participated in the selection of field placement sites. The academic department of the university allocates available school placement resources to each course requiring field experience. Once the instructor has determined available classroom sites, students are given the opportunity to select their choice. This selection process was an activity of the first seminar meeting.
Table 17
STUDENT RESPONSES AS NOTED THROUGH OBSERVATION
FOR WEEKS 1-9 OF CLASS MEETINGS
(N=157)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Traditional Students</th>
<th>Non-Traditional Students</th>
<th>Not Identified</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3</td>
<td>40 (56%)</td>
<td>31 (44%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>4 (67%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 5</td>
<td>Small group work/group reports mixed; individual comments not recorded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 6</td>
<td>1 (33%)</td>
<td>2 (67%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 7</td>
<td>29 (58%)</td>
<td>21 (42%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 8</td>
<td>4 (50%)</td>
<td>4 (50%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 9</td>
<td>2 (40%)</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78 (49.7%)</td>
<td>70 (44.6%)</td>
<td>9 (5.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage reported for each day is for those responses that could be identified.
Although no researcher observations of field placements were made, students shared field experiences during selected seminar meetings.

Optional field participation activities were suggested by the instructor during seminar meetings. These included kindergarten testing, Parent-Teacher Association meetings and school social functions. Students had personal choice as to whether or not they participated in such activities.

B. Instructor Norms and Expectations

6) The instructor exercised control of class structure through time, planning and presentation of agenda, development of lesson topics, selection of instructional activities, and allocation of seminar resources.

6.1) The instructor practiced control of class time by establishing a pattern of greeting class, initiating, controlling flow of and concluding lesson. Extracts of instructor text are presented to illustrate how the instructor used talk to exercise control of class time. See Table 18 for extracts of instructor text used as means of class time control.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Context Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor wk.1</td>
<td>OK I'M GOING TO QUIT TALKING AND I'M GOING TO GIVE YOU ABOUT FIVE MINUTES JUST TO WRITE THAT PARAGRAPH</td>
<td>instructor uses talk to control use of time during class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TAKE A FEW MORE MINUTES AND THEN WE'LL TAKE A BREAK AND WE'LL COME BACK TO IT/ START IN LIKE ABOUT SEVEN MINUTES OR SO</td>
<td>instructor defines break time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wk.3</td>
<td>LET'S TAKE A BREAK/IF WE CAN/ LET'S TAKE ABOUT FIVE MINUTES I'LL SEE YOU NEXT WEEK</td>
<td>instructor restates use of time for break ends lesson (but students stay in room to talk with instructor and other students)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wk.5</td>
<td>LETS GO ON</td>
<td>instructor paces lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wk.6</td>
<td>TAKE A COUPLE MORE MINUTES BREAK TIME QUICK BREAK LETS CONTINUE/LETS TRY THIS ONE/ LETS GO ON HERE</td>
<td>instructor sets break time instructor continues flow of lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wk.7</td>
<td>I GUESS WE'LL TAKE ABOUT FIVE MINUTES OR SO TO READ THAT/ IF YOU'LL TAKE A BREAK AFTER YOU READ IT/ LET'S GO ON TO THE NEXT ISSUE JUST FOR TIMES SAKE LETS GO ON HAVE A GOOD WEEK AND I'LL SEE YOU NEXT FRIDAY</td>
<td>sets break time continues flow ends lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wk.8</td>
<td>I HAD SAID THAT CLASS WOULD BE ABOUT AN HOUR/ IT'S GONNA BE SHORT ALL RIGHT LET'S TAKE A BREAK</td>
<td>sets class time sets break</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2 The instructor presented weekly agendas which had been prepared in advance. The agendas provided students with information regarding day's topic, assignments due, announcements, a teaching 'tip', and on occasion, a reprinted short article or literary piece.

6.3 Instructional activities were presented by the instructor. They included student sharing of field experiences, whole group discussion, small group work, individual assignments, guest lectures, and various video and film presentations. See Figure 12 (p.124) for a taxonomy of norms and expectations for the instructor as perceived by researcher.

Summary

Traditional students, non-traditional students, instructor and researcher identified four norms for this course: participation in a field placement component, participation in regular seminar meetings, attendance and completion of seminar assignments.

The instructor verbalized perceptions of quality of work as an additional expectation for the completion of all tasks.

Students and instructor perceive the non-traditional students as more active participants in seminar activities than the traditional students. The
instructor perceived all students as unsure of themselves, but the non-traditional students as more able to adjust quickly to class demands.

Researcher observation identified both traditional and non-traditional students as contributing to the building of lesson through active participation in discussion. No difference between participants was identified. Though instructor was seen as designer and controller of course structure, students were described as maintaining control over personal time through enter/exit of class patterns.

Other norms were identified by one or more of the participants. See Table 19 for a summary of norms and expectations as perceived by participants.

2.0 **What are the Roles and Relationships Within the Classroom?**

Interview transcripts served as the source of data for the discovery of perceived roles and relationships within this classroom setting. Terms, as organized through a domain and semantic relationship analysis, identified two categories of roles; Academic and Social. Academic roles were characterized as those related to the successful achievement of instructional goals. They were identified through the use of text associated with the performance of field and seminar assignments. Social roles were characterized as
Table 19

Summary of Norms & Expectations as Perceived by Participants and Researcher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norms &amp; Expectations</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>N.T.</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>R.*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Field Participation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 hrs./wk. in field site</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>optional additional field activities</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regular field classroom activities</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spend time and effort in field site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>see cooperating teacher as control of field participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students fulfill field responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seminar Participation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participate in seminar activities</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. would not be as active as N.T.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be unsure of self</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be confident</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be active participants</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passive participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>see N.T. as aggressive participants</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benefit from personal experiences with children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participation varied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students would be insecure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participate in socialization activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students control time through</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enter/exit patterns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work in whole groups, small groups, and individually</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. respond approx.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.T. respond approx.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students assist in field site selection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instructor control of class structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.T. initiate student response</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.T. display confidence</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>see N.T. as experienced with children</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. follow and become active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discussion as major learning tool</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ask questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nervous, shy, unsure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assignment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complete seminar assignments</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>choose other people as topics</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>choose field activities as topics</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>choose self as topic</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use discipline as topic</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complete reaction cards, two</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>looked for work quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T=Traditional; NT=Non-traditional; I=Instructor; R=Researcher
providing support to classmates and contributing to a more confident approach to their lives as students.

Perceptions of roles came from many sources. Some were self-perceptions, others came from classmates, instructor and outside the class sources. Outside the class sources included, field cooperating teachers, students who had been enrolled in the course other quarters and experiences with students in other classes.

2.1 What are the Roles and Relationships within the Classroom as Perceived by the Traditional Students?

A. Academic Roles:

Source of perceptions of academic roles came from many sources. Although terms used to identify academic roles were taken from transcripts of interviews with traditional students, some perceptions shared were those projected by other sources such as the course instructor and field cooperating teacher.

1. The traditional students perceived themselves as followers and the non-traditional students as leaders within the instructional setting in this class. There is a sense among the traditional students that the non-traditional students serve as initiators of discussion and as academic role models.
2. Traditional students were learners not only of content, but also of study skills. Non-traditional students were perceived of as models for the acquisition of effective study procedures.

Two (29%) of the traditional students gave reasons for becoming involved in study groups with non-traditional students. Comments which illustrate this perception include:

"For the most part the older people take their education a lot more seriously";
have "different study habits"; and
are "organized", and
others "could learn from them".

3. Traditional students envision themselves as 'teacher'. This role is perceived by the traditional student in their field experience. Three samples of text reflect this perception of field experience role:

"I've always been the student and never the teacher"

"I've been/just/teacher"

"And try to be as much of a teacher as you can"

One traditional student suggests that the role of teacher in this course is proposed by the instructor:

"Mrs ___ keeps referring to us as/teachers/or/whatever/and I think if
we're going to be considered as teachers/maybe we should be treated more like/teachers"

For another traditional student, the course teased them with the teacher role:

"I'd love to take over the class/tell the teacher to step aside/I don't think that's possible/but its what I'd like to do/oh yea/teach away/open that book up and do it myself"

Of the seven traditional students interviewed, four (57%) shared perceptions of themselves as 'teacher'in the field. Two (29%) talked about themselves being involved in 'teaching' activities. Following is a list of text used by traditional students. It illustrates the use of the word 'teacher' or 'teaching'in reference to self within the field site.

Traditional student 1:
"It's what I'd like to do/oh yea/teach away And try to be as much of a teacher as you can As much like a teacher as you can"

Traditional student 2:
"I had some teaching experience in the other level"

Traditional student 3:
"They don't really think of me As a teacher We should be treated more like teachers"

Traditional student 4:
"That's what I try to look at Um you know As being a teacher"

Traditional student 5:
"I teach second grade well I help in second grade
I've been just teacher
I've always been the student never the teacher"

Traditional student 6:
She'll ask me if I want to teach a lesson
Say you have to teach a lesson on math"

B. Social Roles

1. Interview data identifies traditional and non-traditional students in the mutually beneficial role of helper and friend to each other. The traditional students assisted the older student as they made the transition `back':

"I know what the teachers expect/and they've been out for five years or more/they've lost that sense of what/you know/of what you're expected to do"

This group of students identified the non-traditional student as friend and confidant, a source of help in the handling of personal problems:

"But most of them you could go and talk to/When you couldn't tell your friends something/that they might blab".

"They have experiences that can help me"/just like when I was working with Mike I went to one of the ladies in class/I was just sitting and talking to her and
maybe/well/She was able to help me understand/and give me a new insight into what he was going through"

2. An important role for the traditional student in this setting was that of building social life. The following two samples of interview text reveals this perception:

1. "At my age/ social life is very important/ whereas the older person/have their family and children/most of them have jobs and everything";

2. "I guess they've all got more important things to worry about/like their children and this that and the other/whereas I just have school"

2.2 What are the Roles and Relationships Within the Classroom as Perceived by the Non-traditional students?

A. Academic Roles

1. Study of the non-traditional student interview data led to the identification of this group of students as initiators of class discussion, the 'talkers' who are "the first one(s) to say something". This data also describes the traditional student in the
role of follower and being "a little more reluctant to
give any input".

2. The non-traditional students depict themselves
as "more serious about getting good grades" and their
traditional classmates as assuming a lackadaisical
approach to their role of learner.

Of fifteen non-traditional comments recorded
about academic role characteristics, ten (67%) identified perceptions of the traditional student. See Table 20 for a summary of text used by non-traditional students to identify their perceptions of academic role characteristics played out by themselves and the traditional students.

B. Social Roles

1. Analysis of interview data suggests the non-traditional students perceive themselves and their younger classmates in a mutually beneficial social role. Traditional students help the returning students "break back into the mold". In return, the non-traditional students perceive themselves as helpful to the younger student by assisting in the development of confidence with children and child-related topics.

2. There was a sense among the non-traditional students that the younger, traditional student provided them with another insight into topics for which they
Table 20
Summary of Text used to Identify Academic Roles for Traditional and Non-Traditional Students as Perceived by Non-Traditional Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive of:</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Students</td>
<td>just don't think they work as hard a little more reluctant to give any input they're naive they're very nervous I thought that their approach was oh why study where a lot of times the traditional student will say gee that was an easy course I got a c in it not quite as involved some that work very hard some are very dedicated I saw the younger students as being naive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Traditional Students</td>
<td>the older students tend to be more serious about getting good grades and being in class The older student they're not satisfied with the c they want the b and a more serious maybe it was the non-traditional who was more receptive toward making comments in open discussion I'm a talker We're always the first one to say something</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
had already developed attitudes. They saw that as a positive, supporting role for the younger student in their lives.

"THEY GIVE ME ANOTHER INSIGHT I GUESS"

3. Non-traditional students also perceived themselves as role models for their family members.

"I think now not only am I setting a good example for me but my children are seeing me my husband's seeing me"

Role of Instructor as Perceived by Students

Both groups of students viewed the role of the instructor as initiator of lesson, critic of work assignments, field supervisor, provider of information, and renderer of "a new way of looking at something". See Table 21 for a summary of perceptions of the instructor, as perceived by the students.

2.3 What are the Roles and Relationships Within the Classroom as Perceived by the Instructor?
A. Academic Roles

1. The instructor, from the beginning, assumed the role of course designer, selecting foci for study,
establishing standards and requirements, and generally fulfilling university objectives for the course. She projected herself as the giver of "needed guidance", responsible for "meeting agendas of the adult learner", and "wetting their appetites" for the profession of teaching.

2. Another role assumed by the instructor was that of learner. She saw this continuing task in her professional life as an opportunity to become "better at leading discussion" and generally more adept at the role of 'college level instructor'.

Table 21
Perceptions of Instructor as Perceived by Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As Perceived by:</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Traditional Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. And maybe she opens up new things you haven't thought about a new way of looking at something</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. explained it primarily as a tool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. always had some very positive and informative information to tell us</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. That was another one she disagreed with what I said</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I think ---- she always gets us started</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Social Roles:

1. The instructor identified herself as the one who would meet varying agendas of the students. There was the perception that:
"This might be a career decision that a person makes/ Maybe a make or break situation based on the classroom participation /how I interact with them as the FEEP supervisor"

2. The instructor perceived herself assisting students adjust to the role of student within this particular setting. This role required her to provide an environment in which the students could develop an interest in the profession of teaching.

She projected the younger student as a developing adult having difficulty relating to classroom, cooperating teachers: "I don't know if they're comfortable as an adult yet". She saw her role as one obligated to ease the transition for these young students from `student' to `teacher'.

On the other hand, she shared the perception that the older, non-traditional student also lacked confidence in their new role as student, and that they "just appear more confident and adjust more quickly".

See Figure 13 for a summary of the roles and relationships as perceived by the instructor.
Figure 13
Roles and Relationships as Perceived by the Instructor
2.4 What are the Roles and Relationships Within the Classroom as Perceived by the Researcher?

The data present a picture of routine events occurring in the classroom. Researcher observation data presents these events as occurring within two sets of patterns, one for students and one for instructor.

A. Student Roles

1. Students were perceived as followers of an instructor designed course, and acted as builders of instructor presented issues. Students participated as builders of lesson by presenting personal topics during discussion activities, providing questions for guest lecturers, and sharing field experiences. Student generated topics served as lesson during two occasions.

   During Week 2 students wrote questions to be answered by a guest administrator Week 8. Questions were collected by instructor and mailed to the guest to allow for preparation of responses. Lesson during Week 9 focused on instructor selected student reaction card and observation paper topics. See Development of the Instructional Period chart, Appendix E.

2. Non-traditional students acted as initiators of response with the traditional students following and assuming active participation. Observation data indicates non-traditional students initiated student responses during Weeks 2 through 9. Week 1 field notes
did not identify respondents as traditional or non-traditional.

During Weeks 3 and 7 non-traditional students made six and three responses prior to traditional student involvement. However, by the end of each of the meetings, traditional students accounted for 56% and 58% of total responses. By the conclusion of the ten week course, traditional students had made 49.7% of the total 157 responses noted. See Table 17, page 129. Weeks 3 and 7 are noted for findings here because the lesson for those meetings provided rich opportunity for student participation.

3. Role of parent is visible both through actual presence of children during class time, and reference to them during discussion activities.

4. Students served as official contact between university and public school districts. Students delivered course description, mid-term and end-of-term evaluation materials during placement period. Figure 14 is a taxonomy of student roles as perceived by the researcher.

B. Instructor Roles

1. Observation data suggests that the instructor assumes the role of director of class by planning and implementing the weekly agenda, pacing the flow of lesson, assigning tasks, moderating discussion and
Follow instructor directions for participation

non-traditional initiate response

Build on instructor topics

traditionals follow and assume active role

Present own topics to instructor request

Provide topics for guest presenter during final seminar meeting

Contacts between university and school districts

Figure 14

Taxonomy of Student Roles as Perceived by Researcher
providing extra-curricular information. Instructor role behaviors became routine patterns of events and are illustrated in the Development of Instruction for the ten week course, (see page 239). Figure 15 is a taxonomy of instructor roles as perceived by the researcher.

Summary

All three sources of information present the student and instructor roles as ones commonly accepted in our culture. That is, the instructor serves as course designer and the students as builders of lesson through interactive participation.

Student perception data reveals students in the role of helper/friend/confidant to each other. Such support is visible in academic and social issues. Table 22 provides a summary of roles and relationships as perceived by participants and researcher.

3.0 What are the Rights and Obligations Within the Classroom?

Interview transcripts served as the source of data for the discovery of perceived rights and obligations for this group of participants. Domain analyses using the cover terms "obligations' and `rights' were
Instructor, Director of Class
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Start control of class time continues conclude
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Moderates discussion
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Figure 15

Taxonomy of Instructor Roles as Perceived by Researcher
Table 22
Summary of Roles and Relationships
as Perceived by Participants and Researcher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles and Relationships</th>
<th>*</th>
<th>T.</th>
<th>N.T.</th>
<th>I.</th>
<th>R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic roles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant in discussion</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. as followers</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.T. as leaders</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.T. as initiators</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic role models</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learner of study skills</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'teacher' in the field</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps N.T. know what to</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expect from instructors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps T. learn study skills</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps with academic skills</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student as builder of lesson</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. as active participants</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students as presenters of personal topics</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students as contact with school districts</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instructor roles</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instructor as director</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Roles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friends</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confidant</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gives new insights</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>builder of social life</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role model for family</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parent</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructor Roles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sees instructor as critic</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sees instructor as evaluator</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sees instructor as learning source</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>course designer</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>giver of guidance(career)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meets agenda of adult learners</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assists students in adjustment to student role</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* T=traditional; N.T.=Non-traditional; I=Instructor; R=Researcher
constructed. Semantic relationship analyses were used to categorize information. Analysis of observation data, through expanded field notes, led to the identification of rights and obligations as perceived by the researcher.

3.1 **What are the Rights and Obligations Within the Classroom as Perceived by the Traditional Students?**

Rights and obligations that emerged in the study of traditional student interview data were categorized as location specific. That is, (A) those within the field placement; (B) those within the seminar; and (C) those dealing with issues beyond course boundaries.

A. **Within the Field Placement**

1. Six of the seven (86%) traditional students perceived the right to criticize their field placement cooperating teacher. This perception applied both to the manner in which the teacher performed tasks with the classroom students and the manner in which they worked with the university student. Four of the six were critical of the teacher's discipline practices; 2 criticized field personnel procedures for working with the FEEP student; 1 criticized activities observed in the teacher's lounge; and 1 was critical of the cooperating teacher's teaching style.
Seminar discussion topics and self-selected topics for written assignments reflected the student perception of their right to judge what they saw in the field classroom. The following samples of text taken from transcripts illustrate this perception:

"I think she lays on too much homework for them"

"I didn't feel the discipline/reaction/that she took was appropriate"

"And when I see my teacher/you know/doing things/that I wouldn't want to do"

2. Study of data suggests the traditional students shared an obligation to confer with their field classroom teacher. This obligation on their part allowed them to exercise a right to help decide what field activities could be available to them. This interactive relationship was illustrated in the following text:

"Cause when I first came in/ she told me if you want to/do something you just tell me and we'll do it"

"She always asks me if there's anything that I/want to accomplish before I leave the class"

"We confer pretty much between the two of us/we pretty much discuss it/she kinda gives me guide
lines and lets me go from there/that's it/she's pretty open and free with me"

3. Though traditional students expressed a sense of obligation to complete six hours a week in the field site, they also sensed the right to participate in extra activities and hours if they chose. Two (29%) participated in kindergarten testing and one (14%) attended an Open House program.

4. Analysis of data suggests the traditional students perceived an obligation to accept the authority position of field placement personnel, but also sensed a right to assume initiative in working with the children to whom they had been assigned. When one student was assigned tasks outside of her classroom by her field principal, she complained that she was not being able to "be in the classroom with the kids". She believed she had lost her right to participate in the setting in the manner she perceived as valid for the course and shared this frustration in these words:

"Sometimes I feel like
I don't know
Like I'm there to do everybody else's work
Because the kids were asking where I was
Like they thought I didn't want to come back
All because I was gone for three days doing another teacher's work
It bothered me
But I didn't say anything"

B. Rights Within the Seminar

1. Traditional students saw seminar attendance as an obligation. Three of the seven traditional student interviewees made direct reference to the need to attend or come to class.

2. Analysis of interview data suggests traditional students shared a right to intentionally become involved with non-traditional students in order to develop new study skills and take advantage of the academic skills of that group of students. One student particularly focused on this by stating:

"I made sure I got in a study group with them (non-traditional students) because I knew they would put the same amount of work into it/ where with the younger kids/ especially first quarter err first year freshmen/there's no guarantee that their/study habits have developed yet/and this being my third year/you have to know"

3. A study of the transcript data revealed traditional student right to criticize course structure. This was particularly evident in the
statements of students pursuing secondary certification. The major focus of the program offered on the regional campus is the Elementary Education certification program. Secondary certification majors perceive much of the course work as inappropriate for them. Though they exercised the right to criticize course structure, they recognized the obligation to participate in and complete the course as structured.

C. Rights and Obligations beyond Course Boundaries

1. Traditional students saw themselves as having a right to develop a social life they believed appropriate to their stage in life. One student remarked:

"At my age/social life is very important".

One characteristic of life on the regional campus that she questioned was the large number of non-traditional students and the impact that had on her opportunities to becoming socially involved with classmates.

Another student regarded developing relationships with non-traditional students as a positive opportunity:

"If I went to main campus/ I'd not have/ cultivated friendships with older people
because I'd have been so centered on group activities with my age/ Like playing basketball and that stuff/ stuff I enjoy/probably centered more around people my age that I would do outside of school".

See Figures 16 and 17 for taxonomies of rights and obligations as perceived by the traditional students.
Figure 16
A Taxonomy of Rights
As Perceived by the Traditional Students
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A Taxonomy of Obligations
As Perceived by the Traditional Students
3.2: What are the Rights and Obligations Within the Classroom as Perceived by the Non-Traditional Students?

A. In the Field Placement

1. The non-traditional students recognized an obligation to accept the authority of their classroom cooperating teacher in deciding field activities in which they would participate. Five of the six non-traditional students shared this perception through the following words:

Student 1: Its pretty well set up in a framework
A framework that's given to us
There are certain guidelines on how to participate

Student 2: Its the teacher pretty much who determines what you do

Student 3: What that teacher feels is acceptable for you to do

Student 4: I've been pretty much his little go-fer

Student 5: Its always on my table for me different thing I had to do

Non-traditional students also assumed the right to visit classrooms other than their assigned ones;
"But I am going to observe another class"

B. Within the Seminar

1. Non-traditional students sensed an obligation to complete seminar assignments as due. This group of
students was critical of the traditional student practice of completing reaction card assignments during seminar meeting time.

"I notice that a lot of the younger ones the day the reaction cards are due they're writing them down that day/ And the older ones are more prepared and ready"

2. Non-traditional secondary certification students demonstrated a right to criticize course structure for its emphasis on elementary education topics. This right was shared by three interviewees:

1. "I wish the FEEP here would/uh/give the secondary equal time/the thing here is geared toward elementary/course I realize they have the elementary program here/there are quite a few of us here that are in secondary"

2. "It just seems like a lot of the little handouts and everything/ideas are all geared toward/right/are for elementary level"

3. "One quarter is enough/yea/especially because its basically geared toward early childhood education for the most part"

3. The study of data revealed the non-traditional student perceived a right to waive Freshman Early Experience based on earlier school experiences. Students accepted an obligation to perform certain
administrative tasks in order to seek the waiver. Though they recognized this right, some chose to not exercise the option:

"I really enjoy it and that's why I came back again this quarter even though I could have probably petitioned out"

4. The non-traditional students were noted as exercising the right to become friends with, and enjoy a relationship with the younger, traditional student. The following text taken from transcriptions of two non-traditional students interviews illustrate the perception.

Student 1; "I work with a lot of the younger students here/I mean I have really enjoyed because they have helped me break back into the mold. Really just 18 and 19 year olds and they were helping me through botany/ They really helped me coaching me and explaining to me. They tell me something in a different way/ I think it broadens my horizons really"

Student 2: "We talked about that a little bit. He's one of my better friends here and I think he's nineteen years old or something like that I can walk over in the cafeteria right now and sit down with a bunch of them you know. Get involved in a conversation. We've got a lot in common. It's hard to believe but I'm basically a shy person. But I just feel comfortable around kids so they come up and talk to me. That they'll come out of their way and come over"
In turn, it was obligatory for non-traditional students to accept the traditional students' seemingly lower regard for academic involvement and achievement. Figures 18 and 19 summarize rights and obligations as perceived by the non-traditional students in this class.

3.3 What are the Rights and Obligations as Perceived by the Instructor?

A. Within the Field Placement

1. The instructor perceives an obligation for the student to fulfill assigned responsibilities in the field placement site. Student participation within the field placement was seen as reflective not only of the student, but of the university and its program. The instructor also sensed student behavior in the field as reflective of her, personally. The instructor made four separate references to this student obligation during the interview:

1. "The only thing I don't get pleased about is if they quit in the middle of the quarter and don't fulfill their responsibility. I just take that personally" (ln.176-180)
Figure 18

A Taxonomy of Rights
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A Taxonomy of Obligations
as perceived by Non-Traditional Students
2. "I just don't like
People who don't fulfill their responsibility
It's so embarrassing
It puts me on the spot" (ln.190-193)

3. "Ah I think it embarrasses the program
I think it makes the program
To me personally" (ln.198-200)

4. "I think it makes it difficult to serve the
program all down the line
If every part
If any part of our program
Fails" (ln.204-208)

B. Within the Seminar

1. Interview data suggests the instructor is
obligated to design the course in such a manner as to
allow for active student participation.

2. The student has the obligation to attend and
participate in seminars. The instructor perceives
attendance and participation as a minimal requirement
for the course.

Figure 20 illustrates rights and obligations as
perceived by the instructor.

3.4 What are the Rights and Obligations Within the
Classroom as Perceived by the Researcher?

Two categories of rights and obligations surfaced
during the analysis of observation data; those for the
students and those for the instructor.
Figure 20

A Taxonomy of Rights and Obligations as Perceived by the Instructor
A. Student Rights and Obligations

1. Students may enter class late and exit early. Those who enter class late were obligated to obtain material presented earlier and to take singled-out greetings by the instructor. Students also were permitted to exit and re-enter the classroom during individual or small group activities, but were obligated to complete the activity. Table 16, (see page 126) presented late enter/early exit patterns.

2. Students had the right to participate or not participate in seminar discussions. Instructor expectations revealed that even though lessons were largely built on student participation, she anticipated some would not take part in discussion activities.

3. A right to face to face evaluation with the instructor at the end of the instructional period was acknowledged, under the condition that the student set an appointment time.

4. All students were obligated to attend a required six hours per week in the field placement site. They may participate in additional activities outside of the regular classroom ones. The instructor presented these opportunities as optional activities:

"And up on the board is a call for help
If you are interested
Don't feel pressured to do that
It's simply an opportunity"

5. Students had permission to bring children to class, but expressed an obligation to have them not disturb class. Non-traditional female students brought their children to class weeks 3, 6, 7 and 9. During those times the children sat next to their mothers and were noted using materials brought with them (crayons and coloring papers, books, food). On one occasion, a mother took books from the media center shelves for their children. The instructor had been asked at the beginning of week 3 if it was alright to have the child there. The following text is taken from the expanded field notes for Week 3:

7:50 a.m. A non-traditional student has brought her small child with her. The student asks the teacher if it is alright to have her.

I:   Sure

I wish we had something to offer her

We don't even have any cocoa

B: Instructor Rights and Obligations

1. The instructor assumed the right to design, implement and control course structure by:

   a: monopolizing talk time
during seminar meetings;

   b: pacing flow of lesson;

   c: selecting issues for presentation; and
d: making choices for instructional activities.

See Appendix E for a chart of the use of time during seminar meetings, and Development of Instruction.

Summary

An issue presented by data include the student's right to criticize both seminar structure and field placement cooperating teacher. In spite of the right to criticize the student was obliged to complete both field and seminar assignments as presented. Instructor assumed right to construct course structure, but sensed an obligation to construct the course in a manner that would allow for maximum student participation. There was a student obligation to maintain university and program credibility with cooperating school districts through their performance in the field site.

Students had the right to not participate in seminar activities, right to face to face evaluation with the instructor, the right to practice personal control of time through a pattern of enter/exit class behaviors, and the right to bring children to class. See Table 23 for a summary of rights and obligations as perceived by participants and researcher.
## Table 23

Summary of Rights and Obligations as Perceived by Participants and Researcher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rights &amp; Obligations</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>N.T.</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>In the Field</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticize field personnel</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperate with field personnel</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete six hrs./week in field</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept authority of field personnel</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulfill responsibilities</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In the Seminar</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend seminar</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn new study skills from N.T.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticize course structure</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete seminar assignments when due</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete seminar assignments during class meeting time</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waive PEEP</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design course</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage participation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enter late/exit early</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May participate or not</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face to face evaluation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bring children to class</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor right to control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course structure</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student right to participate on individual level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outside Course</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop social life</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Become friends with traditionals</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*T=traditional; N.T.=non-traditional; I=Instructor; R=Researcher*
Question 4.0: **What is the Common Definition of 'Student' for the members of this class as Perceived by Participants and Researcher?**

Question 4.0 was a comparison of the perceptions presented in Questions 1.0, 2.0, and 3.0. A triangulation model consisting of four points of triangulation was used to respond to the question.

4.1 Triangulation Point 1

What is the common definition of 'student' as perceived by Students, Instructor and Researcher?

The presentation of data among students, instructor and researcher highlights three basic similarities. One, attendance in both field and seminar experiences is perceived by both groups of students, instructor and researcher as an expected student behavior; two, it is anticipated that students will participate in seminar activities differently; and three, students will be expected to complete specific written assignments. See Table 14, Summary of Norms and Expectations, page 134.

Perceptions of attendance and participation expectations, both in the seminar and field sites, were shared by students and instructor, but the frameworks which bound those perceptions varied. Interviewed students framed perceptions of anticipated behaviors in terms of academic expectations. That is, they
presented expectations for the course in terms of academic products, class and field participation and assignments to be used in course evaluation.

The instructor expectations for student behavior in the seminar and field experiences were structured from the viewpoint of administrative as well as academic concerns. The instructor perceived quality of work as an issue. She also regarded student behavior in the field as affecting university/school district relationships, good-will, and program credibility.

Both groups of students and the instructor came to expect the non-traditional students to participate more actively in seminar activities than the traditional students.

Student, instructor and researcher data identified weekly reaction cards, two observation papers and summaries of five news articles as seminar assignments.

Researcher observation described the routine events of class. Data was organized as Student Behaviors and Instructor Behaviors. Since no observation was made of the field participation sites, resulting data for the field experience were limited to information gleaned from seminar events. These events most often occurred during 'sharing' times at the beginning of seminar and were solicited by the instructor. Table 24 reveals students shared field experiences during Weeks 3, 4, 5 and 9.
Table 24
Student Sharing of Field Experiences
During Seminar
(taken from expanded field notes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Number of experiences shared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students were observed attending seminars regularly. Late entries and early exits of class were noted. Student response patterns during instructional activities indicated non-traditional students initiate response and traditional students follow and became active participants. Students participated in talk with classmates, instructor and researcher before, during and after dismissal of class.

Students expect the instructor to be instructional leader in the seminar. This is supported by researcher data and hinted to by the instructor. Such a role is traditionally accepted in our culture. (Green, Weade and Graham, 1988). The role of student as builder of instructor topic is reflected in all three sources of data.

An issue presented by student interview data that does not surface in either instructor interview or researcher observation data is the students' perceived role as helper/friend/confidant to each other. Though researcher information presents students as working together in small groups during seminar task assignments, there is nothing to suggest the personal as well as academic support concept that surfaced from student data.
Students and instructor perceived rights and obligations as appropriate to the field and/or seminar. Within these two settings, students and instructor differentiated rights and obligations as those relevant to students and those relevant to instructor (or field teacher). Researcher findings were considered student or instructor rights and obligations.

Students sensed an obligation to work/confer with, and a right to criticize their assigned field cooperating teacher. They shared a concern about the time involved in fulfilling field requirements for the course.

To the instructor, fulfilling field assignments included an obligation to uphold the integrity of the program by responsibly fulfilling their assignment.

Student, instructor and researcher perception of rights and obligations within the seminar included regular attendance and participation in instructional activities. Data from all three sources indicate students considered participation as both a right and an obligation. Participation included taking part in whole group discussions, small group work, and individual assignments. Individual assignments were both in-class activities and written assignments to be completed outside of class. Weekly reaction cards and two observation papers reflecting on field experiences,
and summaries of five news articles were assignment obligations as perceived by students, instructor and researcher. Students perceived a right to take part in discussion, contribute personal opinions and ask questions.

Instructor data suggests an obligation to design the course in such a manner as to allow for active student participation. Researcher data indicates the instructor assumed the right to construct the course prior to the beginning of the quarter, and to modify it as the instructional period developed. Interview data revealed student right to criticize the structure of the course.

Researcher data suggests students exercised the right to control the use of time by defining their own entrance/exit time. That is, observation noted students entering class after the designated opening time and leaving before the established dismissal time. Students were permitted the right to bring children to class. Tables 25 and 26 summarize concurring and non-concurring findings of Triangulation Point 4.1.

4.2 Triangulation Point 2
What is the common definition of 'student' as seen by Non-Traditional Students, Traditional Students and Instructor?
A comparison of data from traditional and non-traditional students and their instructor suggests that all three groups expect the non-traditional students to be more actively involved in seminar activities, to be the initiators of discussion, questioners, and generally more academically motivated. See Table 14, Summary of Norms and Expectations, page 133.

The traditional students see themselves as nervous and unsure of themselves. They present the older, non-traditional student as more confident, knowledgeable, and goal-oriented. The perception of the traditional student as nervous and unsure is reflected in the non-traditional student's perception of them as well. This group of older students expects their younger cohorts to be naive, inexperienced with children, and generally

| Table 25 |
| Triangulation Point 4.1 |
| Summary of Concurring Issues |
| Students, Instructor and Researcher |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attend field regularly</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend seminar regularly</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete specific assignments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reaction cards,</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>observation papers</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 news summaries</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in seminar:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-traditionals lead</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor as leader</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student as builder of lesson</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 26
Triangulation Point 4.1
Summary of Non-Concurring Issues:
Students, Instructor and Researcher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enter/exit patterns</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students socialize through talk</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Work</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Traditionals more active</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditionals follow</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor design course</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor control class time</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students control personal time</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bring children to class</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticize course structure</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share field experiences in seminar</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field work affecting p.r. between university/school</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work/confer with field teacher</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticize field teacher</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulfill field responsibilities</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students as helper/friend/confidant</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The instructor, though projecting the older, non-traditional student as aggressive, initiators of discussion, and appearing more confident and self-assured, perceives both groups of students as lacking confidence and in need of help in adjusting to college work.

The three groups of participants expected reaction cards, observation papers, and news articles reports as assignments due in the seminar. Only the instructor
projected a concern about the quality of those assignments.

Field experience is viewed by all three sources as an important component of the course. Students and instructor project different concerns for the field experience. Both groups of students anticipated working/conferring with their assigned field cooperating teacher, and participating in a variety of activities and classroom settings in the field.

All three sources suggest academic and social roles being played out in this setting. A comparison of data from the two groups of students and their instructor suggest that all three groups expect the non-traditional students to be initiators of discussion and questioners within instructional periods.

Traditional students picture the instructor as critic, leader and evaluator, while the non-traditional students identify her as learning resource. Non-traditional students serve as academic role-models for their younger classmates as well as for their families.

Though each group of students project a mutually helper/friend role, there is no indication from instructor data that this role is being played out among her students.

Though traditional students monopolized the right to criticize field teachers, both traditional and non-
traditional students exercised the right to criticize the structure of the seminar portion of the course. This was especially visible in regard to the issue of material presented which they perceived as irrelevant to secondary education issues.

Traditional and non-traditional students acknowledged an obligation to work/confer with their field teacher. Rights in selection of field participation were expressed differently by traditional and non-traditional students. Traditional students expressed a right to participate in the selection of field activities within their assigned classroom, while the non-traditional students were more concerned with their right to participate in a variety of settings within the whole school setting.

Instructor perception of rights and obligations were designated as an instructor obligation to design the course so that students could exercise their right to active participation. In return, the students had the obligation to fulfill responsibilities, as defined through the course structure, within both seminar and field settings.

Traditional students perceived the right to develop new study habits through companionship with non-traditional students. Non-traditional students sensed a right to associate with, become friends with,
and receive help and support from traditional students. The obligation for maintenance of such relationships was accepted by each group. Non-traditional students recognized a right to seek waiver of the course due to past life experiences.

Tables 27 and 28 display concurring and non-concurring findings of Triangulation Point 4.2.

4.3 Triangulation Point 3

What is the common definition of 'student' as perceived by Non-Traditional students, Traditional students and Researcher?

The most striking difference among perceptions of this group focuses on student participation expectations within the seminar. Researcher observation did not support the anticipated controlling voice by non-traditional students in seminar activities as revealed through both traditional and non-traditional students and instructor data.

Researcher data gave support to the student's perception of the non-traditional students as initiators of response, but did not support the perception of traditional students as observers, listeners, and generally low level participants. Researcher data presented the traditional student as following the lead of the non-traditional student, but
Table 27
Triangulation Point 4.2
Summary of Concurring Issues
Non-Traditional Students, Traditional Students and Instructor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-traditionals as:</th>
<th>Non-Traditional</th>
<th>Traditional</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>more active</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>initiate discussion</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confident</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knowledgeable</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditionals as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsure of self</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inexperienced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with children</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lacking confidence</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignments included:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reaction cards</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>observation papers</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>news articles</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field experience important</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Roles</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Rights &amp; Obligations</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fulfill responsibilities</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar Rights &amp; Obligations</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fulfill responsibilities</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 28
Triangulation Point 4.2
Summary of Non-Concurring Issues
Non-Traditional Students, Traditional Students and Instructor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Traditional Students</th>
<th>Traditional Students</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Traditionals as:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goal-oriented</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lacking confidence</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role models</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helper/friend/confidant</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditionals as:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nervous</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naive</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less academically</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motivated</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helper/friend/confidant</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignments requiring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quality of work</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with field teacher</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticize field teacher</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in a variety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of field settings</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of field activities</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor as:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>critic of work</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluator of work</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning resource</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designer of course</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticize course structure</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waive course</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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quickly becoming active participants in seminar activities. During particular discussion periods traditional students became the controlling voice. This was especially noted during discussion of 'favorite teacher characteristics', and discipline issues.

Researcher data revealed casual student talk with classmates during gathering for class time, break time and after dismissal of class.

The most notable right for both groups of students made visible through researcher data, but not through student data, was the right to establish control of time by entering class after the university scheduled time and exiting class before the scheduled time for dismissal. This pattern was presented in earlier findings. It suggests that traditional, but not the non-traditional, students will exercise the right to enter late. Both traditional and non-traditional students exercised the right to leave early. Neither group felt obligated to ask permission for early exits.

Another right seen in researcher data is that of non-traditional students bringing children to class. This right was exercised on three of the nine meeting days by one non-traditional student and on one meeting day by a second non-traditional student.
Obligations which surfaced in data from the three sources included the obligation to attend seminars and field placement, and complete assignments for both settings. The right and obligation to participate in instructional activities according to personal inclination was also noted.

Tables 29 and 30 summarize Triangulation Point 4.3.
Table 29
Triangulation Point 4.3
Summary of Concurring Issues as Perceived by Non-Traditional Students, Traditional Students & Researcher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Traditionals:</th>
<th>Non-Traditional Students</th>
<th>Traditional Students</th>
<th>Researcher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>initiate discussion</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignments included:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reaction cards</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>observation papers</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>news articles</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field experience important</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Roles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend seminar</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attend field placement</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bring children to class</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participate on different levels</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 30  
Triangulation Point 4.3  
Summary of Non-Concurring Issues as Perceived by  
Non-Traditional Students, Traditional Students & Researcher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Traditional</th>
<th>Traditional</th>
<th>Researcher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traditionals as:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nervous</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsure of self</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naive</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inexperienced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with children</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less academically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motivated</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>observers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>listeners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-traditionals as:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confident</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knowledgeable</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goal-oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Trad as leaders</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Roles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helper/friend/confidant</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student socialize through talk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student control of personal time</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trad enter late</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trad and Non-Trad exit early</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students bring children to class</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 Triangulation Point 4

What is the common definition of 'student' as seen through Interview data, Observation data, and Questionnaire Data?

A summary of Questionnaire Data is presented in Appendix D.

All three sources of information identify attendance and participation in seminar and field assignment as an expectation for behavior for the course. There was agreement that discussion was a significant source of learning within the seminar setting.

Interview data indicated traditional students, non-traditional students and the instructor perceived the non-traditional students as more active in course activities than traditional students. Observation data did not support this finding. Questionnaire data reveals students continued to perceive the non-traditional students as more active. 67% of the non-traditional students and 88% of the traditional students indicated they believed the older, non-traditional students usually participated in class more than the younger, traditional students. However, when
asked if they believed the non-traditional students tended to over-power discussion, 58% of the traditional students agreed or strongly agreed, while 56% of the non-traditional students disagreed. When asked to respond to a statement saying the traditional students participated more than the non-traditional students, 89% of the non-traditional and 58% of the traditional students disagreed or strongly disagreed. See Questions 4, 6 and 8 in Questionnaire Data, Appendix D.

The effect of life experiences (i.e. as parents) as a contributing factor to success for non-traditional students was made visible in the interview and questionnaire data, but not noted in observation data. Questionnaire data indicates the students expected continuing school experience to not be advantageous to traditional students while life experiences were advantageous to the non-traditional students. See Questions 31 and 32 of Questionnaire Data Summary.

Similarities of findings for the three sources of data reveal students attend and participate in seminar and field placements. The use of discussion as an instructional behavior is widely recognized. There is disagreement regarding rate of participation among the student body. The effect of life experiences in learning was made visible in interview and questionnaire data. Traditional students and non-
traditional students, instructor and researcher perceive identical assignments for the seminar. Only the instructor indicates concern for quality of work.

Data from the three sources identify student and instructor roles as traditionally accepted ones of student as follower and builder of lesson and instructor as course leader and lesson designer. More than 90% of the questionnaire respondents indicated their major role as student in the seminar was to discuss topics presented by the instructor.

Interview, observation and questionnaire data provide similar findings regarding the role of non-traditional students as initiators of class discussion. Observation identifies the traditional student as an active participant. Though observation data supported the non-traditional student as an initiator of discussion, it does not support the non-traditional student as the more active participant. Questionnaire data, however, modifies the perception of this older group of students as a controlling voice in discussion activities. 56% of the non-traditional respondents indicated they did not believe the older students overpowered discussion, while 58% of the traditional students believed they did. In an open comment response a traditional student stated she believed the traditional student ("younger generation") "did not
participate as often, simply because they couldn't really relate to the subject (having their own children)".

Social role of helper/friend/confidant, as initially expressed through interview data, but not visible through observation, was partially supported by questionnaire data. Non-traditional students reported the helper/friend/confidant role was a valid one for them both inside and outside the classroom, while traditional students saw the role as real within the seminar, but not outside.

Traditional roles of student and instructor continue to be supported in this setting. Role of helper/friend/confidant found more questionnaire support by non-traditional than by traditional students. Evidence suggests a difference between perception of the helper/friend/confidant role within and outside class.

Interview data reveals students sense a right to exhibit initiative in the definition of field site activities, criticize supervisory figures in the seminar and field, decide their level of seminar participation, and develop relationships with classmates both inside and outside the classroom.

Analysis of interview data also made visible the perceived obligation to attend seminar meetings and
field placement assignment and to complete tasks in both settings.

Observation of the regularly occurring seminar meetings provided a picture of the routine events of class. Through this procedure, the researcher was able to describe the obligation to attend regular seminar meetings as an observed reality. The obligation for students to attend their field assignment was not observed by the researcher but was perceived as a reality because students shared their experiences as part of the seminar activities. Only through observation data was student enter/exit class patterns and right to bring children to class made visible.

44% of the non-traditional and 67% of the traditional student questionnaire respondents described attendance at seminars as an obligation. 56% of the non-traditional students and 67% of the traditional students indicated they had the right to enter and exit class at any time. Field participation of at least six hours per week was seen as an obligation by 77% of the non-traditional and 75% of the traditional student respondents. Tables 31 and 32 represent Triangulation Point 4.4.
Table 31
Triangulation Point 4.4
Summary of Concurring Issues as seen through
Interview Data, Observation Data and Questionnaire Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Non-Traditionals:
- initiate discussion  x  x  x

Assignments included:
- reaction cards  x  x  x
- observation papers  x  x  x
- 5 news summaries  x  x  x

Seminar attendance required
- discussion major tool  x  x  x

Field attendance required  x  x  x

Student Roles
- student as:
  - follower of instructor  x  x  x
  - builder of lesson  x  x  x
  - N.T. initiator of discuss.  x  x  x
  - attend field placement  x  x  x
  - participate in field  x  x  x
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Triangulation Point 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Non-Concurring Issues as seen through Interview Data, Observation Data and Questionnaire Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Observation Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional as:</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-traditional as:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less active participants x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>more active participants x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nervous x</td>
<td></td>
<td>confident x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsure of self x</td>
<td></td>
<td>knowledgeable x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naive x</td>
<td></td>
<td>goal-oriented x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inexperienced with children x</td>
<td></td>
<td>question x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less academically motivated x</td>
<td></td>
<td>benefit from life experiences x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active participant x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students enter late/exit early x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Roles</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>helper/friend/confidant x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>students socialization x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Field Rights &amp; Obligations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>students help define activities x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>students criticize field personnel x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>complete field assignments x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

Interview, observation and questionnaire data continue to support the traditional picture of student as follower in classroom settings, and instructor (teacher) as leader. Attendance and participation at both seminar and field settings was supported through all three sources.

Interview and questionnaire data presented perceptions of the non-traditional student as the more active participant in seminar instructional activities. Observation data contradicted the perception.

The student role of helper/friend/confidant surfaced through interview data, but was not visible through observation. Questionnaire data presented support of the helper/friend/confidant role. One questionnaire respondent commented:

"The link between traditional and non-traditional students is very strong. There's a common feeling that we all have something to offer to each other. The cooperation is one bonus at ___."

Observation data was the sole evidence of student right to control their use of time by entering class late and/or exiting early. Questionnaire data supported the finding.
Use of the three sources of data suggest that what we may learn about life for the non-traditional student in this classroom may be influenced by the type of research tool and analysis used (Morine-Dershimer, 1988). The comparison of the three sources indicate support for some findings and contradiction for others.

In Chapter IV findings were presented relative to the major research questions and their sub-questions. Given the extensiveness of the findings, a chart of selected findings will be presented here. Discussion will be presented in Chapter V.
Table 33
Summary of Selected Findings

**Norms and Expectations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional Students</th>
<th>Non-Traditional Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>attend field 6 hrs/week</td>
<td>attend field 6 hrs/week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attend optional, additional field hours</td>
<td>concerned with time in field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attend seminar regularly</td>
<td>see cooperating teacher as control of field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expects enthusiastic participation, but seen as not as active as the non-traditional students</td>
<td>attend seminar regularly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confident</td>
<td>active participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inexperienced with children</td>
<td>confident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>initiating discussion questions</td>
<td>experienced with children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complete assignments weekly reaction cards</td>
<td>complete assignments weekly reaction cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 observation papers</td>
<td>2 observation papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 news articles</td>
<td>5 news articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>choose &quot;other people&quot;, &quot;activities&quot; and &quot;self&quot; as topics</td>
<td>choose &quot;other people&quot;, &quot;activities&quot; as topics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Roles and Relationships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional Students</th>
<th>Non-Traditional Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>followers in discussion, &quot;teacher&quot; in field</td>
<td>leaders in discussion, learner of &quot;whole school&quot; picture in field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friend</td>
<td>friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sees N.T. as confidant</td>
<td>sees T. as giving new insight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>academic role model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>parent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rights and Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional Students</th>
<th>Non-Traditional Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>complete 6 hrs/wk in field</td>
<td>complete 6 hrs/wk in field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>criticize field personnel</td>
<td>accept authority of field personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooperate with field personnel</td>
<td>cooperate with field personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>criticize course structure</td>
<td>criticize course structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learn study skills from N.T.</td>
<td>waive course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>develop social life</td>
<td>become friends with T. use T. to help in return to student life</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple Sources of Data

Interview:
- presented students as helper/friend/confidant;
- identified perception of non-traditional students as more active in seminar discussion;
- suggested non-traditional students as confident;
- revealed perception of non-traditional students as possessing knowledge of children;
- presented perception of traditional students as less involved in seminar and general academics;
- presented perception of traditional students as shy, unsure of self;
- identified traditional students as critical of field personnel, seminar instructor and course structure;
- revealed topics for written assignments.

Observation:
- presented routine events of classroom life;
- revealed late entry/early exit patterns;
- presented traditional students as equal sharers in seminar discussion;

Questionnaire:
- affirmed student perceptions of attendance and participation requirements;
- affirmed perception of non-traditional students as more active participants in seminar discussion.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

This chapter returns to the central issue presented in Chapter 1: the identification of the students' world as perceived by traditional and non-traditional students. The question asked what commonalities and differences were perceived by the two groups of students, and did those commonalities and differences exist in actions or only as perceptions.

This study informs us in three areas:

1. The traditional and non-traditional students identify the role of student as the commonly accepted one held by our culture, but they play out this traditional role differently. That is, both groups expect to attend class, participate in instructional activities, complete assignments and generally follow the plan of instruction as presented by the instructor. However, the manner in which each of these functions was interpreted and performed was different for the traditional and non-traditional students.
2. Traditional and non-traditional students construct specific helper/friend/confidant roles with each other.

3. The use of varying perspectives and multiple types of data in the study of this classroom life provided a rich source for investigating the construction of participation rules within the adult post-secondary classroom. The use of interview data made visible participants' perceptions of classroom life while observation data permitted us to view the actions of everyday classroom life. What often times was hidden in one source of data became visible in another. In Section III of this chapter we will discuss the effect multiple data sources had in this study.

We begin the discussion of findings with commonalities and differences of traditional and non-traditional students' perceptions of their role as students.

Section I

Living out the Role of Student

Shultz, Florio & Erickson (1982) talk about a "classroom culture" within our society: "There seems to be a general set of standards for how to act in school, a sort of American "classroom culture" (p.91). Literature reports we begin to learn the role of
"student" in our culture very early in life and that this learning continues throughout our experience in school. Fernie (1988), talks about this process for pre-school children:

"In these first schools, children begin an important process in earnest: the process of becoming a student; they must learn a "student role" of appropriate knowledge, behavior, and expectations to guide their participation in the academic and social life of classrooms (p. 3)."

The definition of the student role in our culture, has been identified within other research findings. Students in some classrooms have been described as the "construction gang" and the teacher as the "architect and foreman" (Green, Kantor and Rogers, in press). The same authors tell us that students may or may not be involved in the decision making process for "what to do, when, where, with whom, and in what ways (p. 337)."

Edwards and Westgate (1987) present the teacher in the role of classroom "expert" by asking "questions to which they already have answers ", and students in the role of one who must match the teacher's knowledge (p. 46).

The current study indicates that traditional and non-traditional adult students continue to accept and
participate in this commonly held, particular picture of how a student should behave within the classroom. That is, the adults in this study accepted the instructor design for the course and looked to the instructor as 'expert', providing them with guidance and information. However, the study also indicates that the manner in which the traditional and non-traditional students lived out the role of student varied. Discussion of these differences will be presented within the framework of Attendance, Participation, and Completion of Assignments behaviors. First we will look at how the students differed in attendance behaviors.

ATTENDANCE

Seminar Attendance

University regulations and course syllabus had established the number of required attendance hours for each of the course components, seminar and field experience. However, both traditional and non-traditional students were observed not to fully comply with the seminar hours. A pattern of late entries, and early exits of the class were noted. Both traditional and non-traditional students exited early. However,
only traditional students were observed to enter class late.

Perceptions of course function/purpose were considered reflected in attendance practices. For instance, student comments ranged from: it's a "waste of time", and "things are drug out too far"; to "its very worthwhile", and "everyone thinking about teaching should take it". To what extent perceptions of course purpose/function influenced seminar attendance practices was not studied, but would be a question for later review.

Field Site Attendance

The course syllabus stated that students were expected to attend in the field site six hours per week, with optional additional hours available. The study showed that traditional students and non-traditional students attended the required six hours, but that traditional students were apt to attend optional additional hours more than the non-traditional students.

The study indicated that the non-traditional students were very concerned about the amount of time required for field tasks. Time, to these adult students, was an important commodity.
The issue of time has also been discussed in the literature. Hayslip and Panek (1989) comment that during the middle years (30-40) many individuals develop a sense of running out of time to complete the goals they set for themselves during young adulthood (20-30) (p.46). Bergevin, Cross and Knowles contribute to the acknowledgement of time as a contributing factor in the education of adults. This concern with time could explain the non-traditional student's lower participation in optional hours activities.

Though there was concurrence by traditional and non-traditional students to attend both field and seminar components of the course, students exhibited different standards and priorities for that commitment of time. Goals and perception of the course played a part in the students decisions as to how they would play out their attendance requirement. The course had initially been presented as a "career exploration" course and these students' perceptions of what it meant to "explore" the career of teaching may be reflected in where they anticipated spending their field time. The sense of control (or lack of) over their field experience may have direct bearing on their perceived success in the course (Wittrock, 1986), or of the perception of course relevancy to their lives and raises a question for further study.
PARTICIPATION

Participation in the Field

Though the field participation was not observed, comments made during the seminar indicate students utilized their required field participation hours differently. For instance, traditional students preferred to spend the major portion of their field time with the students in the assigned classroom. They complained when field administrators asked them to perform tasks outside the classroom setting.

The non-traditional students expected to spend their field time in many classroom settings, looking for as diversified an experience as possible. As one non-traditional student commented:

They have a lot of /uh/ I don't know if they call them handicapped or /they're physically handicapped students/ and I want to observe them in a classroom/ I want to see what/ that was like"

The non-traditional students wanted to get a more `whole school' experience than the younger, traditional students. Five of the six non-traditional students interviewed had school age children of their own and were familiar with their behaviors. Findings of this study indicate that this group of students did not
believe spending time interacting with children in the school setting was the best use of their time. One of the non-traditional students commented that the field component of the course was "a waste of time" because she had previous experience with children in school settings. Others chose to exercise a right to waive a portion of the course requirement based on such experience.

The traditional students were prone to identifying their role in the field site as 'teacher'. Adopting this role in the field caused some traditional students to experience role conflict during the experience. The instructor had told them they would be participating as, and should assume professional characteristics of, a 'teacher'. They had been told they should refer to themselves as 'Miss', 'Mrs.', or 'Mr.'; should dress as the other teachers in the school did; be on time and prepared for their duties; etc. But, when students were not included in activities intended for school staff, they perceived field personnel as not regarding them in that role. When they were not permitted to "open the book and just teach" as much as they wanted, they felt frustrated.

The course had initially been presented as a 'career exploration' course and these students' perceptions of what it meant to 'explore' the career of
teaching was reflected in how they spent (or wanted to spend) their field time.

Participation in the Seminar

Though the non-traditional student was perceived by all groups of participants as the more active voice of class, observation data provided conflicting evidence. Non-traditional students were observed in seminar discussion periods as initiators of student response, but not as making a significantly larger number of responses than the traditional student.

A further in-depth examination of non-traditional student characteristics offers a possible explanation for the non-confirmed perception of non-traditional students as more active participants. First, traditional students perceive the older, more experienced students as more confident, sure of themselves; they "know what they want". Non-traditional student comments presented in a confident, "sure of themselves' manner may suggest a dominating attitude and appear as more active.

Secondly, the non-traditional student also was perceived as more knowledgeable about children. Therefore, their responses may have projected a voice of authority, and again contribute to the sense of being more active. During discussion periods the non-traditional students were able to relate personal
experiences with their children to discussion topics. A traditional student commented in the questionnaire:

"the older generation had much of the class discussion, talking about their own children; I think the younger generation did not participate as often simply because they couldn't really relate to the subject".

A third possible explanation is that the student perception of 'active' may have included the amount of time used in responses, rather than the number of responses. No study was made of the amount of time used for student responses, so this possibility remains speculative, and a question for later study.

**COMPLETION OF ASSIGNMENTS**

**Seminar Assignments**

Two seminar assignments (reaction cards and observation papers) were directly related to the field experience. All topics for these assignments were self-selected and reflected student goals, expectations and perceptions of course functions. An in-depth look at the Development of Instruction chart (Appendix E) reveals a clash between instructor and student interpretation of the assignments. We note that assignments were defined on four different occasions during the nine week period. Though there was
agreement of the 'what' of assignments, there was not agreement on 'how' they were to be done. The study did not look at how this clash between instructor and student interpretation of assignments was played out by the traditional and non-traditional students, and remains as a possible future study.

Topics selected for written assignments provided a rich source of information for student perception of their life within this course setting. Though topics selected by the entire student body could be sorted into three categories ('other people', 'activities' and 'self'), the findings reveal that traditional and non-traditional students' selection of topics differed.

The most notable difference between the two groups of students was the use of topics dealing with reaction of 'self' to events within the field placement. Traditional students used this topic for 26% of their assignments. No uses of the topic were noted by non-traditional students. It could be speculated that the younger, traditional students may still be defining 'self', and were still very much focused on self and the development of a personal identity.

The complete omission of 'self' as a topic for the non-traditional students was striking. Though findings are sketchy and inconclusive on the issue, one may speculate that the older, non-traditional students had
established themselves within various social tasks in society (such as parenthood and marriage) and self-identity was not a focused interest. They were not as concerned with topics of 'self', but rather on getting the job done.

Section II

ROLE OF HELPER/FRIEND/CONFIDANT

The role of helper/friend/confidant, as perceived by both traditional and non-traditional students in this study, is not unique to the adult learner. Peer teaching, as presented by Cazden, (1986) in the adolescent and younger learner classroom assumes a function similar to that of academic helper for the adult learner. Gumperz (1986) refers to the development of relationships with peers as affecting "the products of learning (p.53)". Cliques as support groups in adolescent classrooms has been noted in literature. Heck and Williams (1984) refer to the role of peer relationships in adolescent classrooms as facilitating the development of student self-concept (p.63).
Two differences are seen in this role/relationship pattern of the adult students compared to the role/relationship observed in adolescent and younger student classrooms. One is the use of such relationships within the younger student classrooms as competitive, leaving some children isolated from peer help (Cazden, 1986). In this adult classroom the role was one of mutual cooperation.

A second difference is the concept of young and old, experienced and inexperienced, sharing knowledge, guidance and support. Though the current study findings noted the older, non-traditional student as role model for academic participation, the younger traditional student was perceived as the model for 'getting back into the mold' of studenting, and the gaining of 'a new insight'. A non-traditional student comment on the questionnaire summed it as: "I think the link between traditional and non-traditional students is very strong. There's a common feeling that we all have something to offer to each other. The cooperation is one bonus".

Non-traditional students could be considered as encouraging the development of friendships with the traditional student in order to regain a part of their youth that, for one reason or another, was denied them. Development of such friendships would help meet the
needs of students who, as presented by Houle (as related in Darkenwald & Merriam, 1982), return to the classroom in order to satisfy a need for personal change. Darkenwald & Merriam describe the reasons for adults returning to school as "multiple, interrelated, closely connected to life roles, and highly personal (1982, p. 136)". An investigation of the reasons for returning to the classroom, studied from the perspective of the non-traditional student, is a question for later study.

Section III

USE OF MULTIPLE SOURCES OF DATA

Initially, multiple sources and types of data were utilized in this study as a means of confirming and/or disconfirming participants' perceptions of classroom life and suggested findings. As the study progressed, it became apparent that the use of multiple perspectives added dimensions which otherwise would have remained hidden. Multiple perspectives confirmed, disconfirmed and provided another "layer of seeing" to various norms and expectations, roles and relationships, right and obligations at work in the setting.

The role of helper/friend/confidant was made visible through student interviews. Neither instructor interview data or researcher observation data suggested
the role was active within the student's lives. Though observation data of seminar meetings noted traditional and non-traditional students working together during small group activities and engaged in conversation before, during and at the conclusion of class, there was no evidence to indicate the relationships of friend and confidant that were developing.

On the other hand, late enter/early exit patterns for seminar meetings were hidden in participant interview data, but visible in observation data. Questionnaire data indicated students perceived attendance as an expected behavior. Only during observation did the actual attendance behavior become visible.

Each of the sources and types of data added useful information for the description of classroom life within this setting. A variety of participant perceptions suggested that traditional and non-traditional students in this class believed that attendance and participation were required.

Traditional student interview data revealed that they believed not only was participation required, but it needed to be enthusiastic participation. The data also indicated, they did not expect to be the enthusiastic participants the non-traditional students would be. Observation data, on the other hand,
disconfirmed the perception of the traditional student as inactive. Observation data revealed traditional and non-traditional students shared the number of responses during the three classes in which student discussion was the planned instructional activity. In actuality, traditional students responses dominated discussion of teacher discipline behaviors.

Topics used for written assignments were not noted in observation data and would have remained hidden if this had been the sole source of data. Becoming aware of these topics, added another dimension to our understanding of student life in this course by allowing us to see how traditional and non-traditional students differed in what they regarded as noteworthy in the field site.

It is clear from this use of comparative analysis of the adult learner classroom that selecting one system vs. another can affect findings. What may be of more significance is that both complementary and contradictory findings can produce further insights. Each means of looking revealed what another concealed, so that when put side by side a much deeper understanding of being 'student' for the adult learner surfaces.

The findings were not totally unexpected.
Certainly anyone working with adult students knows there will be late entries and early exits from class. What surfaced from interview data allowed the researcher to make inferences as to why such behaviors occurred, and provided questions for further research.

It was interesting to note how findings from the multiple sources fit together and identified a common, but different, picture of the adult students in this class. "The complexities of classroom life have long been acknowledged by researchers (Morine-Dershimer, p.212)." The use of multiple sources of data adds information to what is already known about the adult learner and is justified as a research procedure.

IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE STUDY

The findings of this study present us with several implications for the study of adult learners. A number of those implications, along with associated recommendations for future study, will be presented here.

1. Implications for Researcher

1.1: The results of this study are limited by the use of a specialized, pre-professional classroom setting. Students in the studied Freshman Early
Experience Program class shared common academic and professional goals. This may have brought together a group of students with a more common set of perceptions than would be found in a non-professional course classroom. A more diverse population may result in a broader range of perceptions and add a different set of findings.

Based on this limitation, it is recommended that studies be conducted to investigate similarities and differences in participation rules for traditional and non-traditional students in post-secondary History (Mathematics, Social Sciences, English, etc.) classes.

1.2: The multiple sources of data revealed conflicting findings for student response patterns. Interview data and Questionnaire data indicated participants perceived non-traditional students to be more active than traditional students during seminar discussion. Observation data did not support the finding. Future work needs to look more closely at the nature of response patterns for traditional and non-traditional adult students. The conflicting findings of this study call for additional research into linguistic discourse of the discussion responses of these students. More in-depth study of response patterns needs to be conducted in order to see how perceptions and actual practice of response patterns
are played out by traditional and non-traditional adult students.

2. Implications for Adult Education

2.1: Three issues for Adult Education made visible through this study will be presented here. The first calls for extending the debate on identifying the adult learner. Literature fails to establish either a commonly accepted criteria for recognizing this group of learners or what constitutes education for adults. Therefore, the development of conceptual foundations for such an identification procedure would be an important contribution to the study of the adult learner.

2.2: The above stated issue provides impetus for a second issue within the field. That is the development of a clearer distinction between Adult Education and the education of adults. Research focused on the clarification of conceptual issues relating to the discernment of what constitutes each area of study is called for through this current work. Such research may suggest that perhaps the more desirable action would be a more concentrated effort for the marriage of Adult Education and other studies related to the education of adults. This notion leads
2.3: This study informs the research field that educational research of the adult learner is being conducted by scholars outside the field of Adult Education. In addition to the current study, work is being conducted through research on learning in higher education (Dunkin and Barnes, 1986), professional education (Dinham and Stritter, 1986), and business and industry (Walter and Marks, 1981). These studies are indications of the extent to which researchers are contributing to a body of knowledge of the adult learner. Given that such an extensive amount of information is available, it is suggested that there is a need to build a more holistic model to study adult learners using knowledge gained from various disciplines.

3. An implication for the Teaching of Adults

3.1: This study identifies the adult learner classroom as one composed of students with a wide range of ages and at various stages of social and cognitive development. It presented the adult learners as complex beings possessing a variety of life world experiences which impacted the classroom life. Non-traditional students with personal experience of children and other life tasks were able to participate
in a way denied to the traditional student who lacked such experience and development. This combination of human beings within one setting created a tension among the participants. Such an issue suggests that further study needs to be undertaken regarding the tension created through the presence of such a combination of students and its impact on teaching and instruction.

4. Implications for the Adult Learner

4.1: Differences in perceptions of the studied traditional and non-traditional students ran across all facets of their classroom life. Though the framework of 'student' was commonly considered as the traditionally accepted one of student following an instructor planned agenda, traditional and non-traditional students defined particular pieces of the role differently. Their perceptions of being a student differed and reflected developmental and social phases of their lives. It becomes an issue of not how "human life submits to rules, but how rules become adapted to life (Malinowski, 1976, as found in Green & Wallat, 1981, p.193)".

Though findings from earlier studies of adult learners have not been seriously challenged as a result of this study, they have been expanded and strengthened. The need of adults to have control of events within their life appears to have revealed
itself through student's enter/exit patterns for this class. Further study needs to be undertaken to support and explain this behavior and how it plays itself out with traditional and non-traditional adult students.

4.2: Additional study of the reasons students have for returning to school needs to be conducted in order to understand student expectations for their lives as students. In such studies, in-depth analysis of student perceptions would be conducted. More work needs to be conducted from the non-traditional adult student's personal perspective. Motive for attending is one of those issues.

4.3: This study identified a role relationship for traditional and non-traditional students of helper/friend/confidant. The role was revealed as one of a mutuality of help between the two groups of students. Through the development of friendships with the younger, traditional students, non-traditional students demonstrated a desire to live a student life as they perceived it. Such actions on their part may have led to their role as confidant for the younger student. Further work needs to be done to see how such behaviors supports and constrains findings of the helper/friend/confidant role revealed in this study.

4.4: Fifty seven percent of the traditional students in the class were female, 11% were male. Of
the non-traditional students in the class, 24% were female, 8% male. These numbers indicate a larger proportion of male to female students within the non-traditional group (3:1) than within the traditional student group (5:1). Researcher experience also indicates a growing number of male non-traditional participants in post-secondary classrooms. Future work needs to explore the influence of gender and role in adult learner classrooms. It needs to investigate how female and male non-traditional students perceive their transition from an 'outside-the-classroom' role to a student role. Such studies would investigate similarities and differences, within and across genders, of how others assist and/or hinder in this transition.

4.5: Though none of the non-traditional students in this study were new to university life, all were new to the teacher education program. Is there a developmental pattern for non-traditional students 'becoming a student'? Future study needs to be conducted to investigate what changes occur in student perceptions of administrative tasks as well as academic attitudes and practices from the time they return to school to the time of graduation.

4.6: The selection of topics for written assignments by students has implications for future
work with adult learners. Though both traditional and non-traditional students chose 'other people' and 'activities' within their field placement experience as relevant topics for assignments, only traditional students used 'self' as such a topic. The complete omission of 'self' as a relevant topic for non-traditional students suggests a need for additional work for confirmation/disconfirmation of the finding.

5. Implications for Teacher Education

5.1: The Freshman Early Experience course in which the studied students were enrolled is an introductory course within the teacher education program of the university. It's primary intent is career exploration for prospective students. Two issues for teacher education which surfaced during this study will be presented here.

First, student perceptions of the function of the course indicate a broad range of acceptance of the course as relevant to their personal, academic and professional goals. Interview data revealed comments ranging from 'a waste of time' to 'everyone considering teaching should take it'. Non-traditional students exercised a right to petition waiver of the course requirement. Future work in teacher education needs to explore the function and appropriateness of such career-exploration courses for non-traditional
students. Such work would investigate non-traditional students' perceptions of course relevancy to their lives, and its role as a career-decision vehicle.

5.2: Another teacher education issue made visible in this study was the use of time in field experiences. Traditional and non-traditional students differed in what they considered to be the most appropriate use of their time in the field site. Though traditional students concentrated their participation on the students in their classroom, the non-traditional students focused on a more 'whole-school' experience. This finding suggests a need for further investigation of the role of such field experiences in teacher education work.

CONCLUSION

Perhaps the focus of the study becomes not so much the similarities and differences of classroom life for the traditional and non-traditional students, but rather how the presence of the non-traditional students in the classroom affects the whole class. In the opening Statement of Problem, Knowles (1978) was quoted: "we know more about how animals learn than about how children learn; and we know much more about how children learn than we know about how adults learn."
This study calls for directions that here-to-fore have not been pursued in the study of adult learners. It presents a need to understand the 'student world' of non-traditional learners as they, themselves, perceive it.
APPENDICES
Syllabus

Seminars are held in Hopewell 55, Friday, 8 - 10 and 10 - 12.

March 31

Introduction to the Freshman Early Experience Program

April 7

Setting Goals for Field Experience

April 14

No Class to compensate for attendance at "The Rights of the People" Symposium, April 5

April 21

Dealing with Discipline

Reaction Card #1 Due

April 28

Gaining Confidence as a Teacher-Candidate

Guest: Paddy Kutz, Mental Health Association

Reaction Card #2 Due

May 5

Planning for Instruction

Reaction Card #3 Due

Guided Observation Sheet #1 Due

May 12

Social Issues in Education: The CAP Program

Guest Speaker: Kate Madson, Director

Reaction Card #4 Due

May 19

Secondary vs Elementary Education

Reaction Card #5 Due

May 26

Controversies in Education

Reaction Card #6 Due

Guided Observation Sheet #2 Due

June 2

Summing Up the FEEP Experience

Media Lab Investigation Due

Newspaper Article Collection Due
Freshman Early Experience Program  
Spring, 1989

Course Requirements

1. **Satisfactory completion** of six hours per week in a school setting (punctual, attend when scheduled, complete assigned tasks, perform in a professional manner, demonstrate an interest in and commitment to the teaching profession).

2. Maintain an attendance log of participation hours

3. Complete **six** weekly Reaction Cards (5 points per card) = 30 points

4. Complete **two** Guided Observations Sheets (5 points per sheet) = 10 points

5. Complete the Media Lab Orientation (5 points) = 5 points

6. Collect a minimum of **five** newspaper articles and summarize, write a paragraph of summary and reaction for each (Include source and date) = 5 points

7. Attend and participate in the weekly seminars (5 pts per seminar) = 50 points

Total 100 points

100 - 92 = A
91 - 83 = B
82 - 74 = C
73 - 68 = D

The Freshman Early Experience Program is graded S (Satisfactory)/U (Unsatisfactory). A "satisfactory" performance must be demonstrated in both the Field Component and the Seminar Component in order to receive a "Satisfactory" grade for the course.

If you must miss a seminar or scheduled school placement **YOU MUST CALL IN ADVANCE.** Leave a message at the Media Lab, 366-9230, and with the school secretary. Work submitted late will automatically lose half of the total points for the assignment.

Due Dates:

Weekly Reaction Cards - Due every Friday, April 21 - May 26

Guided Observation Sheets - #1 is due May 5, #2 is due May 26

Media Lab Orientation - June 2

Newspaper Article Collection - June 2

Attendance Log - June 2
Purpose: The Weekly Reaction Card is a communication device that will highlight your personal reactions to the school placement.

What Do You Do? Before you attend the Friday seminar, fill out a Weekly Reaction Card. This card should describe your reactions to a specific incident that occurred during the week, (e.g. a discipline situation, your interaction with a particular student, your first time in front of the class, an incident in the teacher's lounge). Briefly describe the incident and use most of the card noting your reaction, what you learned, how you might handle things differently, etc.

Card Format: Use a 5" x 8" index card. On the top put your name, school, grade level, and the date the card is due. (Friday's date)

Evaluation: The purpose of the card is to reveal if your school placement is affecting your opinions about the teaching profession and increasing your knowledge about schools in general. Cards will be graded on:

1. Quality of response - Did you respond to an important experience and is your response well thought out?

2. Depth of response - Does your response seem superficial or did you give your comments some thought?

3. Mechanics - Did you take time to check spelling, sentence structure, handwriting (cards can be typed) and other composition skills?
The purpose of the Freshman Early Experience Program is to provide an in-depth survey of the teaching profession so that the prospective teacher-candidate can make an informed decision about applying to the College of Education.

This requirement will ask you to focus on a specific aspect of schools, classrooms, and the teaching profession.

For this requirement you will:

1. Choose two topics to investigate. Topics are suggested below or you are encouraged to follow an area of interest to you.
2. Find out about the topic by interviewing a teacher, observing a classroom, looking at materials, talking with students, attending a school function.
3. For the paper you will submit (no longer than two pages—please be concise) you will summarize what you investigated, the results of your observations, and your reactions to the experience, e.g. what you learned, how you were affected, what you might do differently.
4. Due dates:
   Guided Observation Sheet #1 - May 5
   Guided Observation Sheet #2 - May 26

Suggested topics:

1. Observe another teacher (special education, different subject area, another grade level, same grade but different teacher).
2. Observe a discipline situation and describe the roles and reactions of all involved.
3. Spend an hour with an administrator.
4. Interact with the students in a setting beyond the classroom, lunchroom, school function, sporting event. Compare students' attitudes in class with the new setting.
5. Spend time in another FEEP student's classroom. Compare your experience.
6. Investigate the school building—find the different classrooms, services, etc.
7. Observe a teacher teaching a subject or grade level you feel you would "never" want to teach.
8. Interview teachers about their reasons for becoming teachers.
9. Observe the classroom from a student's perspective. From the teacher's perspective. Compare the two viewpoints.
10. Survey the materials used in the classroom. What is your reaction to these materials.
11. Work with one student over a period of time. Describe how the relationship changed. How did you change? How did the student?
12. Keep a log of anecdotes about your FEEP experience. React to your comments made early in the quarter compared to ones written later.
Suggested Activities  The list of activities is intended to guide the FEEP student's exploration of the teaching profession. The list is intended as a guide...and can be adapted to individual classroom schedules and needs.

Initially...

- Meet the principal
- Get to know student names
- Make a seating chart
- Learn to operate school equipment: copy machine, projector.
- Prepare and read a story to the class
- Help students individually
- Work with a small group
- Grade and record student work
- Do clerical work: file papers, sort student workbooks
- Cut out display or art materials.
- Do housekeeping chores: straighten books, organize cupboards.
- Run errands
- Share teacher responsibilities at recess, in lunchroom, studyhall
- Explore the entire school to determine location of lunchroom, gym, office; make or follow a school map.
- Review a copy of school and classroom rules. Read discipline policy. Review emergency procedures (fire, tornado)

As the quarter continues...

- Observe teachers in other grade levels or subject areas.
- Administer a test or quiz.
- Bring in materials to supplement a lesson the sponsoring teacher is presenting.
- Attend a staff meeting or PTO program.
- Look at sample forms used by the school. (Permanent records, medical forms)
- Make a worksheet for students.
- Lead a discussion.
- Observe students in a variety of settings: lunch, before or after school, on the bus.

Before the quarter ends...

- Put up a bulletin board
- IF POSSIBLE, teach a lesson

Before you leave at the end of the quarter...

- Return all materials to sponsoring teacher
- Thank students and sponsoring teacher... something special for the students???
Today's Agenda:

1. Response to the Symposium
2. Identification of previous teaching experience
3. Webbing motivations for becoming a teacher
4. Ohio State's Teacher Education Program: Mickey Smith

Announcements:

1. Please do not come to class next Friday -- next class is April 21
2. Ask for resources or materials or HELP to maximize your school placement.
3. The Media Lab personnel can help you locate lots of appropriate materials for your school placement - materials circulate to those enrolled in education classes for three days.
4. Do you have a question for an administrator (principal) who has worked with secondary and elementary students? Please submit questions so that Mr. Bowers, principal at Fulton Middle School, can address your concerns later in the quarter.
5. FOR THE APRIL 21 SEMINAR, bring ideas for dealing effectively with discipline concerns...what works...what doesn't?

IDEA: Do you want to get to know the students in your classroom??? Prepare a STUDENT SURVEY. Students write on a form you prepare:
Name, Nickname, Favorite Food, Favorite Movie, Favorite TV show, Favorite Color, etc.

You could make this an activity just for you...or you could have students interview each other - answer the questions - and then draw a picture of the person they interviewed.
Freshman Early Experience Program

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

WHAT IS F.E.E.P.?

F.E.E.P., Freshman Early Experience Program, is a two-quarter course required of all students who want to enroll in the College of Education. Students enrolled in F.E.E.P., Ed Huser, 289.01, receive four quarter hours of credit.

WHAT WILL I DO IN F.E.E.P.?

Students enrolled in F.E.E.P. will complete a school or social agency participation of six hours per week and attend a weekly two-hour seminar on the Newark Campus.

AM I EXPECTED TO TEACH WHEN I AM IN THE SCHOOLS?

Since F.E.E.P. is a career exploration course, students are expected to spend school participation time finding out as much as possible about the field of education. F.E.E.P. students grade papers, help individual students, assist the teacher, put up bulletin boards and displays, and investigate all aspects of school life. Some F.E.E.P. students teach a lesson, but since students have not had classes in lesson plan preparation, this is not assigned part of the experience.

WHAT ARE MY RESPONSIBILITIES AS A F.E.E.P., STUDENT?

You are expected to demonstrate preliminary teacher-candidate traits:
1. You are expected to be in your school as scheduled.
2. You must be punctual.
3. You should demonstrate initiative in the classroom.
4. You should be an eager teacher-candidate - ready to learn from your sponsoring teacher.
5. You must attend seminars and complete assigned tasks.
6. Above all, you must be professional - dress, act, and communicate like a teacher.

WHAT DO I DO IF I HAVE TO MISS A DAY AT SCHOOL OR A SEMINAR?

First, you must call. As a teacher you will be expected to call the school if you are sick or unable to attend. The same is expected of F.E.E.P. students. Since 60-hour experience is expected in schools, you might have to make up days missed. An alternative assignment might be assigned for seminars not attended.

HOW WILL I BE EVALUATED?

You will receive a Satisfactory (S) or Unsatisfactory (U) for the F.E.E.P. course. In addition, written evaluations will be submitted by your sponsoring teacher and F.E.E.P. supervisor that will become a permanent part of your credentials. These evaluations will be strongly considered when you make application to the College of Education.

WHAT WILL I GAIN FROM F.E.E.P.?

The F.E.E.P. course will either confirm your decision to major in education or it will convince you to consider another major. This early introduction to the teaching profession is your opportunity to "try-on" the role of teacher before important career decisions must be made.
The Early and Middle Childhood Education Media Lab in Hopewell 55 is the base of operations for the College of Education at the Newark Campus. Most education classes are held in this room and nearly all educational materials are stored on the shelves.

The Media Lab Director, Peggy Halbedel, and her staff assist students with special projects or help them find materials. Students enrolled in education classes are permitted to borrow materials on the shelves.

During the FEEP program it is important to familiarize yourself with the physical layout of the Media Lab. Later in your coursework you will take ED 600 where you will learn to operate audiovisual equipment.

Complete this sheet by noting the name or location of each of the following:

1. a math manipulative
2. a 4th grade reading text
3. a commercial game in any content area
4. one children's book that features animals
5. a BIG BOOK
6. elementary scissors
7. the name of the person on duty in the lab
8. the name of the area where the laminator is located
9. #109 of the Phi Delta Kappa Series
10. the model of the heart
11. a book of bulletin board ideas
12. one science kit
13. an environmental education resource book
14. something interesting in the social studies area
15. find the Ellison Machine and attach something you made from that machine to this sheet
To: Students and teaching staff of Ed. Services & Research 289.01 on the Newark campus of The Ohio State University.

From: Michellina Smith

I am working on a research project that includes audio and video taping of various activities of this class. Though the administration and local department chairs have given permission for this research to be conducted, it is important that you consent to the taping procedures that will be used.

Purpose of taping:
Since so little is known of the means by which adults make sense of the everyday events of a classroom, taping has been selected as a technique for studying, in detail, a selected period of time in your classroom experience. The taping will provide a record of activities and interactions over an academic period of time. This record will serve as a base for the collection of data intended to contribute to the knowledge bank of what is known about the adult learner.

Any tapes produced will be shown only in conjunction with the presentation of research and never released for public showing without additional consent.

I appreciate your cooperation in this effort.

---

Your Name: ____________________________ Date: ________

Your signature: _________________________

In order to gain as indepth a perspective of your classroom experience as possible I also will be conducting individual interviews and field observations. If you are willing to participate in these additional activities please sign the following form.

Yes, I am willing to participate in:

_____ a personal interview

_____ a field observation activity

Name: ____________________________ Age: ________

Signature: ____________________________

Dates of any earlier college work: ____________________________
APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR FEEP INSTRUCTOR

Date: _________________________

Objective:
To become aware of the manner in which students are perceived at the start of the quarter;
To become aware of expectations for participation;
To become aware of tasks.

1. What do you see as the function/purpose of FEEP?

2. What "rules" do you have for the students? That is, what do you expect of them in terms of being a participating member of this class?

3. I know that you use letter grades to evaluate the seminar portion of the course. Would you talk a little about how you make those grade decisions?

4. My focus of study is the non-traditional student. You have both traditional and non-traditional students in the seminar. How would you describe their approach to the class?
APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR STUDENTS

Date: ________________________

Objective:
To develop a knowledge of student cultural and academic background;
To become aware of student motive for selecting teacher training as academic focus;
To become aware of student perception of class responsibilities;
To become aware of student perception of classmates.

1. Tell me about yourself; what brought you to this Freshman Early Experience class and to this particular campus?

2. What do you see as the function/purpose of the course?

3. What do you believe you have to do in order to be successful in FEEP? 
   Tell me about the seminar.
   Tell me about your field experience. 
   How do you decide what to do?

4. Tell me about your classmates. 
   Do you see any difference in the way different students approach the class?

5. Is there anything else you would like to add that we haven't talked about?
Appendix D
Questionnaire Data
Non-Traditional Student N=9
Traditional Student N=12

Percentages are rounded to whole number and may result in less than or more than 100%.

1. The most important factor in successfully completing FEEP was to attend the seminars.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.A.</th>
<th>A.</th>
<th>U.</th>
<th>D.</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Trad:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6(67%)</td>
<td>1(11%)</td>
<td>2(22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trad:</td>
<td>2(17%)</td>
<td>4(33%)</td>
<td>2(17%)</td>
<td>4(33%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Enthusiasm was an important factor for success in the seminars.

| Non-Trad: | 4(44%) | 5(56%) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Trad: | 6(50%) | 5(42%) | 1(08%) | 0 | 0 |

3. Seminar discussions were a main source of new learning and added to personal knowledge.

| Non-Trad: | 1(11%) | 6(67%) | 1(11%) | 0 | 1(11%) |
| Trad: | 8(67%) | 4(33%) | 0 | 0 | 0 |

4. The older, non-traditional students usually participated in class more than the younger, traditional students.

| Non-Trad: | 1(11%) | 5(56%) | 2(22%) | 1(11%) | 0 |
| Trad: | 6(50%) | 4(33%) | 0 | 2(17%) | 0 |

5. Sometimes, the older, non-traditional students participated in class less than the younger, traditional students.

| Non-Trad: | 0 | 4(44%) | 1(11%) | 3(33%) | 1(11%) |
| Trad: | 0 | 2(17%) | 2(17%) | 6(50%) | 2(17%) |

6. The non-traditional students tended to over-power the seminar discussions.

| Non-Trad: | 0 | 2(22%) | 2(22%) | 5(56%) | 0 |
| Trad: | 3(25%) | 4(33%) | 2(17%) | 3(25%) | 0 |

7. The younger, traditional students participated in class as much as the older, non-traditional students.

| Non-Trad: | 0 | 3(33%) | 2(22%) | 4(44%) | 0 |
| Trad: | 0 | 5(42%) | 2(17%) | 5(42%) | 0 |

8. The younger, traditional students participated in class more than the older, non-traditional students.

| Non-Trad: | 0 | 0 | 1(11%) | 6(67%) | 2(22%) |
| Trad: | 0 | 0 | 5(42%) | 6(50%) | 1(08%) |
9. More of your reaction card topics were about the students in the field placement classroom than about the teacher or yourself.
Non-Trad: 0 3(33%) 0 4(44%) 2(22%)
Trad: 1(08%) 1(08%) 3(25%) 5(42%) 2(17%)

10. More of your reaction card topics were about your personal reactions to events in the field placement classroom than anything else.
Non-Trad: 1(11%) 7(78%) 1(11%) 0 0
Trad: 5(42%) 4(33%) 1(08%) 1(08%) 1(08%)

11. More of your reaction card topics were about your cooperating teacher in the field placement classroom than anything else.
Non-Trad: 0 2(22%) 0 7(78%) 0
Trad: 0 3(25%) 3(25%) 5(42%) 1(08%)

12. If you had other favorite reaction card topics, what were they?
Non-Trad: Field trip to Cols; Student behaviors; reaction to other teachers; reaction to the school in general.
Trad: Complaining about not having a topic; complaining about my placement; discipline; to tell how the students reacted to me and to the teacher, it helped me see the development of the children with different influences; school policies; special programs for LD students in placement school, disciplinary techniques; visiting other classrooms, field trip, planning a lesson; I had no favorite. events that took place at my field placement school;

13. Traditional and non-traditional students tended to approach their studies with a different attitude.
Non-Trad: 1(11%) 5(56%) 3(33%) 0 0
Trad: 2(17%) 7(58%) 3(25%) 0 0

14. Generally, the non-traditional students earned higher grades than the traditional students.
Non-Trad: 0 2(22%) 6(67%) 1(11%) 0
Trad: 2(17%) 2(17%) 6(50%) 1(08%) 1(08%)

15. Students socialized with each other before class.
Non-Trad: 1(11%) 6(67%) 2(22%) 0 0
Trad:  2(17%)  8(67%)  1(08%)  1(08%)  0
S.A.  A.  U.  D.  S.D.
16. Students socialized with each other during class.  
Non-Trad: 0  6(67%)  3(33%)  0  0  
Trad:  2(17%)  9(75%)  0  1(08%)  0  
17. Students socialized with each other after class.  
Non-Trad: 0  7(78%)  2(22%)  0  0  
Trad:  2(17%)  8(67%)  1(08%)  1(08%)  0  
18. Traditional and non-traditional students helped each other with class assignments outside of class time.  
Non-Trad: 1(11%)  4(44%)  3(33%)  1(11%)  0  
Trad:  1(08%)  4(33%)  4(33%)  3(25%)  0  
19. Traditional and non-traditional students helped each other with personal problems/concerns.  
Non-Trad: 0  4(44%)  5(56%)  0  0  
Trad:  1(08%)  1(08%)  8(67%)  2(17%)  0  
20. The traditional and non-traditional students helped each other with class assignments during class time.  
Non-Trad: 0  6(67%)  2(22%)  1(11%)  0  
Trad:  2(17%)  7(58%)  1(08%)  2(17%)  0  
21. Student ideas for topics were used in seminar. If you agree with this statement, do you remember a specific topic that was used? What was it?  
Non-Trad: 0  0  8(89%)  1(11%)  0  
Trad:  2(17%)  2(17%)  8(67%)  0  0  
Non-Trad: no topics were offered  
Trad: The principal from Fulton School came in and spoke about the profession(salary,demand, encouragement etc.;someone suggested writing a lesson plan in class;discipline techniques, lesson planning;  
22. Students had the right to not attend the seminar.  
Non-Trad: 0  4(44%)  1(11%)  2(22%)  2(22%)  
Trad:  0  3(25%)  1(08%)  3(25%)  5(42%)  
23. Students had the right to not complete the six hours a week in the field participation site.  
Non-Trad: 0  2(22%)  0  4(44%)  3(33%)  
Trad:  0  2(17%)  1(08%)  4(33%)  5(42%)  
24. Students often expressed their opinion in seminars.  
Non-Trad: 5(56%)  3(33%)  0  1(11%)  0
25. Conflicting student opinions were solicited by the instructor.
Non-Trad: 2(22%) 6(67%) 1(11%) 0 0
Trad: 0 6(50%) 6(50%) 0 0

26. Non-traditional students expressed their opinions more often than the traditional students did.
Non-Trad: 2(22%) 5(56%) 2(22%) 0 0
Trad: 5(42%) 3(25%) 2(17%) 2(17%) 0

27. Students could enter and exit class at anytime.
Non-Trad: 0 5(56%) 2(22%) 0 2(22%)
Trad: 0 8(67%) 2(17%) 2(17%) 0

28. Students had the right to criticize the instructor's evaluation of their work.
Non-Trad: 0 6(67%) 3(33%) 0 0
Trad: 0 7(58%) 5(42%) 0 0

29. Students were obligated to participate in an end-of-the-quarter evaluation with the instructor.
Non-Trad: 1(11%) 3(33%) 0 3(33%) 2(22%)
Trad: 0 3(25%) 5(42%) 3(25%) 1(08%)

30. There was a significant difference in participation levels of the traditional and non-traditional students.
Non-Trad: 1(11%) 3(33%) 2(22%) 3(33%) 0
Trad: 1(08%) 6(50%) 4(33%) 1(08%) 0

31. Traditional students had an advantage over the non-traditional students because they had been having a continuous school experience and had a better idea of what to expect in their courses.
Non-Trad: 0 0 3(33%) 6(67%) 0
Trad: 1(08%) 0 3(25%) 7(58%) 0

32. Non-traditional students had an advantage over the traditional students because they had extensive life experiences.
Non-Trad: 0 6(67%) 2(22%) 1(11%) 0
Trad: 2(17%) 5(42%) 3(25%) 2(17%) 0

33. A major role for students in FEEP seminar was to discuss topics presented by the instructor.
34. The younger, traditional and older, non-traditional students worked together much of the time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.A.</th>
<th>A.</th>
<th>U.</th>
<th>D.</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Trad:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8(89%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1(11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trad:</td>
<td>2(17%)</td>
<td>9(75%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35. In retrospect, do you have any comment you would like to make about your experience in Freshman Early Experience that quarter?

Non-Trad:

1. "A fun class"

2. I enjoyed both the class and my time spent at Roosevelt Jr. High. I believe FEEP helps the student make decisions about the teaching field;

3. I believe my FEEP experience was an experience that I will never forget. I enjoyed, participated, and expressed my views in this class. The time I got to spend in the classroom was fantastic. Everyone should attend these classes if they intend on teaching;

4. The seminars were thoroughly rewarding. does an excellent job of making everyone feel worthwhile. In my experience after 2 years at I think the link between traditional and non-traditional students is very strong. There's a common feeling that we all have something to offer to each other. The cooperation is one bonus at ___.

5. I felt the entire experience was a good example of getting acquainted with teaching. It opened my mind to different possibilities. I also felt the instructor's enthusiasm and creative lessons was a learning experience by itself;

6. I waived my second quarter requirement
of FEEP because of previous classroom experience. However, I felt that my FEEP experience wasn't very helpful to me as a future teacher. The tasks I was asked to do and the things I was exposed to in my FEEP placement were all things that I have been doing at my own children's school. The seminars, on the other hand, were educational, helpful and enlightening.

Trad:

1. "S__ was a fantastic instructor. She respected the students' opinions but still gave us the advice that I know I needed so badly;

2. FEEP was a learning experience everyone thinking about going into the field of education should involve themselves in. It really gives one a chance to see what this profession is all about. Even though it can't compare to having ones own class it helps one see one small part of the responsibilities and rewards of being a teacher;

3. I had a wonderful FEEP experience and I feel that FEEP plays an extremely important role in a student's learning experiences;

4. It was an excellent experience, which I'll never forget. Students definitely need to attend seminars and their six-hour participation site to learn anything from this course. S__ D__ did a terrific job of teaching the class. Her enthusiasm adds a special touch and makes you feel wanted in her class;

5. I really enjoyed my FEEP experience, however, some of the seminars got "old". Old in the sense that the "older" generation had much of the class discussion, talking about their own children, etc. I had problems relating /that because I am younger, & do not have children. Sometimes it
just seemed like there was too much class time talking about other students' children when it could have been spent learning something more valuable that we could use later. I think the younger generation did not participate as often simply because they couldn't really relate to the subject (having their own children). However, I did enjoy my FEEP experience and having been in the elementary school will be very valuable to my future.

6. The cooperating teachers should be teachers who want to participate in the FEEP experiences. These teachers should want to provide positive experiences and be enthusiastic about their prospective future teachers in their classroom.
Organizational meeting

Define field placements → Confirm field placements
Define tasks → 2nd definition of tasks → 3rd definition of tasks → 4th definition of tasks

Instructor initiates/coordinates through talk

Instructor presents topic of discipline → Discipline carried as topic

Students write a talk to Symposium

Students write questions for guest administrator

Instructor presents upcoming sessions as having more student input

Students respond to role playing event; Students present to large group; Instructor identifies topic

Students respond to sharing of experiences; Small group report to large group

Instructor asks student for response to topic sharing of experiences; Individual or small group present to large group

Student response to activity; Student response to instructor; Student response to instructor

Used by guest student task as basis for topics used in presentation as lesson

Guest speaker

Students do a writing task; Share with large group; Video presentation

Guest speaker video presentation

Guest speaker

Guest speaker

Development of the Instructional Period
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Wk.1</th>
<th>Wk.2</th>
<th>Wk.3</th>
<th>Wk.4</th>
<th>Wk.5</th>
<th>Wk.6</th>
<th>Wk.7</th>
<th>Wk.8</th>
<th>Wk.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>greeting</td>
<td>greeting</td>
<td>gather</td>
<td>instructor talk</td>
<td>greeting</td>
<td>gathering</td>
<td>gathering</td>
<td>gathering</td>
<td>gather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>identified</td>
<td>writing task</td>
<td>greeting</td>
<td>asks for sharing</td>
<td>video</td>
<td>agenda</td>
<td>instructor</td>
<td>'class begins'</td>
<td>places screen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as organizational</td>
<td>review agenda</td>
<td>asking</td>
<td>divides class</td>
<td>questions</td>
<td>next</td>
<td>activity</td>
<td>requests</td>
<td>guest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sharing</td>
<td>sharing</td>
<td>into activity</td>
<td>sharing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presents</td>
<td>presents</td>
<td>reconvenes as</td>
<td>expectations</td>
<td>activity</td>
<td>large group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'Band-Aid'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>group</td>
<td>shows film</td>
<td>new activity</td>
<td>students write</td>
<td>whole group</td>
<td>break</td>
<td>group</td>
<td>break</td>
<td>group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>project</td>
<td>writing task</td>
<td></td>
<td>talk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>reconvenes</td>
<td>reconvenes</td>
<td>reconvenes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>break</td>
<td>break</td>
<td>break</td>
<td>break</td>
<td>break</td>
<td>break</td>
<td>break</td>
<td>break</td>
<td>break</td>
<td>break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>students</td>
<td>guest</td>
<td>directions for</td>
<td>guest</td>
<td>students</td>
<td>'guest video'</td>
<td>whole group</td>
<td>guest</td>
<td>film</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>select</td>
<td>assignment;</td>
<td>guest</td>
<td>students</td>
<td>present</td>
<td>activity</td>
<td></td>
<td>film</td>
<td>activity</td>
<td>issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>field site</td>
<td>presents</td>
<td>activity</td>
<td>review</td>
<td>student</td>
<td>new activity</td>
<td>student</td>
<td>choose positions</td>
<td>student</td>
<td>leaves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>directions</td>
<td>activity</td>
<td>review</td>
<td>handout</td>
<td>leaves</td>
<td>video</td>
<td>leaves</td>
<td></td>
<td>leaves</td>
<td>dismiss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>video</td>
<td></td>
<td>video</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>dismissal</td>
<td>dismissal</td>
<td>students</td>
<td>guest</td>
<td>students</td>
<td>students</td>
<td>guest</td>
<td>dismissal</td>
<td>dismissal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>guest asks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>for questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>for questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use of Time During Seminars
LET'S SEE IF WE CAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>students raise hands to comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 (number of comments)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(personal note: do the younger ones remember more because it's closer to current experience?)

Students chatter to each other while teacher passes out another hand-out; "Dealing with Discipline".

9:30 one student (a non-traditional) leaves
Mother takes child to sink to wash hands

9:35 A second student leaves the classroom
Teacher continues to talk with no obvious reaction to student leaving

Mother and child are playing with each other
Mother is looking at the teacher and at the subject sheet while playing with the child.

Teacher uses an audio tape of a discipline discussion on the radio.

9:43 Students begin to pull together their books and materials and leave (Mickey, check tape to see if teacher has spoken any words of dismissal)

Students gather to talk with teacher (both traditional and non-traditional)

One non-traditional walks around looking at books on shelves. (Class is held in media center)
Students chatter to each other while teacher passes out another hand-out; "Dealing with Discipline".

ALL RIGHT
LET ME JUST VERY QUICKLY THEN I THINK
OH
GEE
VERY QUICK
LET ME JUST GO OVER PART OF IT THEN WE'LL CALL IT A DAY AND PICK UP NEXT WEEK
LET ME JUST GO OVER THE FIRST SIX STEPS AND THEN WE'RE DONE FOR THE DAY

Instructor proceeds to review the handout—

9:30 one student (a non-traditional) leaves
mother takes child to sink to wash hands

9:35 A second student leaves the classroom
Teacher continues to talk with no obvious reaction to student leaving
Mother and child are playing with each other
Mother is looking at the teacher and at the subject sheet while playing with the child

Teacher uses an audio tape of a discipline discussion on the radio.

9:43 Students begin to pull together their books and materials and leave (Mickey, check tape to see if teacher has spoken any words of dismissal)

LET'S CONTINUE THIS THE NEXT TIME WE MEET
AND IF YOU HAVE ANY (INAUDIBLE COMMENTS DUE TO STUDENT MOTION AND TALKING)
ILL SEE YOU NEXT WEEK
Students gather to talk with teacher (both traditional and non-traditional)

One non-traditional walks around looking at books on shelves. (Class is held in media center)
THE OLDER PEOPLE TAKE
I DON'T MEAN THIS TO SOUND STEREOTYPICAL BUT
FOR THE MOST PART THE OLDER PEOPLE TAKE THEIR EDUCATION A LOT
MORE SERIOUSLY

I'VE HAD A FEW CLASSES WHERE I HAVE
ONE PERSON OLDER EASILY
I DON'T MEAN THIS AS A DETRIMENTAL
ONE OLDER LADY IN THE CLASS THAT IS ONLY TAKING ONE
THEY ONLY TAKE ONE CLASS PER QUARTER
WE USED TO CALL THEM GRADE POINT BUSTERS
THEY WOULD THROW THE WOULD SKEW THE GRADE DISTRIBUTION OF THE
CLASS
I CAN REMEMBER I HAD THIS ONE WOMAN IN TWO OF MY CLASSES
SHE WAS TAKING ONE CLASS PER QUARTER AND
ME AND MY FRIENDS WERE TAKING THREE
AND WORKING AND
SHE WAS A

HOME MAKER TAKING ONE CLASS PER QUARTER
AND SHE WORKED INTENSIVELY IN THE CLASS AND SHE WOULD SKEW THE
GRADE DISTRIBUTION
SHE WOULD HAVE LIKE A HUNDRED AND ONE AND THE REST OF THE CLASS
WOULD BE LIKE A 89
SO IN THAT PERSPECTIVE AGGRAVATING BUT
IT WAS

A FRIEND OF MINE
SHE'S UH
I THINK AROUND 45 SHE HAS CHILDREN
SHE'S COMING BACK TO SCHOOL NOW AFTER ABOUT 25 YEARS I THINK SHE
SAID
AND IT'S INTERESTING SHE
WE HAVE DIFFERENT METHODS OF STUDYING TOO

THE OLDER PEOPLE
I'VE ADOPTED SOME OF THEIR WAYS CAUSE THEY ARE EFFECTIVE
I USED TO GO THROUGH MY NOTES AND I WOULD HIGH LIGHT MY NOTES BUT
I'D HAVE TO TURN FROM PAGE TO PAGE TO PAGE
BUT A LOT OF OLDER PEOPLE HAVE INCORPORATED FLASH CARDS AND
AND IT'S NOT NECESSARILY UNIQUE TO OLDER PEOPLE BUT IT SEEMS LIKE
ALL THE OLDER PEOPLE WHO COME BACK USE THAT METHOD

AND

IT IS AN EFFECTIVE WAY
I THINK THERE'S WAYS
THINGS THAT SOMEONE COMING OUT OF HIGH SCHOOL CAN LEARN
BETTER STUDY HABITS FROM PEOPLE COMING BACK CAUSE THE PEOPLE
JUST LIKE A NORMAL TEACHER WOULD
WHEN THEY DON'T UNDERSTAND AND
I UM
I SEE A LOT OF WHAT THEY DO IN DISCIPLINE
YOU KNOW
WHICH I GUESS
I DON'T ENFORCE DISCIPLINE
AND STUFF LIKE THAT
SOMETIMES
I'M JUST OBSERVING
AND STUFF LIKE THAT
I CAN FEEL LIKE
JUST BEING IN THE TEACHERS LOUNGE
HOW THEY INTERACT AND STUFF LIKE THAT
I'M REALLY GETTING THE IDEA OF WHAT IT'S ALL ABOUT YOU KNOW
--- does it seem very different than when you were in school
---
UHM
I GUESS SO
A LITTLE BIT
BUT
I DON'T KNOW
YEA I GUESS SO
YOU ALWAYS THOUGHT A TEACHER WAS SUCH A NEAT PERSON
YOU KNOW YOU ALWAYS LOOKED UP TO EM
AND ESPECIALLY WHEN YOU HAD KIDS
YOUNGER KIDS
LIKE STUDENT TEACHERS COME IN AND
YOU ALWAYS THOUGHT THAT WAS SPECIAL
IT WAS SOMETHING DIFFERENT
IT'S NOT
YOU KNOW
YOU STILL PUT A LOT OF WORK INTO THAT
YOU KNOW
AND THEY REALLY
I GUESS
THEY REALLY
DEPEND ON YOU BEING THERE AND STUFF LIKE THAT
--- in what kind of setting are you working
UHM
I'M IN A FIFTH GRADE
AND
I'M AT HEBRON WHICH IS A LOT DIFFERENT
I THINK
THAN FROM WHERE I WAS FROM
CUASE THERE'S A LOT OF KIDS THAT COME FROM A LARGE
THEY COME IN
YOU ALL KNEW WHEN I WAS IN GRADE SCHOOL
YOU KNOW
WHERE YOUR FRIENDS LIVED
AND STUFF LIKE THAT YOU KNOW
AND SO I
IT'S A SMALL CLASS
THERE'S ABOUT 23 OF THEM
THEY HAVE
A LOT OF
UH
I DON'T KNOW IF THEY CALL THEM HANDICAPPED OR
THEY'RE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED STUDENTS
AND I WANT TO OBSERVE THEM IN A CLASSROOM
I WANT TO SEE WHAT
WHAT THAT WAS LIKE
what kind of things do you think you'll look for
I DON'T KNOW I
I GUESS AND
I DON'T KNOW
THERE'S ONE
THERE'S NOT THIS PHYSICALLY
ANOTHER HANDICAPPED
I MADE A SNAP JUDGEMENT
THE FIRST DAY I WAS IN THERE
THIS LITTLE BOY
AND HE WAS EXTREMELY HYPER
EXTREMELY HYPER
I MEAN
I DON'T THINK HE SAT IN HIS CHAIR ANY MORE THAN
TWO OR THREE SECONDS AT A TIME
HE WAS UP DOWN UP DOWN
UNDER HIS DESK ON HIS DESK
EVERYWHERE
AND I IMMEDIATELY ASSUMED WELL HE WASN'T VERY INTELLIGENT
WELLLLL
THIS LITTLE BOY
GETS EXCELLENT GRADES
I GUESS I WANT TO GO SEE
WHAT THEY'RE REALLY LIKE
CAUSE MAYBE I ASSUMED
THAT IF THERE'S A HANDICAP
THAT MAYBE THEY'RE NOT AS INTELLIGENT
BUT THAT'S NOT TRUE AND I THINK I LEARNED SOMETHING
good
did that by any chance turn out to be a reaction
card for you
YEA IT DID
I THINK I THINK YEAH I THINK IT DID
I FELT REALLY BAD ABOUT IT CAUSE I WAS SO UPSET THIS DAY CAUSE
I WENT HOME AND TOLD MY HUSBAND I FELT ALWFUL CAUSE POOR
LITTLE MIKEY I I
I SHOULD NEVER HAVE THOUGHT THAT SO I'VE BEEN
I JUST HAVE BEEN MORE OPEN
TO THE CHILDREN AND NOT BEEN AS
I GOT JUDGEMENTAL OR SOMETHING OR ASSUMING SOMETHING
BEFORE I ACTUALLY KNOW
BECAUSE TO SEE HIM YOU WOULD NEVER THINK HE COULD CONCENTRATE
LONG ENOUGH
I'D HAVE THOUGHT WITH EIGHTEEN KIDS IN A HONORS CLASS SOMEONE
WOULD HAVE AND I GUESS THE OTHER SEVENTEEN THOUGHT THE
SAME WAY

BUT NOT ONE OF US HAD READ IT

NOT ONE

I THOUGHT

WELL THIS IS AN HONORS CLASS
WE'RE IN BIG TROUBLE HERE
LIKE I SAID I WAS AS GUILTY AS THE NEXT PERSON
CAUSE I HADN'T READ IT I THOUGHT
SOMEBOY ELSE WOULD TAKE CARE OF IT
I THOUGHT ONE PERSON WOULD
PRETTY MUCH CARRY THE LOAD AND IT JUST DIDN'T HAPPEN
NO
DR. WAS PRETTY DISSAPPOINTED

SO
I COULD UNDERSTAND WHERE HE WOULD BE
then what happened the rest of the quarter
did that kinda
did that shake anybody else up

WELL
I DON'T KNOW IF IT DID
I THINK YOU KNOW IT DID HIM
WE TALKED ABOUT THAT A LITTLE BIT HE'S ONE OF MY BETTER FRIENDS
HERE AND I THINK HE'S NINETEEN YEARS OLD OR SOMETHING LIKE
THAT

AND I
WE GOT TO TALKING ABOUT IT AND FROM THAT POINT ON ME AND HIM MADE
SURE WE WENT DOWN AND SIGNED OUR NAMES
and you're finding it easy to make friends with
some of the younger ones

OH YEAH
did they take you on

OH YEAH
I THINK THAT IN A LOT OF RESPECTS I'M STILL YOUNG
PERSON

YOU KNOW I'M A REBEL
LIKE MATIE DAVIDSON SAID ON MOONLIGHTING A REBEL WITHOUT A CLUE
I A I A
A LOT OF MY FRIENDS ARE RETURNING STUDENTS BUT
I HAVE ABSOLUTELY NO PROBLEMS
I CAN WALK OVER IN THE CAFETERIA RIGHT NOW AND SIT DOWN WITH A
BUNCH OF THEM YOU KNOW
GET INVOLVED IN A CONVERSATION
WE'VE GOT A LOT IN COMMON
I LISTEN TO THE MUSIC THEY LISTEN TO YOU KNOW
DO THE SAME THINGS THEY DO
I'M JUST OLDER

YOU KNOW WELL TRULY
I'VE SLOWED DOWN SOME
I WENT TO THE KENTUCKY DERBY
I WAS YOUNGER
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