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ABSTRACT

Student teaching has been cited in the literature as a valuable part of teacher preparation but research is conflicting on how teachers are socialized into the teaching profession. Some researchers argue that student teachers are socialized through spending countless hours as pupils in classrooms; others argue that student teachers are passive individuals who accept the values and norms of the school. These two arguments suggest that socialization is unidirectional. Recent socialization literature suggests that student teachers are active participants in the socialization process and that socialization is a "dynamic series of social events" that interact between student teacher role identities (TRIs) and program features, settings, and people.

The purpose of this study is to describe the process through which student teachers selectively acquire the attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge current in the teaching profession. An ethnographic approach to this study enabled the penetration of the complex and interrelated world of student teaching experiences.

The setting for data collection is eight student teaching sites within a 60-mile radius of a large midwestern university. Four home economics education student teachers
(two traditional and two non-traditional) student taught at
two separate sites for eight weeks in middle/junior and senior
high programs. Traditional/non-traditional enrollment status
was selected as the primary variable of interest. The home
economics teacher education program was a four-year program.

Three methods of ethnographic data collection were
utilized: (a) semi-structured interviews; (b) non-
participant, non-interactive observations; and (c) review of
program-related materials. Student teachers addressed their
perceptions of themselves as teachers and teacher roles, why
and how they chose to become teachers, and expectations of the
student teaching experiences.

Data collection, recorded in field notes and on audio
tapes, provided a detailed description of individual TRIs for
four student teachers, the socializing impact from specific
variables, and the socializing impact of program features,
settings, and people. Data were analyzed with a computer
program entitled The Ethnograph (Seidel, Kjolseth, & Seymour,
1988).

Content analyses support the contention that four student
teachers entered student teaching with well-developed TRIs.
Student teachers were clearly active agents in their own
socialization processes. Findings indicate that TRIs for four
student teachers developed over time through the influence of
close family members, former teachers, and past teaching experiences in non-formal settings. TRIs served as lenses through which student teachers interpreted and evaluated their value as teachers, their teacher roles, and their cooperating teachers' attitudes, values, and beliefs about teaching and teacher roles.

Former high school teachers emerged as powerful pre-student teaching socializing influences for traditional student teachers; life experiences and past teaching experiences in non-formal settings emerged as powerful socializing influences for non-traditional student teachers. Findings support the contention that knowledge bases and methodological skills were not significantly altered during student teaching but knowledge transferral and classroom management skills increased. Full-load teaching responsibilities and pupils in classrooms emerged as powerful socializing influences during student teaching.

Findings from this study support the contention that more qualitative socialization research should be conducted to further describe the interaction between student teachers and program features, settings, and people. Data from this study support the notion that teacher educators should be aware of preservice teacher biographies and preconceived TRIs as they plan and implement home economics teacher education curricula.
CHAPTER I.
INTRODUCTION

Elliot (1981) concludes that all teachers learn and change with experience. According to Ricord (1986), that particular change is commonly known as socialization. Socialization is defined as the process by which people selectively acquire the attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge (in short, the culture) current in groups to which they are or seek to become a member (Merton, Reader, & Kendall, 1957). Despite philosophical differences on conceptualizing and describing the socialization process, teacher socialization researchers agree that student teachers do change during student teaching (Ricord, 1986). However, little is known about the actual process of socialization (Zeichner, 1984; Goodman, 1985).

In order for researchers and practitioners to understand how student teachers are socialized into the teaching profession, several researchers assert that socialization must be viewed as a process of "dynamic social events" made up of intertwined physical, emotional, and social variables (e.g., Fox et al., 1976; Goodman, 1983; Tabachnick 1981; Tabachnick et al., 1979-80; Wells, 1984). Based on a thorough review of
the socialization literature, it seems apparent that researchers are rethinking the magnitude of the variables that impact the socialization process for student teachers.

As conceptualized in the past, the socialization process included not only developing teaching strategies and methodology but also learning the values, attitudes, norms, behavioral patterns, and interests of the profession (e.g., Feiman-Nemser, 1983; Hoy & Rees, 1977; Lortie, 1975; Zeichner, 1980a). Recent socialization literature reveals that student teacher biography is also being considered as a powerful socializing variable (Lortie, 1975; Zeichner, 1986a; Zeichner & Grant, 1981).

Lortie (1973) concludes in his examination of the "riddle of teacher socialization" that there are several explanations for the socialization process. The socialization of teachers is "undoubtedly a complex process not readily captured by a simple, one-factor frame of reference" (p. 488).

The purpose of this chapter is to present: (a) an overview of the importance of the student teaching experience; (b) the socializing variables that have been reported in the literature since the early sixties; (c) university contextual factors; (d) university and school interaction; (e) the study proposal; and (f) definition of terms. Recent teacher socialization and student teaching literature reviews
illuminate a debate in terms of whether or not student teaching is influential in impacting the socialization of student teachers into the teaching profession. This particular debate will be discussed in Chapter II.

Importance of Student Teaching

In reflecting on preparation for teaching, professional teachers consistently refer to the student teaching experience as the most valuable experience they had before beginning to teach, the time during which they learned the most about being a teacher (Fraser, 1989; Tabachnick, 1980; Watts, 1987). Haberman (1982) pointed out that student teaching is considered to be the heart and mind of teacher preparation. Student teaching has been acknowledged as the key element of any teacher education program (Tabachnick, 1980) and the most crucial aspect of teacher preparation (Goodman, 1983).

Definition of student teaching. A review of literature reveals that there is no agreed upon definition of the student teaching experience and that there is variety in the ways in which the student teaching experience is conceptualized, organized, and conducted (Zeichner, 1986a). Beyond a general agreement that student teaching is "guided teaching during which time the teacher education student takes increasing responsibility for work with a given group or groups of
learners over a period of consecutive weeks" (Flowers, Patterson, Stratemeyer, Lindsey, 1948, p. 21), there are many alternative approaches to the conceptualization of student teaching experiences. Yates and Johnson (1981) cited examples of alternative approaches to student teaching experiences relative to program content and goals, structural and organizational characteristics, relationships to campus-based courses, supervisory involvement, and roles assumed by student teachers.

Impacts on socialization. Despite hundreds of studies on student teaching and teacher socialization, the literature presents a shallow understanding of the relationships among socializing variables, the actual socialization within the context of teacher education, and the implications for teacher education programs (Crow, 1986). Tabachnick and Zeichner (1984) assert that student teaching has a significant impact on the socialization of teachers while admitting that there is disagreement about the specific nature of that impact in terms of which particular socializing variable plays the most influential role in the socialization of student teachers.
Socialization Variables

Eleven socializing variables have been cited in the literature as factors that impact on socializing teachers into the teaching profession. Those variables are: (a) key individuals; (b) cooperating teacher/university supervisor; (c) ecological characteristics of classrooms; (d) student teacher/cooperating teacher similarities and differences; (e) bureaucratic characteristics of schools; (f) changes in attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge; (g) role expectations; (h) student teacher biography; (i) communication skills; and (j) acquiring teacher behavior. Each specific socialization variable was included in the review of literature because each variable was addressed by the four student teachers who participated in this study.

Key individuals. Student teachers in Manning's (1977) study indicated that professional contacts (e.g., cooperating teachers, university supervisors, other university professors) exerted the most significant influence upon their teaching beliefs. Other groups of people such as parents and friends had a less significant influence. Setting and preparation variables had some effect on the perceived nature of influence exerted by each group.

Student teachers in the Karmos and Jacko (1977) study indicated that cooperating teachers had by far the most
socially significant influence on them during their student teaching experience. These student teachers, however, described the cooperating teacher's influence as being in the personal support and role development area whereas the influence of university faculty was considered to be of greater significance in the area of professional skill development (Marso & Pigge, 1986).

Karmos and Jacko (1977) found that pupils in classrooms served two functions in socializing student teachers into the teaching profession. First, the pupils' positive and/or negative responses to student teachers legitimized the student teacher's role as a teacher in the classroom. Second, the pupil's positive and/or negative task-related behaviors determined the success or failure of student teachers' lessons. Copeland (1978) reported that the type of pupil (e.g., below grade level reader, disruptive pupil) within a particular placement was more responsible for shaping the student teacher's values and teaching methodology than the efforts of the cooperating teacher or the university supervisor.

Lortie (1975) reported that psychic rewards gained from the teacher's perceptions of pupil achievement were an important part of the total rewards received by classroom teachers and became important socializing factors. Pupils
provide immediate rewards for the efforts of the classroom teacher thereby shaping their practices and beliefs (e.g., Brophy & Good, 1974; Friebus, 1977; Lortie, 1975; Yee, 1968).

Friebus (1977) conducted a survey to determine if there were other significant people in the student teacher's socialization process. Friebus (1977) studied 19 student teachers and found a number of persons, other than the cooperating teacher, who were important to student teachers during their student teaching experience. The student teachers in this study considered other teachers in their placement sites to be very important sources of ideas. These teachers served as unofficial advisors, counselors, and role models.

The student teacher's ability to focus personal energy on the student teaching experience has been found to be associated with success (Crow, 1987a). Student teachers who had large portions of their time, energy, and attention consumed by the demands of unrelated settings (e.g., spouses and children, other jobs) were less likely to experience success in their placements (DeVoss, 1979).

The Karmos and Jacko (1977) and Friebus (1977) studies also indicated a limited role played by non-professional agents but the studies provide conflicting evidence about the socialization impact of friends and spouses on student
teachers. Karmos and Jacko (1977) demonstrated that emotional support was provided by friends, parents, and spouses. Friebus (1977) found that spouses and dating partners made demands on student teachers' time and emotions which conflicted with student teaching obligations. Such a conflict provided a negative influence on socialization because the student teachers felt emotionally distanced and somewhat uncommitted to the profession as a result (Crow, 1987a).

Research on peers represents an attempt to investigate those contextual variables not directly involved in the teacher education program (Crow, 1987a). Friebus (1977) and Karmos and Jacko (1977) reported that peers influence the socialization of student teachers through providing emotional support. Karmos and Jacko (1977) concluded that student teachers offer each other collegial support by sharing 'ordeals' and comparing notes on cooperating teachers and university supervisors. Iannaccone and Button (1964) reported that student teachers used one another as barometers of progress toward mastery of teaching roles.

Cooperating teachers/university supervisors. Iannaccone (1963) focused on the changes in student teachers' perceptions of teaching while student teaching for a semester. The preliminary perceptions reflect student "horror" and "indignation" over cooperating teacher behaviors (Griffin,
Iannaccone (1963) suggested that these concerns correspond to an entry stage in which student teachers act only as observers. A transition stage occurs when student teachers and cooperating teachers begin to establish collaborative relationships dependent upon mutual concern for individual learning but the relationships were still clearly superordinate-subordinate in nature (Iannaccone, 1963).

In the final stage, the relationship between student teachers and cooperating teachers becomes more collaborative. The student teachers' attitudes toward discipline and how to facilitate learning more closely resemble the attitudes of the cooperating teachers (Iannaccone, 1963). This finding was consistent with Lanier's (1984b) thesis that cooperating teachers exercised power and influence when they supervised student teachers and Haberman's (1978) argument that student teachers were particularly susceptible to control by group norms, especially those espoused by the cooperating teacher.

Edgar and Warren (1969) found that student teachers gravitated toward the beliefs and practices of those professionals who were perceived to have evaluative power over the student teachers' performance. However, Morris (1974) and Zevin (1974) suggest that the university supervisor's influence on the student teacher socialization process was not a strong influence.
Bowman (1979) indicated that the university supervisor's role in the student teaching process is minimal because of the small amount of time that the university supervisor actually spent observing the student teachers during the teaching/learning process. Friebus (1977) found that the university supervisor played a more significant socialization role through "coaching" the student teacher when the university supervisor was placed in a situation that allowed for more student teacher/university supervisor interaction in the placement site.

Ecological characteristics of classrooms. Recent research acknowledges the placement site as an important variable in teacher socialization (Zeichner, 1980a, 1984). Doyle and Ponder (1975) define the classroom ecological system as "that network of interconnected processes and events which impinges upon behavior in the teaching environment" (p. 183). According to this view, learning to teach involves "learning the texture of the classroom and the type of behaviors congruent with the environmental demands of the setting" (Doyle, 1977, p. 51).

Environmental demands establish limits on the range of teacher behaviors. Those behaviors that are congruent with the classroom's ecology are more likely to persist regardless of attempts to prepare student teachers in the use of specific
skills (e.g., through microteaching) and regardless of the specific models provided by the cooperating teachers (Copeland, 1980). Several researchers have documented the structural characteristics of classrooms that impinge upon the work of the teacher and, again, limit the range of teacher behaviors (Doyle, 1977; Dreenben, 1973; Jacobs, 1968; Sharp & Green, 1975).

Evidence from the literature indicates that student teachers adopt the attitudes and behaviors of their cooperating teachers by the end of the student teaching experience, thus suggesting that the cooperating teacher has been the primary cause of this socializing effect (e.g., Edgar & Warren, 1969; Griffin, 1986; Haberman, 1978; Iannaccone, 1963; Lanier, 1984b; Zeichner, 1980b). While not denying the influence of cooperating teachers on student teachers, Copeland (1980) argued that the influence from the cooperating teacher is mediated by factors not under the direct control of either the cooperating teacher or student teacher (e.g., the teacher-pupil ratio). The ecology of the classroom is influenced by many factors and these factors may not be apparent to the cooperating teacher or the university supervisor.

Copeland (1978) provided evidence that ecological classroom characteristics were influential in developing the
cooperating teachers' teaching practices and beliefs and that those same ecological classroom socialization factors were also instrumental in shaping similar teaching practices and beliefs in the student teacher. The ecological classroom phenomena may be responsible for the student teacher's reported shift in attitudes and beliefs toward those of the cooperating teacher (Crow, 1987a). Thus, Copeland (1980) argued further that "the relationships that have been detected between cooperating teachers and student teachers may have been the result of the shaping forces exerted on both the cooperating teacher and the student teacher by the ecological characteristics of the classroom" (p. 197).

Student teacher/cooperating teacher similarities and differences. Lasley (1980) found differences between student teachers and cooperating teachers in terms of beliefs about teaching. Student teachers expressed beliefs that teaching was a fulfilling career whereas many cooperating teachers were disillusioned with teaching citing low prestige, low pay, and student misbehavior as reasons (Griffin, 1986). DeVoss (1979) concluded that when student teachers and cooperating teachers were mutually supportive and similar in philosophy, orientation, and attitudes, the student teachers were more likely to report having successful experiences.

Socialization researchers also have explored critical
incidents in student teaching. Southall and King (1979) identified a lack of student teacher-cooperating teacher communication and unrealistic cooperating teacher expectations as the two most frequent problems with which supervisors had to contend. Differing expectations and failure in interpersonal relationships were also identified by Campbell and Williamson (1973) as problems.

**Bureaucratic characteristics of schools.** There is a possibility that, for student teachers, immersion in school bureaucracies promotes patterns of socialization and the development of meanings, values, and commitments that are compatible with the educational status quo or patterns which seem to contribute to the development of "utilitarian teaching perspectives" (Iannacone, 1963; Popkewitz, 1977; Tabachnick et al., 1979-80). However, Mahan and Lacefield (1978) suggest that time plays a role in the magnitude of the shifts in student teacher attitudes in terms of how those attitudes have been affected by the bureaucracy.

Research on school bureaucracy has provided minimal evidence related to the impact school settings have on the socialization of teachers. Poole (1972) reported that school context was important to the student teachers' perceptions of adequate teacher preparation. For the study, student teachers were asked to rate 30 statements about physical arrangements
within the school; contacts with fellow student teachers; and their experiences with their cooperating teacher, principal, and other staff members. Responses to the questions about experiences in the school were factor analyzed, yielding six factors: (a) experience in well-organized, supportive situations; (b) experience with criticism; (c) good working relationships with staff; (d) lack of support; (e) good working relationships with fellow student teachers; and (f) good, informal working relationships with pupils. When these factors were correlated with the student teachers' perceived value of the student teaching experience, the strongest predictor for whether or not the student teacher had learned a great deal from student teaching was having experienced a well-organized supportive environment.

According to Hoy and Rees (1977), another significant part of the school influence on student teachers was 'bureaucratic socialization', defined as an organization's "attempt to mold role ideology and role performance of personnel through a variety of procedures and mechanisms designed to make individual beliefs, values, and norms correspond with those of the school" (p. 23). Hoy and Rees assessed students' bureaucratic orientation before and after their student teaching experiences and found that student teachers' beliefs and orientations were more bureaucratic following the student
teaching experience. Student teachers were more likely to state that orders were to be followed without challenge and that student teachers should be loyal to superiors without questioning their authority as a result of the student teaching experience (Griffin, 1986).

Further, Hoy and Rees (1977) examined the effects of the student teaching experience on student teachers' values and beliefs that were rewarded by school bureaucracies (i.e., self-subordination and maintaining the status quo); student teachers' pupil control ideology, and levels of dogmatism. Results suggested that student teachers became more bureaucratic in their teaching orientation and more custodial in their pupil control orientation. There was no change in their levels of dogmatism. Hoy and Rees concluded that the school bureaucracy quickly impressed upon student teachers the need to conform to the teaching professions' traditional values and norms. The authors conclude that "the focus of bureaucratic socialization seems strong and efficient" (Hoy & Rees, 1977, p. 25).

Pruitt and Lee (1978) concluded that it is not surprising that teachers, in general, are subordinate and traditional in their approach to the teaching profession. "Most teachers, especially cooperating teachers, are caught in a web of conformity. They are often rewarded for conformity through
promotions, salary increases, light schedules, and subtle administration favors" (p. 71).

Student teachers found themselves trapped in a bureaucratic web and if they conformed to the demands of the school bureaucracy, student teachers found the student teaching experience rewarding (Pruitt & Lee, 1978). Pruitt and Lee noted that "innovative and idealistic student teachers often meet stern opposition, become frustrated, and then conform in a last ditch effort to salvage a grade" (p. 71). The combined pressures of certification, graduation, and approval from the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor usually resulted in a high degree of conformity (Griffin, 1986).

The supportive and bureaucratic influences of schools are worthy of consideration because the same people who serve as support systems for student teachers can also create pressure to conform to the rules of the school (Griffin, 1986). The student teachers' active participation in this conforming process needs to be examined in order to develop a better understanding of the school-related socialization variables and their effects upon the student teaching experience (Griffin, 1986).
Changes in student teacher attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge. Theoretically and empirically, research has reported a functionalist approach to the study of teacher socialization. As a result, research has reported the attitudinal changes among college students before and after their teacher education experiences (Crow, 1987a) with little information provided in terms of the interaction of intervening variables which may affect the socialization process.

Research indicates that there is a progressive to traditional attitudinal change among student teachers (Fuller & Bown, 1975; Lanier, 1984a; Veeman, 1984; Wells, 1984; Zeichner, 1980a; Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981). Feldman and Newcomb (1973) analyzed over 1,500 research studies in an effort to synthesize attitudinal examinations of college students. They found that students entered the university with fairly traditional views but then gradually abandoned those values in favor of increased liberal sociopolitical beliefs (Crow, 1987a).

Similar types of studies have been conducted with education students (Petty & Hogben, 1980; Veeman, 1984; Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981). The Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (MTAI) used in teacher socialization research attempts to measure teacher attitudes toward children and
teaching in general (Zeichner, 1978). When using the MTAI with education students, Callis (1950), Jacobs (1968), and Muus (1969) found that preservice teachers held increased liberal notions. These studies demonstrate a liberal shift toward teaching practices. For example, education students were open and informal about student-teacher relationships, the purpose of schools, and the teachers' roles in creating classroom environments. However, the progressive attitudes shifted toward traditional attitudes when student teachers were placed in school sites (Crow, 1987a).

Jacobs (1968) used a 102-item questionnaire to evaluate education students' attitudes toward their social roles in problem situations. He compared student teachers before and after their student teaching experience and found that the liberal, more democratic points of view had been reversed by the student teaching experience. Muus (1969) used the MTAI with prospective elementary teachers prior to a four and one-half month teacher internship placement and found that they became more liberal after their academic coursework. These education students were considered tolerant and humanistic in their views. However, after completion of their internships, the students' scores decreased significantly, indicating that they became narrow and authoritarian in their attitudes about students and teaching practices. Muus (1969) states that:
discipline problems, finding oneself in and identifying with the new role of the teacher and the inability to immediately implement high educational ideals and ambitions apparently brought about a disillusionment, loss of idealism, and a return to more traditional attitudes, less tolerance, and less sympathy for children and their behavior" (p. 188).

In a review of the student teaching literature, Zeichner (1978) concluded that he could not "find a single MTAI study that indicated a general increase in scores by the end of student teaching" (p. 23).

Hoy (1967) used the Pupil Control Ideology (PCI) attitudinal instrument (Willower et al., 1967) to measure beliefs about teacher-student relationships. On one side of the continuum are custodial values, while on the other side are humanistic values. Hoy and Rees (1977) state:

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

Hoy (1967) surveyed students before and after an eight-week student teaching placement and found that students became more custodial in their values. Other studies have produced similar results (Roberts & Blankenship, 1970; Hoy, 1968, 1969; Hoy & Rees, 1977).

Hoy and Rees (1977) also reported that preservice teachers became significantly more bureaucratic in their orientation to
teaching by the end of their student teaching experiences. The authors described this bureaucratic orientation as a commitment to values and beliefs characteristically rewarded by school bureaucracies such as self-subordination and traditionalism (Wells, 1984). Hoy and Rees speculated that the school bureaucracy quickly informs the student teacher of the need to conform to its norms, values, and traditions. They conclude that the conformity resulting from student teaching was not strong enough to be considered a stable attitudinal change, but should be viewed as a change in orientation toward teaching practices and schools.

Studies on teacher socialization during the formal teacher education program present a clear and consistent progressive-traditional shift in attitudes. However, critics (Griffin, 1982; Wells, 1984; Zeichner, 1978; Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981) suggest that the heavy reliance upon survey and questionnaire methodology has restricted the studies to speculative generalizations about the influence of the formal teacher education program on the student teachers (Griffin, 1983). Zeichner (1978) concludes:

"Although the studies seem to indicate a clear and consistent pattern in terms of attitudes, they do not indicate whether student teachers act in ways consistent with their beliefs . . . these studies do not illuminate the inevitable contradictions between beliefs and actions" (p. 30).
Another problem concerns the researcher's inability to assess intervening variables which may be responsible for attitudinal changes (e.g., cooperating teachers, university supervisors). Some researchers argue that student teacher attitudinal changes imitate, correspond to, or shift in the direction of the cooperating teacher's values and that attitudes toward pupils and teaching tend to change negatively during student teaching (Corrigan & Griswold, 1963; Johnson, 1969; Price, 1961a, Roberts & Blankenship, 1970; Scott & Brinkley, 1960; Seperson & Joyce, 1979; Tabachnick, 1980; Yee, 1969). Hoy (1967) and Hoy and Rees (1977) surveyed student teachers before and after an eight-week student teaching experience and found that student teachers became more custodial in their values and more bureaucratic in their thinking by the end of their student teaching.

Uchiyama and Lindgren (1971) discovered that by the end of student teaching the university supervisor's perception of an ideal teacher had a significant influence on the student teacher's beliefs about teaching. These studies indicate that the apparent progressive to traditional shift may reflect a complex interaction among variables within the socializing environment (Zeichner, 1978).

Role expectations. Gettine (1980) studied differing expectations about the roles and responsibilities of student
teachers as perceived by school administrators, cooperating teachers, and student teachers. Student teachers perceived themselves as more ready to assume a professional role than did school administrators and cooperating teachers. School administrators and cooperating teachers perceived student teachers as more similar to assistants, aides, or apprentices. Farley (1973) found that cooperating teachers and student teachers differed in opinions on the importance of instruction time, discipline policies, and educational innovations as well as the duties of the student teachers.

Student teacher biography. Some researchers considered the influence of a student teachers' personal biography on the development of teaching perceptions, values, ideas, and behaviors (e.g., Lortie, 1975; Stephens, 1969; Wright & Tuska, 1968; Zeichner & Grant, 1981). There is evidence that the student teacher is an active agent in controlling the socialization process through being resistant to institutional norms and that student teachers vary in their understanding of what it means to be a teacher (e.g., Goodman, 1983; Tabachnick et al., 1979-80; Zeichner, 1980a).

Tabachnick and Zeichner (1983) and Lacey (1977) maintain that student teacher values and personal past experiences interact with environmental variables to influence the development of teaching perspectives. After a thorough review
of the literature, Zeichner (1984) concludes:

"The personality characteristics, dispositions, and abilities that students bring to the placement site (including their unique biographical histories) are undoubtedly important factors in influencing the quality and strength of their socialization" (p. 17).

There is evidence that the student teacher has expectations and perceptions about teachers and teaching prior to student teaching (Crow, 1987a). Several authors suggest that student teachers start their teacher education program with perspectives and expectations about their ability to teach and their chosen profession (e.g., Books, Byers, & Freeman, 1983; Feiman-Nemser & Buchmann, 1983; Lanier, 1984b; Lortie, 1975).

Lanier (1984b) reported that student teachers maintain low expectations about the professional knowledge aspects of their education. Also, student teachers perceive the occupation of teaching as intellectually anemic and professionally atrophic because the student teacher believes that "Opportunities to exercise informed judgment, engage in thoughtful discourse, and participate in reflective decision-making are practically non-existent" (Lanier, 1984b, p. 53). According to Lanier (1984b), the result of this attitude is a skeptical student who dismisses the value of professional knowledge and the possibility of becoming a serious student of education.
Communication skills. Southall and King (1979) and Thies-Sprinthall (1980) investigated the effects of cooperating teachers in the areas of interpersonal relationships and communication. Close matching of student teachers and cooperating teachers on conceptual levels has been advocated in the literature (Thies-Sprinthall, 1980). The assumption underlying matching student teacher and cooperating teacher appears to be that those pairs working from a similar frame of reference will interact more effectively and smoothly (Griffin, 1986).

The importance of the interpersonal relationships between student teachers and cooperating teachers has been supported by some research findings. When asked to identify the problems encountered in working with cooperating and student teachers, university supervisors identified lack of communication between cooperating teachers and student teachers as the most frequent problem (Southall & King, 1979). Other problem areas were failure of the student teachers to meet expectations of the cooperating teachers and failure of the student teachers to follow through on suggestions from the cooperating teachers (Southall & King, 1979).

Acquiring teacher behavior. Feiman-Nemser and Buchmann (1983) suggest that learning to teach is complicated by the student teachers' previous socialization as pupils in
classrooms. The resultant perception by student teachers is that teaching is easy and routine and that anyone can teach. Lanier (1984a) indicates that "... the views that student teachers ... hold about learning to teach affect their involvement in formal teacher education programs" (p. 54). Teacher socialization research indicates that student teachers enter teacher education programs with expectations about their profession and preparation program which influence their socialization (Crow, 1987a).

Books, Byers, and Freeman (1983) provide evidence on student teacher expectations with information gathered from a survey of student teachers before and after involvement in a teacher education program. Books, Byers, and Freeman reported that 90% of the student teachers believed their professional studies had little to offer and that 25% of the student teachers entered their program with high or complete confidence in their ability to teach prior to specialized coursework. Sixty-six percent of the student teachers felt at least moderately sure of their ability prior to student teaching.

Several studies have found that cooperating teachers play an important role in the student teachers' classroom performance (Price, 1961b; Seperson & Joyce, 1973; Zevin, 1974). However, individual characteristics of both the
cooperating teachers and the student teachers may mediate the influence of the cooperating teachers on student teachers' classroom performance (McIntyre, Buell, & Casey, 1979).

Conflicting results have been reported for cooperating teacher influence on student teacher classroom performance. Student teachers studied by McIntyre, Buell, and Casey (1979) did not model the verbal behavior of their cooperating teachers. DeVoss (1979) suggested that it is important to consider the student teachers as active agents in acquiring their own teaching behaviors because satisfaction with the student teaching experience was directly tied, in part, to the students' own abilities to utilize the opportunities in classrooms for learning.

University Contextual Influences

The university contextual influence on the socialization of student teachers into the teaching profession centers around: (a) the value placed on teacher education programs; (b) support for supervising student teachers; (c) importance of pedagogy and methods; (d) hidden curriculum; and (e) length of time student teaching.

Value placed on teacher education programs. In addition to the direct influences that the university exerts on student teachers through university courses, student teaching
placement, and student teacher supervision, the academic environment also has an indirect impact on the socialization of student teachers. This indirect impact occurs through the value that the university community places on teacher education programs (Griffin, 1986).

Teacher education evolved through the years independently from the academic community and has gradually emerged as a function of higher education in the last century (Hughes, 1981). There is some question as to whether the values and standards necessary for effective teacher education programs are compatible with academic values. Goldhammer (1977) argues that the "culture of higher education often runs counter to developing teaching abilities and professional development of programs" (p. 12). Specifically, Goldhammer (1977) asserts that there is a lack of values, prestige, and recognition given by the academic community to student teachers.

According to Griffin (1986), the degree to which this conflict is resolved by the education component of a university can influence both the teacher education program and the perspectives of students in the program. The university community provides potent socializing influences with regard to the student teachers' perceptions of the importance of developing a variety of teaching abilities. The influence may be transmitted through the specific type of
teacher education program student teachers experience and/or through the philosophies and value positions held by faculty members.

Support for supervision. Perhaps the most obvious way in which the value of developing teaching abilities and the importance of professional development is upheld occurs with regard to the degree to which the university provides a strong supportive environment for the student teaching experience (Goldhammer, 1977; Hunter, 1980). Supervision of student teachers is sometimes an added responsibility for an already overburdened faculty (Griffin, 1986).

In some cases, student teacher supervision is assigned to graduate students who are underqualified in student teacher supervision (Griffin, 1986). Supervising student teachers is often a low-priority and exhausting task with few rewards for the university supervisor. The degree to which university faculty and graduate students function effectively as supervisors depends heavily on support, encouragement, and rewards provided for that responsibility. Therefore, the student teaching experience may be affected by the degree to which the university provides a supportive environment for those charged with supervising student teachers (Griffin, 1986).

Importance of pedagogy and methods courses. There is
evidence that the pedagogical methods and content knowledge introduced to students in university courses has little influence on the subsequent actions of students even during initial teacher preparation or student teaching (e.g., Grant, 1981; Hodges, 1982; Katz & Raths, 1982). There is also evidence that when attempts are made to prepare prospective teachers in the performance of specific teaching skills through microteaching and other systematic procedures, the continued use of the skills by prospective teachers outside the laboratory is dependent on whether the ecological conditions in classrooms are conducive to the use of the skills (Copeland, 1980).

According to Poole's (1972) study, students who indicated that their present teacher education program had provided adequate preparation for student teaching also felt that they had made a contribution to the school and that they had experienced good informal working relationships with the cooperating teacher and the pupils. Those students who reported that student teaching appeared to be merely an evaluative experience indicated that they had experienced considerable criticism and lack of support.

Hidden curriculum. Dale (1977a, b) and Bartholomew (1976) argue that the impact of initial teacher preparation comes not through the formal knowledge and skills imparted to preservice
teachers, but through the hidden curriculum of teacher preparation programs. In general, initial teacher preparation fosters a cognitive style of "liberal individualism" which predisposes prospective teachers to see the world in particular ways, to become conscious of the world having particular properties and possibilities, and to reject or never recognize other properties or possibilities. This cognitive style directs teachers to seek the source of their problems in pupils in classrooms and not in the schools in which they work (Dale, 1977a).

Bartholomew (1976) analyzes the pedagogical practices and the social organization of teacher education programs. Despite the fact that teacher education programs encourage students to use liberal phrases and to affirm liberal slogans in places other than the university, socialization within the university (including the separation of theory and practice) encourages the development of "objectivist" conceptions of knowledge, fragmented views of curriculum, and perceptions of pupils as passive recipients of officially approved knowledge. The real impact of preservice preparation lies in these images of teacher, pupil, knowledge, curriculum, and professional which are subtly communicated to prospective teachers through the hidden curriculum of teacher education programs (Bartholomew, 1976; Ginsburg, 1984, 1985; Giroux, 1980;
Arguments related to the socializing impact of the hidden curriculum in preservice preparation have been offered on logical and theoretical grounds with little supporting evidence (Zeichner, 1986b). With the exception of Ginsburg's (1984, 1985) studies of the development of teacher perspectives toward professionalism, empirical evidence to confirm that teachers actually incorporate formal knowledge elements into their perspectives in ways consistent with the theoretical arguments is weak.

**Length of time.** Lanier (1984b) reports a range of 6 to 18 weeks of student teaching is required by different states for teacher certification. Additional time student teaching has been either suggested or mandated by colleges and/or state departments of education for teacher certification programs. The general consensus seems to be that the greater the number of hours student teachers spend observing, assisting the cooperating teacher, and teaching in formal settings, the better prepared the student teacher will be (Beyer, 1984).

However, student teaching research reports a general tendency for prolonged student teaching experiences to produce and perpetuate strategies that are congruent with existing school and professional expectations. Zeichner (1980b) asserts that the literature on student teaching clearly "does
not support the contention that practical experience in schools is necessarily beneficial" (p. 51). Proposals which address problems of teacher education by merely scheduling more student teaching time in classrooms rest upon the apparently untenable assumption that more time spent in student teaching will automatically produce better teachers (Tabachnick et al., 1979-80).

There is the possibility that prolonged immersion in schools will promote patterns of socialization and the development of meanings, values, and commitments that are compatible with the educational status quo, patterns which seem to contribute to the development of "utilitarian teaching perspectives" (Iannacone, 1963; Tabachnick et al., 1979-80; Popkewitz, 1977).

University and School Interaction

In addition to the separate influences of the university and school on the socialization of student teachers, the interaction between the university and school has considerable influence on student teachers. Several researchers have indicated that a collaborative university-school relationship is an important determining factor in a successful student teaching program (Andrews, 1964; Howey, 1977; MacNaughton, Johns, & Rogus, 1978).
Griffin et al. (1983) found that the primary influence on the student teaching experience is the classroom context. The dominant theme expressed by cooperating teachers was that preservice teacher education program knowledge would be of little, if any, value in performing the work of teaching. Although some university supervisors attempted to maintain ideological and pedagogical links with preservice methods courses and university faculty, those attempts were not observed as being influential upon the student teaching experience. Further, there was little evidence that any systematic efforts were being expended toward the goal of building linkages between the schools and the university (Griffin et al., 1983).

**Study Proposal**

**Research design.** The main purpose of ethnographic research is to describe the culture of a people or an organization. This study incorporated an open, as opposed to focused, ethnographic research design. When little is known about the topic under consideration or when attempting to gain a holistic understanding of a fairly complex situation is the purpose of the research, an open ethnographic research design should be used (Dobert, 1982). This study sought to illuminate the totality of the student teaching socialization
process for four student teachers.

Open ethnographic research is used to generate hypotheses and questions in order to create an overall cultural perspective inherent in a particular situation. Open ethnographic research begins with no boundaries. The questions asked lead to a research design that resembles a broad net. These questions are general enough to permit the researcher to gather a wide variety of potentially relevant data while, at the same time, the questions will begin to narrow the focus toward the more central aspects of the situation (Dobert, 1982).

**Research questions.** Explaining the totality of any situation requires that some of the data be treated as central, some be given merely a supporting role, and some be neglected altogether (Dobert, 1982). Research questions formulated at the onset of this study were designed to permit the researcher to make intelligent choices relative to describing the student teacher socialization process from a holistic perspective, while at the same time, the questions were narrow enough to focus specifically on the student teacher.

Dobert (1982) asserts that theory is of critical importance in ethnographic research. Well-formed research questions that address specific theory are necessary to guide
the researcher. For this study, the researcher considered two theories of socialization as cited in the literature: (a) student teacher biography (as opposed to teacher education preparation and experience) is a powerful influence in socializing student teachers into the profession (Feiman-Nemser, 1983; Lortie, 1975; Wells, 1984; Zeichner, 1980a); and (b) socialization is a process whereby student teachers are influenced, not only by their own biographies, but also by program features, settings, and people encountered throughout the student teaching experience (Crow, 1987a; Knowles, 1988; Zeichner, 1980b).

The research questions that guided this study were:
First, how were student teachers socialized prior to student teaching? Did student teachers bring to the student teaching experience a clearly delineated set of attitudes, values, and beliefs that guided their student teaching experiences? Were student teachers active participants in their own socialization processes?

Second, what socializing effect did student teaching have on four student teachers? If student teachers were socialized through interaction with program features, settings, and people, how did student teachers interact with the socializing variables that have been cited in the literature? Were student teachers passive recipients of the socializing
variables?

**Purpose.** Given the apparent differential impact of student teaching experiences, research efforts should focus on capturing the essence of the socialization process inherent in the student teaching experience. Student teaching experiences appear to consist of a complex set of interactions among the program features; the school contexts (settings); the cooperating teachers, university supervisors, and pupils (people); and the characteristics, dispositions, and abilities of individual student teachers (Zeichner, 1986a).

Research that seeks to understand student teaching experiences as occasions for learning to teach must reflect the dynamic and multi-dimensional nature of the student teaching experience (Zeichner, 1986b). Research studies that address the impact of the student teaching experience must link specific dimensions of the teacher education program, specific dimensions of the school placement sites, and specific biological dimensions of individual student teachers to socializing outcomes for individual student teachers (Zeichner, 1986b).

Through an ethnographic approach to the study of the teacher socialization process for four student teachers, socialization variables that emerged from student teaching experiences were addressed. The purpose of this study was to
describe the process through which four student teachers selectively acquired the attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge currently held in the teaching profession.

Definition of Terms

The definitions provided in this section are those common to teacher socialization literature stated in simplified form as they relate to this study.

1. **Attitude** - dispositions to act (Becker et al., 1961); manner, disposition, feeling, position, etc., with regard to a person or thing; tendency or orientation, especially of the mind (Webster's Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary of the English Language, 1989, p. 96).

2. **Belief** - an opinion or conviction; confidence in the truth or existence of something not immediately susceptible to rigorous proof (Webster's Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary of the English Language, 1989, p. 135).

3. **Dialectic** - an interpretive method used to relate specific entities or events to the absolute idea, in which some assertable proposition (thesis) is necessarily opposed by an equally assertable and apparently contradictory proposition (antithesis), the mutual contradiction reconciled on a higher level by a third proposition (synthesis) (Webster's Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary
4. **Heuristic** - a help for discovering or learning; a designated method of education; trial and error approach to finding solutions to problems.

5. **Non-Traditional Student Teacher** - a student teacher who has experienced either interruption (i.e., a lengthy time lapse) in completing an academic degree or a person who has returned to college to earn a degree later in life (i.e., a person who is middle-aged versus a person who enters college directly upon or shortly after high school graduation and completes a degree).

6. **Paradigm** - a matrix of beliefs and assumptions about the nature and purposes of schooling, teaching, teachers and their education that gives shape to specific forms of practice in teacher education (Popkewitz et al., 1979).

7. **Premise** - a proposition supporting or helping to support a conclusion; a basis, stated or assumed, on which reasoning proceeds; to set forth beforehand, as by way of introduction or explanation; to assume, either explicitly or implicitly, (a proposition) as a premise for a conclusion (Webster's Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary of the English Language, 1989, p. 1136).

8. **School** - a public school; placement site for student teachers.
9. **Student Teacher** - a preservice teacher who is participating in an experiential field-based teaching activity; often the last requirement of preservice teacher education; at a middle/junior or high school under the guidance of an experienced teacher and the supervision of a university faculty member (Knowles, 1989).

10. **Student Teacher Biography** - refers to those formative experiences of preservice teachers and beginning teachers that have influenced the ways in which teachers think about teaching and subsequently act in the classroom. Biography has meaning for individuals because it assists, restricts, or modifies formulation of beliefs about schools and the teaching process (Knowles, 1988).

11. **Student teaching** - a period of guided teaching when the student takes increasing responsibility for the work with a given group of pupils over a period of consecutive weeks (Flowers et al., 1948, p. 21).

12. **Teacher Perspectives** - ways in which teachers think about and conduct their work (purposes and goals, conceptions of curriculum and pupils) and the ways in which teachers give meaning to these beliefs by their actions in classrooms (Borko et al., 1987; Tabachnick et al., 1979-80; Zeichner & Grant, 1981); a coordinated set of ideas and actions a person uses in dealing with some problematic situation; a
person's ordinary way of thinking and feeling about and acting on such a situation (Becker et al, 1961, p. 34).

13. **Teaching Ideology** - "a connected set of systematically related beliefs and ideas about . . . the essential features of teaching . . . a broad definition of the task and a set of prescriptions for performing it, all held at a relatively high level of abstraction" (Sharp & Green, 1975, pp. 68-69).

14. **Traditional Student Teacher** - a person who enters a teacher education program directly following or shortly after high school graduation and finishes a degree program.

15. **University** - an institution offering a teacher education program.

16. **Values** - generalized beliefs (Becker et al., 1961); the ideals, customs, institutions, etc., of a society toward which people of the group have affective regard (i.e., freedom, education); to consider with respect to worth, excellence, usefulness or importance; to regard; to esteem highly (Webster's Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary of the English Language, 1989, p. 1578).
CHAPTER II.
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This section presents an overview of three socialization theories that encompass past, present, and future research orientations used to explain teacher socialization. A discussion of the weaknesses and conflicts in the socialization literature will follow. An in-depth explanation of the biographical and interaction theories, student teacher ideologies, and student teacher perspectives will be presented. Future directions for socialization research will be addressed.

Teacher Socialization Theories

Three socialization theories have been cited in the literature as explanations for teacher socialization. Those three theories are: (a) functionalist; (b) biographical; and (c) interaction. A general overview of each theory will be presented in this section.

**Functionalist theory.** The first theory is a functionalist orientation. Student teachers experience private and
overwhelming ordeals as they confront the values and norms of schools (Hoy & Rees, 1977). Student teachers are easily molded (e.g., Hoy & Rees, 1977; Zeichner, 1984) into traditional and conservative teachers. Student teachers are perceived by teacher educators and cooperating teachers as passive individuals who are filled with the values and norms of the institution as they progress through their teacher education programs. Several studies supporting the functionalist orientation as an explanation for teacher socialization (Berger & Luchmann, 1967; Brim, 1966; Wentworth, 1979; Wrong, 1961) suggest that the causal flow of teacher socialization is from society to the individual in the transformation of the "raw material of biological man into a person suitable to perform the activities of society" (Brim, 1966, p. 4).

Biographical theory. The second theory is based on a biographical orientation. Lortie (1975) asserts that student teachers have internalized teacher role models through countless hours of observation as pupils in classrooms and are socialized prior to student teaching. Crow (1988) adds that institutions such as teacher education and the public schools are powerless in reshaping student teachers' beliefs and practices. Institutions, then, are viewed as catalysts for activating the latent beliefs held by student teachers.
Crow (1988) offers the following analysis of these two socialization theories:

"On the surface, the two [theories] appear juxtaposed, each one offering a contrasting explanation for teacher socialization. A deeper look reveals that both views are strange bedfellows - both suggest that teacher socialization is unidirectional. In the first [theory], the individual is the passive recipient of institutional values; in the second, the institution is insignificant in altering the [student teachers'] beliefs. Neither theory allows for significant influence from the other and both deny . . . the existence of a dynamic tension between the individual and the institution" (pp. 2-3).

Interaction theory. Current literature reveals the emergence of an interaction theory for explaining teacher socialization. Several researchers (Fox et al., 1976; Tabachnick et al., 1979-80; Tabachnick, 1981; Wells, 1984; Goodman, 1985) describe socialization as a process of "dynamic social events" consisting of intertwined physical, emotional, and social variables.

Researchers have noted that student teachers are very active in the socialization process (Crow, 1986, 1987a; Knowles, 1988; Zeichner, 1980b). Crow (1988) suggests that students enter a teacher education program with strongly held beliefs about teaching and about themselves as teachers. The author suggests that such beliefs form teacher role identities (TRIs) for student teachers that act as interpretive lenses through which they view the program. Student teachers use
their TRIs to create meaning as they interact with the context.

Knowles (1988, 1989) examined the role of student teachers and their biographies as they moved from student teachers to first year teachers. The author's findings support Crow's (1986) conclusion that socialization is an interactive process involving student teachers' biographies and the contextual factors of schools. Bullough (1987) reported a descriptive study of the transition from student teacher to first year teacher and indicated that a first-year teacher's TRI was a dominant factor in interpreting teaching and establishing teacher responsibilities.

Weaknesses in Teacher Socialization Research

This section presents weaknesses in the teacher socialization literature from several perspectives. Crow (1986) summarizes the following weaknesses with the functionalist theory methodology: (a) neglects biographical perspectives; (b) uses predominantly the empirical-analytic research paradigm; (c) focuses on negative outcomes; (d) does not describe the socialization process; and (e) teacher education programs have not been studied from a holistic perspective.
Neglects biological perspectives. The functionalist theory inaccurately depicts the student teachers' contributions to and influence on the socialization process by neglecting the student teachers' biographical (personal) perspectives and the interaction of these perspectives with the content and values of the entire teacher education program (Wentworth, 1979; Zeichner, 1980a). Crow (1987a) further asserts that the contribution of the individual's personal perspectives in the socialization process is missing in most of the teacher socialization literature.

Empirical-analytic paradigm. First, the empirical-analytic research paradigm used in the functionalist theory has been used almost exclusively for research studies on socialization (Popkewitz, 1976; Rist, 1977; Doyle, 1977; Zeichner, 1978). Hence, quantitative methodology has utilized surveys and questionnaires administered before and after student teaching. The results were reported in the form of group central tendencies and, therefore, variation among individuals is washed out (Crow, 1986; Zeichner, 1978).

Second, quantitative research methodology has concentrated on the role of the social structure in teacher education programs and during student teaching experiences. This approach, then, has narrowly defined the contribution of the
student teacher in the socialization process (Brim, 1966; Edgar & Warren, 1969).

Third, most socialization researchers have used the empirical-analytical paradigm to determine the impacts of student teaching on the socialization process (Doyle, 1977; Popkewitz, 1976; Rist, 1977; Zeichner, 1978). Crow (1987a) argues that the questions asked and the problems studied are narrowed by the use of one paradigm. Based on the investigation of 20 studies on student teacher socialization, Zeichner (1978) concluded that the studies reported specific information on the influence of independent variables (e.g., cooperating teacher, university supervisor, classroom ecology), on student teacher demographics (e.g., gender, major, ethnicity), and nothing insightful in terms of "... how the particular dimensions of the school programs contributed to the outcomes of socialization" (p. 9).

Research has almost exclusively focused on attitudinal change or shifts with little attention given to the socialization variables present in classrooms (Crow, 1987a). Zeichner (1978) states that "to assume that one can gain an understanding of ... teacher development without observing or in some way documenting the experience is a fallacy" (p. 34).
Negative outcomes. Functionalist-oriented research studies on the socializing impact of student teaching generally suggest that the student teaching experience produces negative outcomes (Hoy, 1967; Iannacone, 1963; Matthews, 1967; Sorenson & Halpert, 1968). Study results indicate that student teachers become more authoritarian, impersonal, restrictive, arbitrary, bureaucratic, and custodial by the end of their student teaching experience (Glassberg & Sprinthall, 1980).

Socializing outcomes. The functionalist theory has failed to provide information about the actual socializing experience, the actual outcomes from teacher education programs, and an in-depth understanding of how student teachers are socialized into the teaching profession (Crow, 1986; Feiman-Nemser, 1983; Fuller & Bown, 1975; Zeichner, 1980b). While addressing the teacher socialization issue from a holistic perspective, Sarason, Davidson, and Blatt (1962) called the preparation of teachers an "unstudied problem." Zeichner (1978) concludes that the research literature "... has failed to provide an adequate understanding of what occurs during the student teaching experience" (p. 53) and Feiman-Nemser (1983) adds that "... the existing socialization research presents very little about the actual conduct of teacher preparation" (p. 51).
Teacher education programs. Teacher socialization researchers have utilized a 'bit and piece' approach to the study of teacher education programs (Crow, 1987a). Critics suggest that an investigative study of teacher education programs should consider the holistic nature of the program rather than considering component parts (e.g., early field experiences, required courses, and the student teaching experience) (Crow, 1987a). Feiman-Nemser (1983) and Zeichner (1978) concluded that these component parts cannot and should not stand alone in an investigative study of the impact of student teaching on the socialization process.

Conflicts in Socialization Research

This section presents detailed information about the conflicts between the functionalist and biographical theories used to investigate and explain teacher socialization. This section includes research-based documentation that supports the interaction theory to explain and describe the socialization process.

Functionalist theory. The theory upon which the functionalist orientation is based is that student teaching and subsequent teaching experiences are major influences responsible for socializing teachers into the teaching profession (Copeland, 1980; Edgar & Warren, 1969; Friebus,
1977; Karmos & Jacko, 1977; Zevin, 1974). Contextual socializing factors that appear to emerge from this theory include: (a) the structure of schools (e.g., Hoy & Rees, 1977); (b) cooperating teachers (e.g., Yee, 1969; Zevin, 1974); and (c) the ecological characteristics of classrooms (Copeland, 1980; Doyle & Ponder, 1975). Most studies on teacher socialization rely on the pre- and post-administration of questionnaires and surveys for data collection rather than on observations of and discussions with students as the student teaching experience evolves (Crow, 1987a; Zeichner, 1980b).

Researchers who employed the empirical-analytical research paradigm when investigating socializing impacts have argued that student teaching has a significant impact on the socialization of teachers, an impact that is then strengthened during the early years of a teaching career. However, there is disagreement in the literature about the specific nature of the impact and about the individual and school variables that relate to student teacher socialization (Lortie, 1973, 1975; Tabachnick & Zeichner, 1984; Zeichner, 1980b; Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981).

Zeichner and Tabachnick (1981) theorize that the socializing impact of university preparation is reversed or washed out beginning with student teaching and continuing into
later teaching experiences. The wash out view centers around which socializing variables are most influential in reversing the impact of university-based teacher preparation (Tabachnick & Zeichner, 1984; Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981). Specific socializing variables as reported in the literature have been discussed in Chapter 1.

**Biographical theory.** The biographical theory suggests that formal teacher education preparation, including student teaching, has little effect on the attitudes, values, beliefs, and practices of student teachers. This theory emphasizes the primacy of student teacher biography in the socialization of student teachers and suggests that life experiences pre-dating student teaching are a major socializing influence in the socialization of teachers into the profession (Crow, 1987a; Knowles, 1988; Lortie, 1975; Zeichner & Grant, 1981). Some teacher socialization researchers argue that life and teaching experiences pre-dating formal teacher education preparation are more profoundly influential in socializing teachers into the profession than the efficacy of either university preparation or socialization in the schools during a teaching career (Lortie, 1975; Zeichner, 1986b).
Theoretical Explanations for the Biographical Theory

Feiman-Nemser (1983) reported three theoretical explanations for the socializing influence of student teacher biography. These theories are: (a) evolutionary, (b) psychoanalytic, and (c) reproduction.

**Evolutionary theory.** Stephens (1969) proposes an evolutionary theory to explain the biographical impact on the socialization of teachers which emphasizes the role of "spontaneous pedagogical tendencies" in explaining why teachers think and act as they do.

"Human beings have survived because of their deeply ingrained habits of correcting one another, telling each other what they know, pointing out the moral, and supplying the answer. Thus, children not only learn what they are told by parents and teachers, but they also learn to be teachers" (Feiman-Nemser, 1983, p. 152).

**Psychoanalytic theory.** Wright and Tuska (1967, 1968) provide a Freudian psychoanalytic theory to account for the biographical impact on socializing teachers into the profession. These studies suggest that teacher socialization is affected by the quality of relationships teachers have had as children with significant adults and that becoming a teacher is a process of trying to imitate the significant adult or adults in one's childhood (Zeichner, 1986b).
Wright and Tuska (1967) suggest that early relationships with significant adults set the stage for subsequent relationships throughout life and that the kinds of teachers that education students become are governed by the effects that early relationships have on their personalities. These studies support the "Childhood Romance Theory of Teacher Development" and include statements written by teachers that illustrate the significance of a conscious identification with a teacher during childhood (Wright, 1959).

Reproduction theory. Lortie (1975) argues in support of reproduction or the "apprenticeship of observation" theory (Goodman, 1983) whereby teacher socialization occurs through the internalization of teacher role models and school norms during the countless hours that student teachers spent as pupils in classrooms. The activation of this latent culture during teacher education preparation and at the onset of the actual student teaching experience is viewed as the major influence in shaping students' conceptions of the teaching role and role performance (Lortie, 1975; Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981).

According to Lortie (1975), early perceptions of the role of a teacher are formative:

"... socialization into teaching is largely self-socialization; one's personal predispositions are not only relevant but, in fact, stand at the core of becoming a teacher" (p. 79).
"Years of unformulated experiences as a pupils precede formal teacher socialization; teachers themselves emphasize the importance of the private experiences they had as . . . teachers" (p. 79).

"The lessons taught by early, yet persisting, models rest on chance and personal preference; training in pedagogy does not seem to fundamentally alter earlier ideas about teaching" (p. 79).

Zeichner and Grant (1981) agree with Lortie's (1975) assertion that the socializing impact of student teaching and formal teacher preparation is minimal. Zeichner and Grant argue that:

"Although it is probably incorrect to assume that biography is the sole determiner of socialization outcomes . . . it is clear . . . that what students bring to the [student teaching] experience cannot be ignored in attempts to illuminate socialization mechanisms and that social structural influences have probably been greatly overemphasized in many earlier studies" (p. 307-308).

Several researchers have continued to study the impact of student teacher biography on teacher socialization (Feiman-Nemser & Buchmann, 1987; Silvernail & Costello, 1983; Zeichner & Grant, 1981; Petty & Hogben, 1980; Hogben & Lawson, 1983; Maddox, 1968; Mardle & Walker, 1980; Tabachnick & Zeichner, 1983; Zeichner, 1986b). From a negative perspective, Feiman-Nemser and Buchmann (1985) suggest that familiarity with classrooms and teachers while student teachers were pupils in classrooms may prevent them from searching beyond what they "think" they already know and from questioning the practices
they see. In teacher preparation, prior experience is a trusted though not always a reliable teacher (Feiman-Nemser & Buchmann, 1985).

The theory that emphasizes biography as a primary influence in teacher socialization has been supported empirically (Hogben & Lawson, 1983; Lortie, 1973, 1975; Maddox, 1968; Mardle & Walker, 1980; Petty & Hogben, 1980; Silvernail & Costello, 1983; Tabachnick & Zeichner, 1983; Zeichner & Grant, 1981). These studies clearly indicate that biography exerts a powerful influence on teacher development. However, more research is needed to clarify the specific source of socializing influences (Zeichner, 1986b).

Interactive Socializing Effects

Much of the teacher socialization research has failed to address the interaction between and among the socializing variables operating during the student teaching experience. Tabachnick (1981) asserts that the socializing impact of student teaching occurs during the student teachers' daily interactions with school settings, features, and people (i.e., school systems, cooperating teachers, pupils, and university personnel) and much of what students actually learn during student teaching may be unanticipated by teacher educators. Therefore, interactions between student teachers and program
settings, features, and people should be treated as problematic to understand the impact of student teaching on the socialization of teachers into the teaching profession (Popkewitz et al., 1979).

Tabachnick and Zeichner (1984) argue that student teaching plays a significant role in teacher development in terms of a holistic interactive effect. The effects of university preparation are not washed out or reversed by student teaching and later school experiences but rather are strengthened. Hence, universities and schools are viewed as having complementary effects upon teacher development.

Another angle on the impact of the interactive effect is that university preparation, student teaching, and later school experience are viewed as variables that further the development of teachers, particularly for those student teachers who subscribe to educational commitments that do not challenge existing occupational, institutional, and cultural patterns (Crow, 1987a). Dale's (1977a) findings on the development of a cognitive style of individualism and Bartholomew's (1976) findings on the development of an objectivist conception of knowledge support this position. While student teaching is not singled out as uniquely influential in the socialization process, student teaching is viewed as having a solidifying effect on student teacher
perspectives that are brought to the experience (Crow, 1987a; Tabachnick & Zeichner, 1984).

Student Teacher Ideologies

"All teacher education is a form of ideology. Each program is related to the educational ideology held by a particular teacher educator or teacher education institution, even though the relationship may not be made explicit. There is no such thing as a value-free teacher education program just as there is no such thing as a value-free education for children" (Spodek, 1974, pp. 8-9).

Ideology is a system of beliefs, ideas, and values which exist as abstract and, usually informal, codes of conduct or "rules of the game" within existing social structures (Crow, 1987a). Ideologies are guiding assumptions or unconscious preferences to be utilized in specific social settings (Beyer, 1984). In addition to ideologies as guiding assumptions, ideology is also defined as a constitutive element in the communication patterns, social relationships, and human actions which make up day-to-day experience (Crow, 1987a). With the combination of both definitions, ideology then becomes something other than an adjunct to human existence and woven into the very fabric of social life itself (Beyer, 1984).

This view of ideology is important because such critiques argue for the relevance of ideology analysis in the specific
actions and interactions of people, together with their dominant linguistic and other symbolic forms (Williams, 1977; Berger, 1972). The actions of teachers, in particular, as people whose day-to-day activities often carry ideological meanings, becomes especially important for analyses that are critical and reflective (Crow, 1987a).

Student teacher socialization literature almost exclusively focuses on teacher ideologies as indicators of socialization. Hoy (1969) comments that "studying ideologies focuses only on the student teachers' declared opinions and attitudes, their ideology, not their observed behavior" (p. 64). By focusing on expressed attitudes, independent of any particular context, research on student teaching has provided a limited view of the impact of the student teaching experience on the professional development of student teachers (Crow, 1987a).

Keddie (1971) argues that a direct correlation cannot be assumed between student teacher attitudes and opinions which exist at a high level of abstraction and student teacher perspectives that guide daily classroom practice. Given the inconsistencies and contradictions which exist between these two levels of analysis, researchers must go beyond teacher ideology to adequately understand the impact of student teaching in the development of teachers (Zeichner, 1980b).
Student Teacher Perspectives

Some studies examine the impact of student teaching on the development of teacher perspectives (e.g., Gibson, 1976; Haslam, 1971; Iannaccone, 1963; Popkewitz, 1979; Tabachnick, 1980; Tabachnick et al., 1982). Teacher perspectives refer to ways in which teachers think about their work (e.g., purposes and goals, conceptions of curriculum and pupils) and the ways in which teachers give meaning to their beliefs by their actions in classrooms. The meaning of these ideas and beliefs, hence perspectives, cannot be understood in the absence of intended actions by student teachers to complete the idea or to "express" them (Tabachnick et al., 1979-80).

Several studies indicate that student teaching contributes to the development of student teacher perspectives (Crow, 1987a; Tabachnick & Zeichner, 1984; Tabachnick et al., 1979-80). For example, if a teaching technique "works" for a student teacher, that is, solves the immediate problem at hand, it is evaluated as good for that reason alone. Within this perspective, "technique" becomes an end in itself (a utilitarian teaching perspective) rather than a means toward some specified educational purpose (Zeichner, 1980b).

According to Crow (1987a), these studies have one weakness which limits their usefulness. While in each of these studies
there were students who did not fit the dominant pattern of development, the reports of the studies illuminate the characteristics of one dominant perspective within some group. Thus, despite evidence that student teaching has a differential impact on some students, knowledge about the teaching perspectives of student teachers is limited to indicators of central tendency (Crow, 1987a; Zeichner, 1978).

These studies imply a deterministic view of the socialization process that is inconsistent with the literature on occupational socialization and with the literature on the socialization of teachers (Bucher & Stelling, 1977; Lacey, 1977). The heterogeneous nature of student teacher perspectives or the variety of perspectives existing in the teaching occupation as a whole (Feiman-Nemser & Floden, 1985) has not been adequately addressed by these studies (Crow, 1987a).

Future Directions for Socialization Research

Describe the socialization process. To improve upon the conceptualization of the student teacher socialization process, research that examines the active participation of the student teacher in the socialization process and examines teacher socialization as a process should be conducted (Crow, 1987a; Knowles, 1988; Zeichner, 1980b). Teacher socialization
researchers recommend that future research should describe exactly what occurs when student teachers interact with the school socialization variables in order to capture the richness of life within a particular teacher education context and setting (Fuller & Bown, 1975; Griffin, 1983; Lacey, 1977; Popkewitz et al., 1979; Tabachnick et al., 1979-80; Zeichner, 1980a).

Bucher and Stelling (1977) contend that both the student teacher and the school setting are active variables in the socializing process and must be examined. "Without some idea about the individual's own activity in shaping the student teachers' own social experience, our perspective of socialization becomes distorted" (p. 5).

**Describe the teaching culture.** In order to investigate the dialectical nature of teacher socialization, researchers have argued that inquiry needs to reflect a more social-anthropological approach to teacher socialization research (Lacey, 1977; Popkewitz et al., 1979; Tabachnick, 1981; Zeichner, 1978, 1980b). An alternative research paradigm would pay close attention to the description of school culture, program experiences, and the interpretation given to those experiences by the student teachers (Borg & Gall, 1984; Patton, 1975; Rist, 1977).
Student teachers as active participants. Some teacher socialization researchers have called for a theoretical and empirical reorientation to the study of student teacher socialization (Crow, 1987a; Goodman, 1983; Lacey, 1977; Popkewitz, 1976; Popkewitz et al., 1979; Tabachnick & Zeichner, 1984; Zeichner, 1980b). Such a reorientation would recognize that student teachers are not passive recipients of institutional norms and values, but are active participants in their own socialization processes. Methodologically, this would entail the employment of research strategies that enable the penetration of the complex and interrelated world of student teaching experiences (Zeichner, 1980b).

For example, constructivist (i.e., participant observations, case studies, ethnography) approaches to research are consistent with a view of student teachers as active agents and of student teaching as a series of dynamic social events. They offer potential for illuminating salient socializing mechanisms as they evolve (Zeichner, 1980b).

Furthermore, teacher socialization researchers should utilize qualitative methodology to describe the complex interactions and relationships between student teachers and program variables (Crow, 1986). Such methodology would enable the pursuit of unanticipated phenomena as they emerge and offer a means for understanding the existential reality of
becoming a teacher (e.g., covert processes of student teacher resistance to institutional norms) (Zeichner, 1980b).

**Interaction effects.** Further, recommendations for teacher socialization research include a call for a dialectical orientation to socialization theory and research that considers the dynamic relationship between student teacher and institutional setting (Crow, 1987a; Lacey, 1977; Wentworth, 1979; Zeichner, 1980a). Investigations should begin to describe what occurs when student teachers interact with socialization variables within the institutional setting (Fuller & Bown, 1975; Griffin, 1983; Lanier, 1984b; Wells, 1984; Zeichner, 1980a). Studies must begin to view student teachers as active agents in their own professional development and not as passive recipients of institutional norms to describe the heterogeneous perspectives that emerge from formal preparation and to relate specific program effects on the socialization of teachers (Zeichner, 1980b).

**Evolving socialization theory.** Some teacher socialization researchers (Berger & Luchmann, 1967; Bucher & Stelling, 1977; Crow, 1987a; Knowles, 1988; Wentworth, 1979; Wrong, 1961; Zeichner, 1980b) believe that a theory of socialization will evolve through the study of individual student teachers as active participants in a dynamic socialization process. Other teacher socialization researchers (e.g., Fox et al., 1976;
Goodman, 1983; Lortie, 1975; Popkewitz, 1976; Tabachnick et al., 1979-80; Tabachnick, 1981; Wells, 1984; Zeichner, 1980a) suggest that research investigations should consider the teacher socialization process as a complex interaction between teacher education programs and student teachers.

Socialization variables should be studied as evolving within the daily activities of an entire teacher education program to better understand the impact of the teacher socialization process (Crow, 1987a). In support of a more qualitative approach to teacher socialization inquiry, Zeichner (1978) and other teacher socialization researchers (Crow, 1987a; Lacey, 1977; Popkewitz et al., 1979; Tabachnick et al., 1979-80) argue that in order for the subtleties of the socialization process to be understood, the field must first conduct research studies that capture the richness of life within a particular teacher education context and setting.
CHAPTER III.

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this chapter is to outline: (a) the study setting; (b) teacher education program requirements; (c) selection of student teachers; (d) variables of interest to the study; (e) student teacher academic achievement; (f) family and lifestyle information; (g) methods of data collection; (h) basis for data analysis; and (i) limitations of the research design.

Study Setting

The setting for this study was the home economics teacher education program offered through the Department of Family and Consumer Sciences Education (FCSED) at Iowa State University. More specific information will be provided on the FCSED home economics teacher education program in Chapter IV.

Selection of Student Teachers for the Study

Preliminary selection process. Ten FCSED students were slated to student teach during the 1988-1989 academic school year, the year designated for data collection for this study.
The researcher considered all 10 student teachers in terms of age, academic achievement, traditional/non-traditional enrollment status, and family backgrounds prior to selecting student teachers for this study. Gender was not a selection determinant because all 10 student teachers were female.

The FCSED home economics teacher education curriculum for student teachers was not a participant selection determinant because the student teachers chosen for this study had followed the same curriculum with the same professors to earn degrees in home economics education. However, one student teacher chosen for the study had taken an additional methods course. Specific information on courses taken by student teachers is provided in Chapter IV.

**Final student teacher selection.** In the final selection process, four student teachers were selected for this study. Specific information about each student teacher is provided in Chapter IV. Two student teachers student taught during fall semester 1988, and two student teachers student taught during spring semester 1989. Each student teacher student taught at two different placement sites under the direction of two different cooperating teachers for a total of eight weeks at each site.
Variables of Interest to the Study

The researcher selected traditional and non-traditional enrollment status as the primary variable of interest for this study. Placement site (rural and/or urban) and grade level of courses taught (middle/junior and/or senior high school) were secondary variables of interest. Variables of interest to the study are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Classification by Variables of Interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Teacher</th>
<th>Traditional/ non-traditional</th>
<th>Placement site*</th>
<th>Grade level of classes taught</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>1) Suburban</td>
<td>9-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) Rural</td>
<td>7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>1) Urban</td>
<td>6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) Rural</td>
<td>9-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Non-traditional</td>
<td>1) Urban</td>
<td>6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) Suburban</td>
<td>9-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td>Non-traditional</td>
<td>1) Urban</td>
<td>6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) Urban</td>
<td>9-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All names are fictitious.
*1=first eight weeks; 2=second eight weeks.

Traditional/non-traditional enrollment status. Prior to student teacher selection, the researcher chose traditional and non-traditional enrollment status as the primary variable of interest for this study. Traditional was defined as those...
student teachers who had progressed from high school to the university with little or no interruption in terms of academic chronology. Traditional student teachers are approximately 21 years of age.

Non-traditional was defined as those students who had begun a university-based degree program upon high school graduation and then terminated their education prior to earning a degree or those who had earned a degree several years ago and then returned to the university within the past two years to complete a degree in home economics education. Non-traditional student teachers chosen for this study were 39 and 43 years of age.

Placement sites. Recent changes in National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) teacher certification requirements created a change in the FCSED student teaching requirements. In the past, eight weeks of student teaching was required to be certified. FCSED student teachers taught in one placement sight. Today, 10 weeks of student teaching is required to be certified. Because of the NCATE mandated changes, FCSED initiated a two-site student teaching experience for student teachers. Each student teacher now student teaches in two separate sites for eight weeks in each site.
Part of the philosophical discussion surrounding the PCSED two-site student teaching requirement included the importance of providing student teachers with the opportunity to student teach in classrooms with junior/middle school-aged pupils as well as high school pupils. Student teachers student taught mainly in high school settings in the former one-site student teaching experience. The reason for this decision was to better prepare future teachers for interactions with the wide age-range of pupils who then would be indicated on their teaching certificates. Therefore, each student teacher in this study student taught in two different middle, secondary, or combination middle/secondary school home economics programs under two different cooperating teachers for eight weeks in each site.

Permission Statements

The four student teachers willingly agreed to participate in this study. They signed a permission statement that allowed the researcher to observe them during both student teaching experiences. They agreed to complete entrance and exit interview schedules and to audio tape lessons that they taught when the researcher was not present in the classroom.

All eight placement site building principals agreed to allow the researcher to enter the building to observe the
student teachers. The researcher telephoned each building principal to answer questions about the purpose of this study.

All eight cooperating teachers willingly participated in this study. Each cooperating teacher was contacted and appraised of the nature of the study. In the event that cooperating teachers wanted to receive a copy of the researcher's preliminary dissertation proposal and/or the entrance interview schedules, such information was provided. Examples of permission statements from student teachers are included in Appendix B along with examples of the correspondence between the researcher and the student teachers, cooperating teachers, and building principals.

Comparison of Academic Achievement

Student teacher academic achievement was not used as a variable of interest in this study. Inspection of student teachers' grades for professional courses taken in the two years prior to student teaching revealed that student achievement was similar among the student teachers chosen for this study.

Methods of Data Collection

An ethnographic approach to describing the student teacher socialization process was chosen for this study. A variety of
methods were used for data collection pertinent to obtaining descriptive information about the student teacher socialization process. Three established methods of field research data collection were utilized: non-interactive, non-participant observations (Popham, 1988; Dobert, 1982); informal entrance and exit interviews (Agar, 1980; Spradley, 1979); and a review of program-related materials (Goodman, 1983; Tabachnick, 1980).

A fourth method of data collection was also utilized. Additional insight information was audio taped by student teachers for the purposes of this study. Data collection began during fall semester 1988, and continued through the end of spring semester 1989. An overview of data collection is found in Table 2.

Non-interactive, non-participant observations. Ethnographic researchers typically refer to themselves as non-participants when they attempt to minimize interactions with participants in order to focus attention unobtrusively on the stream of events of an interaction analysis (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984). In conducting studies in school settings, for example, researchers necessarily interact with teachers and pupils under consideration, even if only non-verbally, and to some extent researchers do become participants (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984). However, established research ground rules specify
that there will be minimal interaction between the researcher and the research site. Those ground rules for minimal interaction were established in this study. All parties involved in this research knew, prior to data collection, that the researcher would be cordial during on-site observations but would not initiate interactions with student teachers, cooperating teachers, or pupils.

Table 2. Data Collection Techniques Utilized

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audio Taped Materials</th>
<th>Student Teacher Produced</th>
<th>Researcher Produced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entrance Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td>Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insight Statements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected Classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper Materials</th>
<th>University Course Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Syllabi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course Unit Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course Lesson Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philosophy Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class Unit Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class Lesson Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class Tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class Handouts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Script Tapes

Non-participant observation requires a detached, neutral, and unobtrusive observer or observation tool (Goetz &
LeCompte, 1984). The researcher focused on student teacher behavior during the observations. This type of data collection was suitable when the researcher required a comprehensive, detailed, and representative account of student teacher behavior. The goal of this type of data collection was to record neutral and detached observations in the same way that any other observer might perceive and record the observations (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984).

In this study, on-site observations of student teachers were conducted to gather first-hand comprehensive and detailed information in a natural setting (school site). On-site observations were intended to reflect the decisions that the student teachers made relative to lesson organization, lesson execution, and use of program-related materials. The researcher looked for evidence of the socializing variables within the school setting that may have had an impact on the socialization process (e.g., key individuals, ecological characteristics of classrooms, student teacher/cooperating teacher similarities and differences). The ultimate goal of this particular method of data collection was to understand and to describe the impact that particular socializing variables had on the socialization process over an extended period of time (Crow, 1987a).
An observation consisted of time spent in a classroom with a student teacher on any given day. Actual classroom observations ranged from a minimum of one to a maximum of four class periods. Observations were conducted on an average of twice per week during the second through the fourth weeks of each student teaching experience and on an average of three times per week during the fifth through seventh or eighth weeks of each separate student teaching experience for each student teacher.

Observations involved script-taping and audio taping the activities of each class period taught by the student teacher. Script-taping is used to record objective data of teacher-learner behaviors (Hunter, 1988, p. 35).

On-site student teacher observations occurred randomly, announced or unannounced, within the student teachers' schedules on any given school day. The purposes of random observations were: (a) to collect enough data to provide a comprehensive description of each student teacher's actual teaching experiences over time (sixteen weeks); (b) to observe interactions between the student teachers and cooperating teachers and pupils during different times in a day; and (c) to audio tape each lesson taught by student teachers to collect verbatim verbal flow information. An overview of
actual data collection through non-interactive, non-participant observation is shown in Table 3.

**Informal entrance and exit interviews.** Prior to beginning the first student teaching experience, each student teacher audio taped responses to an entrance interview schedule without the researcher being present. The schedule consisted of 63 items subdivided into 11 socialization variables that have been cited in the literature as having an impact on student teacher socialization into the teaching profession. Entrance and exit interview schedules are found in Appendix C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3. Researcher Observations Per Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FALL, 1999</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPRING, 1989</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Site 1 is the first eight week experience; site 2 is the second eight week experience.*
Items on the interview schedule were developed by the researcher based on the information gathered on socialization variables in the review of literature. The items and socialization variables were reviewed by four different professional or preprofessional groups: (a) the items were reviewed by two university teacher education professionals to determine item and direction clarity and to determine the length of time necessary for responding to the items; (b) the items were then reviewed by three teacher education undergraduate students to determine item and direction clarity and to determine the length of time necessary for responding to the items; (c) the interview schedule was submitted to the Iowa State University Human Subjects Committee for review (see Appendix A); and (d) the interview schedule was submitted to five of the eight cooperating teachers who were slated to be a part of this study to determine item and direction clarity. Several changes were made based upon recommendations from university teacher education professionals, undergraduate teacher education students, and cooperating teachers.

The variable categories on the interview schedule are as follows: (a) key individuals; (b) cooperating teachers/university supervisors; (c) ecological characteristics of the classroom; (d) cooperating teacher/student teacher similarities and differences; (e) bureaucratic characteristics
of schools; (f) changes student teacher attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge; (g) philosophy of education; (h) role expectations; (i) student teacher attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge; (j) communication skills; and (k) acquiring teacher behavior.

At the end of the second student teaching experience (sixteen weeks later) each student teacher audio taped responses to an exit interview schedule. This schedule was similar to the entrance interview schedule except that items were written in past tense. The researcher was not present when the responses to the exit interview items were audio taped.

The entrance and exit interviews took approximately two and one half hours for each student teacher to complete. Student teachers were instructed to respond to two or three items for each variable and to answer each of the items chosen as completely as possible. Student teachers responded to at least two items for each socialization variable.

Review of program-related materials. A review of program-related materials included a two-part analysis of information. First, information that student teachers amassed through participating in their home economics teacher certification degree program was reviewed. Specific information perused included course syllabi, class notes, class assignments
including lesson plans and unit plans, and an introductory paper written by teach student teacher on their philosophy of home economics.

The first purpose of this method of data collection was to familiarize the researcher with the philosophy, values, and standards held by home economics teacher educators in terms of information deemed important for preservice teachers to know prior to student teaching. The second purpose was to provide the researcher with an understanding of the thinking processes of each student teacher.

Second, a review of placement site program-related materials that the student teachers used in teaching their classes was conducted. Lesson plans, some class handouts, unit plans, evaluation instruments, and other materials that student teachers used in teaching lessons to pupils were perused by the researcher.

Additional data collection. Student teachers were asked to audio tape personal insights at the end of two to three school days per week during both student teaching experiences. This particular method of data collection was used to ascertain the student teachers' description of thoughts and emotions about the lessons they had recently taught, about their interactions with cooperating teachers and pupils, and about their overall perceptions of their student teaching
experiences up to the time of the audio tape. Approximately 20 hours of audio taped information was collected using this method of data collection.

Student teachers were also asked to audio tape two to three lessons per week that they taught while the researcher was not present. The purpose of this method of data collection was to add continuity and validity to the researcher's observations and field notes. Approximately two to three classes over 16 weeks were recorded from most of the student teachers totalling approximately 100 hours of data collected.

The researcher observed, script-taped, and audio taped each of the eight cooperating teachers as they taught at least two different classes. The purpose of this method of data collection was to capture a sense of the attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge held by the cooperating teachers.

Collecting data as the student teachers interacted with university supervisors was not a part of this study. However, each student teacher provided information about how they perceived the influence of the university supervisor either on insight audio tapes or in response to items on the exit interviews.
Experimenter Bias

Although the researcher has not been formally prepared with an extensive anthropological background, much study has been undertaken to understand the anthropological underpinnings of ethnographic research. The researcher has taken graduate coursework in qualitative research design, attended workshops presented by published ethnographers, conducted an ethnographic pilot study under the direction of an ethnographic researcher, and had extensive training for script-taping observations using the Hunter (1988) method prior to undertaking this study.

The researcher has approximately 15 years of experience teaching home economics both at the junior high and senior high school levels and in a university setting. Familiarity with typical public school home economics programs provided the researcher with an advantage for this study in terms of a practical background upon which to rely in terms of data collection. However, such a background also provided a basis for the researcher's first bias in terms of preconceived ideas about how home economics programs 'ought' to be conducted.

Although it is true that the researcher understood a great deal about home economics programming at the secondary level prior to undertaking this study, it is also true that each state operates under autonomous state guidelines and each
state has its own chronological heritage with regard to the evolution of home economics programming as well as its future directions for home economics programs. The researcher, though a native Iowan, has not lived in the state for the past 20 years and has never taught home economics in the state. From that vantage point, experimenter bias was reduced.

The researcher had no practical experience with or working knowledge of specific home economics programs in this state or about any of the particular home economics programs selected as placement sites for the student teachers chosen for this study. The researcher previously had worked in a supervisory capacity with one of the cooperating teachers chosen for the study but had no knowledge of the other seven cooperating teachers.

Student teachers were selected on the basis of traditional/non-traditional enrollment status. In an attempt to reduce participant selection effects, the researcher chose student teachers on that basis only. However, two student teachers who were selected for the study were enrolled in a class that the researcher assisted with as a graduate assistant the semester prior to beginning the data collection.

A second source of bias was personality related. The researcher attends to the classroom pupil interactions in terms of how pupils 'ought' to be taught and treated in
classrooms. In the beginning stages of data collection (approximately the first three weeks), the researcher struggled with the desire to interact with the teaching/learning process being observed. After several days of observation, the researcher began to lose sight of the desire to interact with the specific teaching/learning process and, thus, became better at attending to exactly what was occurring between and among student teachers, cooperating teachers, and pupils in classrooms.

The third source of bias for the researcher was that of feeling comfortable as a non-participant observer. Throughout the study, data collection was easier and more comprehensive in those settings where the researcher felt that adequate space was provided for the data collection effort and where the researcher did not feel as though her presence was an unwelcomed intrusion. Data collection for one student teacher in one site was somewhat difficult for the first four weeks because of a lack of space for the researcher. Therefore, that particular section of data collection (about 3 weeks in the first student teaching experience for one student teacher) was somewhat limited.
The principles of "constant comparative" data analysis (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) were used in this study. This inductive strategy combines inductive categorical coding with a simultaneous comparison of all social incidents observed to assist in generating social theory (Crow, 1987a). As social phenomena are recorded and classified, they are compared across categories (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984).

For example, as the researcher noticed how student teachers decided upon a particular lesson to be taught and upon the information that would be used to present that lesson, the researcher classified the choices into student teacher past experience, cooperating teacher suggestions, unit plan sequencing, and pupil interest. From this categorization, the data collected were coded and stored.

The intent of data codification and classification was to discover relationships that may or may not exist within the thought processes of the student teachers in terms of how they made choices relative to the teaching/learning process and to their student teaching experiences. The constant comparative method of data classification identifies categories and generates statements of relationships (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984).
Data were checked for consistency by verifying field notes with audio tapes on each student teacher observation. Field notes were written in script-tape form (Hunter, 1988). Script-taping is a method of documenting information on a time interval basis. An example of the script-tape method of data collection is found in Chapter VIII. The script-taped field notes were typed and stored in the computer in raw data form and the audio tapes were transcribed and stored in the computer to continually verify the accuracy of the field notes as well as to complete verbal flow information from each observation.

Data verification also included checking data for meanings that emerged in order to test those meanings for validity. Testing for validity included comparing the most recent data collected with past data collected on the same student teacher. Consistent with the constant comparative method of data codifying, verification of data was a continuous enterprise (Miles & Huberman, 1984).

Data from this study were collected with two research questions in mind: (a) How powerful was a student teacher's biography, as opposed to teacher education and experience, in terms of the socialization variables inherent in the student teaching setting; and (b) in the classroom, how were student teachers affected by the program features, settings, and
people involved in the student teaching experience? The overall purpose of this research was to describe the socialization processes encountered by four student teachers who student taught in two different student teaching sites over a period of 16 weeks.

At this point, it should be noted that the researcher did not refine the preliminary research questions nor was the researcher aware of how student teachers responded to items on the entrance interview schedule. The researcher believed that experimenter bias would intrude upon the objectivity of the data collection if the entrance interview audio tapes were transcribed prior to placement site observations.

Data collected from interviews, observations, review of program-related materials, and additional data collection procedures were comprehensively analyzed at the end of student teaching experiences using a computer program entitled The Ethnograph (Seidel, Kjolseth, & Seymour, 1988). This computer program was developed for qualitative data analysis and was particularly useful for the data analysis in this study because the conceptualization of the computer program closely resembled the conceptualization of the constant comparative data analysis (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). A comprehensive overview of The Ethnograph will be presented in Chapter VIII.
Data collected from this research study were reported in narrative form (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Miles & Huberman, 1984) and specific examples from the data are used to describe the socialization process for each student teacher. Chapters V through IX will provide a thick description of the student teachers' experiences and insights on the socialization processes for four student teachers.

Reliability

Because ethnographic research occurs in natural settings and is often undertaken to record processes of change, ethnographic research is especially vulnerable to replication difficulties. However, generation, refinement, and validation of variables and postulates may not require replication of situations in the event that there are other comparable studies with which to compare research findings. There are three recent studies with which this study can be compared that have been cited in the literature (Bullough, 1987; Crow, 1987a; Knowles, 1988).

There are several ways that ethnographers enhance the external and internal reliability of the data. A detailed account of how the researcher attempted to reduce the threats to external and internal reliability is presented.
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**External reliability.** First, the researcher status position has been cited by Goetz and LeCompte (1984) as one of the most common threats to external reliability. To what extent are researchers members of the groups being studied and what positions do they hold? In this study, the researcher is a home economics educator with two degrees in home economics education. The descriptions of the student teaching experiences and the findings were predicated on past home economics teaching experience and on being a member of the home economics community, the same community being studied. The student teachers involved in the study were progressing toward baccalaureate degrees in home economics education and the cooperating teachers held baccalaureate degrees in home economics education. Every person involved in the research study was aware of the researcher's background as well as the researcher's interests which were not only in home economics but also in education.

Second, identifying study participants is an important part of producing quality ethnographic research. Each participant has access to unique and idiosyncratic information. No one participant can provide universal information. In the event that this study is replicated, the researcher must contact individuals similar to those who served as participants in previous studies. This threat to
external reliability is handled by carefully describing those participants who provide data (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984). Careful descriptions of the student teachers and a careful delineation of information about each student teacher appears in Chapter IV.

A third element influencing the content of ethnographic data is the social context within which data are collected (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984). In an attempt to reduce the threat to external reliability in terms of social context and conditions, the researcher presents a careful delineation of the physical, social and interpersonal school contexts in Chapter IV. The purpose of such a delineation is to enhance the replication of this study.

Fourth, even if a researcher reconstructs the relationships and duplicates the participants and social contexts of a prior study, replication may remain impossible if the constructs, definitions, or units of data analysis are poorly delineated (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984). This study presents an explicit identification of the terminology and methods of analysis; defines the concepts used in the study so that the terminology will be clear to other researchers. The researcher utilized widely accepted definitions of the socialization variables that informed and shaped this research to facilitate replication.
Fifth, methods of data collection and analysis were presented earlier in this chapter. The researcher used a variety of interviewing and observational strategies to collect data; explained strategies used in validating and refining data during the early stages of data collection; presented information on how observations were recorded in field notes and audio tapes; and provided the reader with the circumstances under which the interviews were conducted. The researcher also presented strategies for analyzing data by clearly identifying the data analysis procedures to provide a retrospective account of how data were examined and synthesized in Chapter VIII.

**Internal reliability.** The question related to internal reliability is whether or not multiple observers agree with the conclusions drawn from the data within a single study (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984). This study was the investigation of one researcher. However, efforts were made to reduce the threats to internal reliability in the following ways.

First, this study presents verbatim accounts (low-inference descriptors) of: (a) conversations with student teachers, cooperating teachers, and pupils; (b) data collected via audio tapes; and (c) data collected via script-taped field notes. The use of both on-site script-taping and audio tapes served to substantiate the events of the observations. The
data, descriptions, and findings presented in this study should provide reviewers, judges, and other readers with a means for accepting, rejecting, or modifying the researcher's conclusions (Wolcott, 1975).

Patton (1975) stresses the importance of reporting any negative or discrepant data as well as positive material that supports the researchers' conclusions in order to present the most credible and ostensibly the most reliable information possible gleaned from the study. This study includes information from two student teachers' experiences that were negative in nature in Chapters V through IX.

Second, mechanically recorded data collection techniques were used for 100% of the data collection. All observations of student teachers, student teacher interviews, and student teacher insights were audio taped. Telephone conversations with student teachers were audio taped with permission. This technique served to cross-validate the researcher's perceptions of the observations with the perceptions of the student teachers.

In summary, threats to external and internal reliability were reduced as much as possible. The researcher adhered to the study variables generated prior to the study and was familiar enough with the socialization literature to believe that the variables inherent in the study were derived from a
theoretical framework that informed the study (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984).

Validity

Establishing validity necessitates demonstration that the propositions generated, refined, or tested match the causal conditions that were obtained in human life (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984). Do researchers actually observe or measure what they think they are observing or measuring? To what extent are the abstract constructs and postulates generated, refined, or tested applicable across groups (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984)? As stated earlier, reliability poses serious threats to the credibility of much ethnographic research. However, validity may be its major strength (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984).

Ethnographers use natural settings for data collection; collect data over long periods of time; and refine constructs to ensure that there is congruence between the data collected and the participants in the study. Ethnographic analysis also incorporates a process of researcher self-monitoring that exposes all phases of the research activity to continual questioning and reevaluation (Erickson, 1973).

**Internal validity.** In terms of internal validity, the question is whether or not the participants and the researcher understand the conceptual categories exactly the same way and
whether or not they share mutual agreement in terms of the meaning inherent in the data (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984). The researcher considered the threats to internal validity prior to the study.

First, the extent to which phenomena initially observed are the same as those observed subsequently are salient where process and change are the focus of the research (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984). Ethnographers assume that history and maturation affects the nature of the data collected and that phenomena rarely remain constant. The task of ethnographic research analysis is to establish which data remain stable over time and which data will change. For this research, such a comparison was facilitated by systematic replication and constant comparison of the data on an on-going basis. The researcher observed student teachers, sometimes several days in a row, in order to replicate and compare the data previously collected. Also, the researcher observed some of the same classes taught by student teachers over time in order to compare the data collected one day with data previously collected. Change over time was an integral part of this research as was consistency over time in terms of establishing validity of the data collection procedures. The researcher also matched the insights presented by student teachers with actual student teacher observations to further monitor history
and maturation threats to internal validity. The constant comparison method of data analysis was utilized in order to distinguish maturation effects from other intervening phenomena to identify possible causes, their interactions, and their probable impacts (Ward, 1971).

Second, observer effects operate in a number of ways for ethnographers. Participant observation, the main source of data collection for ethnographic research, is perhaps most fraught with problems of researcher reactivity than any other form of data collection (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984). In the initial stages of the research, participants may present an "ideal self" or communicate to the researcher what they think the researcher should or wants to hear. Parallel to the problems inherent in observation is the credibility of participant reporting in interviewing. Participants may lie, omit relevant data, or misrepresent their claims (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984).

The researcher believes that the student teachers involved in this study responded to the items on the entrance and exit interview schedule in a natural, uninhibited manner. There are several reasons for such an assumption: (a) student teachers responded to many items on the interview schedule and the items overlapped on several socialization variables which provided a means for checking for consistency of responses;
the student teachers had complete freedom in terms of which items they chose to answer on any given variable; (c) the items on the schedule were apparently interesting to the student teachers; (d) the student teachers provided more information on the audio tapes that they were asked to provide (i.e., most answered more than one or two items per variable); and (e) student teachers were apparently enthusiastic in terms of their responses. Student teachers audio taped responses in their leisure time when answering the items. Also, the researcher believes that the student teachers were natural and honest when they responded to the request for insight information. Student teachers had the freedom to provide insights about their student teaching experiences in a natural, uninhibited manner.

The researcher believes that the student teachers involved in this study responded naturally in classrooms as they were being observed. During the first student teaching experience, two student teachers experienced some hesitation or lack of spontaneity when the researcher was in the classroom. However, by the end of the second week of student teaching, all student teachers seemed comfortable with the researcher being present in the classroom. Even though the researcher was present in the classroom, there was no threat in terms of
criticism or of influencing student teacher grades from the researcher.

The researcher conducted most of the observations while the student teachers were very busy and while there was no time for interacting with the researcher or when student teachers had not noticed that the researcher was observing in the classroom. The researcher had a space specifically assigned for data collection in most of the classrooms.

Third, other threats to internal validity were not a problem in this study. The selection of participants was not a problem because the number of possible participants in this study was small. Some student teachers not chosen for the study were those whom the researcher knew personally and therefore choosing them to participate in this study would have created an obvious researcher bias. However, two student teachers chosen for this study were enrolled in a class in which the researcher served as a graduate assistant. The reason these student teachers were chosen in spite of the fact that the researcher knew them was because of their non-traditional enrollment status. Other student teachers were not chosen because the researcher could not conduct the investigation in the school placement sites assigned to them. All student teachers who began this study finished the study.

Throughout this study, the researcher was not an active
participant in the classroom setting. The researcher script-taped each observation which accounted for nearly 100% of the time spent in the classroom. Therefore, there were few opportunities for the researcher to pose a threat to internal validity in this study. Finally, the findings will not be generalized to any other group of student teachers.

**External validity.** The threats to the external validity for an ethnographic research study consist of those effects that obstruct or reduce a study's comparability and translatability (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984). Comparability refers to the degree to which the components of a study (e.g., units of analysis, concepts generated, participant characteristics, settings) are sufficiently well described so that other researchers can use the reported findings as a basis for comparison with other studies addressing related issues (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984). Translatability refers to the degree to which the researcher uses theoretical frameworks, definitions, and research techniques that are accessible to or understood by other researchers in the same or related disciplines (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984). Several teacher socialization researchers encourage the use of the theories and variable factors utilized in this study (Tabachnick, 1975, 1980; Tabachnick et al., 1979-80; Zeichner, 1980b).
Setting, history, and construct effects were considered in detail prior to data collection to reduce the threat to external validity. The socialization factors under investigation in this study were those factors that can be found in any typical classroom setting (e.g., unique program features, classroom settings, people). Hence, the unique factors can be compared across four student teachers and eight student teaching sites to reduce the setting, history, and construct threats to external validity.

Limitations

1. The activities and meanings associated with these particular student teaching experiences occurred within the socially constructed realities of a particular teacher education curriculum which inherently reduces replication (Crow, 1987a). This study cannot be replicated exactly because of the nature of the teacher education program features, school program features, school settings, and people selected for this study. Therefore, the capability of this study to address the question of strict reproduction of design, results, and conclusions for another researcher is limited (Crow, 1987a). Ideally, using more than one researcher helps to overcome this limitation. In an attempt
to compensate, this researcher used a variety of data
collection techniques.

2. The variety of data collection techniques used in this
study were chosen to minimize the limitation of a single
observer. Data collection techniques included: (a) audio
taping 100% of the interviews and observations; (b) using a
valid and reliable method of writing field notes by script-
taping (Hunter, 1988); (c) using verbatim statements from the
student teachers to promote low-inference descriptors for data
collection; (d) using a well-tested, reliable computer program
to analyze the data; and (e) presenting detailed descriptions
of student teachers and placement sites, including physical,
social, and interpersonal contexts.

3. One weakness of ethnographic research is the
researcher's influence on the environment. The researcher's
intrusion into the natural student teaching setting and into
the natural development of close relationships among the
student teacher, cooperating teacher, and university
supervisor often influences the interaction among the triad
and possibly interrupts program activities (Goetz & LeCompte,
1984).

However, by assuring that precautions for credible
qualitative investigations were built into the research
design, the researcher believes that a high degree of internal
validity was obtained by: (a) using four student teachers and eight cooperating teachers in the research design (Agar, 1980); (b) establishing a position of neutrality in interpersonal and social contexts; (c) providing corroboration from a variety of sources of data collection; (d) using appropriate techniques to decrease data distortion (e.g., student teachers' omissions or misrepresentations of information); and (e) including a retrospective descriptive analysis of the researcher-student teacher relationships and settings for data collection.

4. Another limitation to this research is the generalizability of findings to the population of student teachers. The focus of this ethnographic study was to describe the socialization process for four student teachers enrolled in a specific home economics teacher education program rather than to present generalized findings. A secondary goal of this research was to contribute to the body of knowledge on student teachers. The researcher attempted to describe the student teachers and the placement site settings to allow for comparisons with other ethnographic studies. As a result, a body of research and theory can be built on the accumulation of ethnographic studies on student teachers (Crow, 1987a).
CHAPTER IV.

HOME ECONOMICS TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM

Home Economics Administrative Structure

The College of Family and Consumer Sciences (CFCS) is one of eight colleges at Iowa State University (Iowa State University Catalog, 1987-89, p. 3). Until fall semester, 1987, the college was called the College of Home Economics. There are six departments administered by the CFCS: (a) child development (CD); (b) family environment (FE); (c) food and nutrition (FN); (d) family and consumer sciences education (FCSED); (e) hotel, restaurant, and institution management (HRIM); and (f) textiles and clothing (TC). Students selected for this study majored in home economics education, one degree program administered by FCSED.

Iowa State University Teacher Education Program

The teacher education program at Iowa State University is accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). All students who are recommended by Iowa State University for teacher certification must meet the requirements of the teacher education program and be
recommended by the College of Education. Each student will be enrolled in the department in which he or she plans to major and must meet the graduation requirements of that department and the college in which it is located (Iowa State University Catalog, 1987-89, p. 236).

Students must have a cumulative grade point average (GPA) of 2.50 on a 4-point scale for full admission to the teacher education program. Effective September 1, 1987, all students applying for admission to Teacher Education must also submit scores from a basic skills admissions test, the Pre-Professional Skills Test (PPST) (Iowa State University Catalog, 1987-89, p. 236).

Home Economics Teacher Education

The home economics teacher education curriculum prepares students for teacher certification in general home economics, vocational consumer and homemaking, and in diversified occupational home economics programs for middle, junior, and senior high schools. The home economics education curriculum is approved by the Iowa Department of Education for the preparation of vocational home economics teachers (Iowa State University Catalog, 1987-89, p. 166). Students enrolled in the home economics teacher education program must take 128.5
semester hour credits to graduate with a bachelor of science degree in home economics education.

Home Economics Education Students

The students enrolled in the home economics teacher education program were generally traditional students (average age 19 years) with average standardized test scores (overall American College Testing (ACT) score of 20) (Lanier, 1984a). The majority of students enrolled in the program were female. Academic achievement status is provided in Chapter III.

Before being admitted into the formal home economics teacher education program, students completed approximately two years of general education coursework including one social foundations of American education course, one course in principles of secondary education, and a year and a half of required coursework to complete a major in home economics education. Table 4 provides specific information regarding home economics education degree requirements.

Academic Advisement

Upon declaring a major in home economics education, students were assigned to a FCSED academic advisor. The advisor was responsible for helping the students plan individual degree programs including the scheduling of the
student teaching professional semester. The student teaching experience generally was scheduled upon completion of academic coursework.

Supervision Component

The supervision component of the student teaching experience was conducted by FCSED faculty members. FCSED faculty members also held joint appointments in the College of Education.

Home Economics Education Curriculum Options

FCSED offers a home economics teacher education major with two separate curriculum options, social sciences or natural sciences. These two options allow students to select the option that they believe would be most useful to them in their future home economics teaching careers. All four student teachers in this study selected the social sciences home economics education curriculum option. However, one student teacher in this study, Heather, took additional courses in the natural sciences home economics education curriculum option. For this reason it is important to present a detailed account of the differences between the two home economics education curriculum options. Because Heather took courses in the natural sciences option, the reader should consider the
differences presented in Tables 5 through 7 in order to better understand the socialization process for one student teacher from the teacher preparation perspective.

Comparison of Social and Natural Sciences Options

Table 4 presents specific information about the general categories and semester credit hours required for the social science and natural science home economics education curriculum options.

Table 4. Home Economics Education Curriculum Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
<th>Natural Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>s.h.¹</td>
<td>General Categories</td>
<td>s.h.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Natural sciences &amp; math</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Home economics core</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Home economics</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Professional courses</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dance, health, PE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Iowa State University Catalog, 1987-89, p. 73.
²s.h. = semester hours.

Tables 5 through 7 present an in-depth comparison of the differences between the two home economics education
curriculum options by specific degree requirement categories
(e.g., natural sciences and mathematics, social sciences, home
economics content, and professional courses).

Table 5. Differences Between Options - Natural Sciences and
Mathematics Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Science Option</th>
<th>Natural Science &amp; Mathematics Required Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 s.h.</td>
<td>Natural Science &amp; Mathematics Required Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 CHEM*</td>
<td>General chemistry and laboratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 MATH*</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ZOOL*</td>
<td>Basic physiology and anatomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ZOOL</td>
<td>Human reproduction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural Science Option</th>
<th>Natural Science &amp; Mathematics Required Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 s.h.</td>
<td>Natural Science &amp; Mathematics Required Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 CHEM</td>
<td>General chemistry and laboratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 CHEM</td>
<td>Elementary organic chemistry and laboratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 MATH</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ZOOL</td>
<td>Basic physiology and anatomy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Iowa State University Catalog, 1987-89, p. 73.
*s.h. = semester hours.
*CHEM = Chemistry.
*MATH = Mathematics.
*ZOOL = Zoology.

Table 5 shows that students enrolled in the social sciences home economics education curriculum option were required to take more credit hours in zoology and fewer hours in chemistry than those students enrolled in the natural
sciences home economics education curriculum option. Heather, the student teacher who elected to take courses in both options, had a stronger science background than did the other three student teachers in this study.

Table 6. Differences Between Options - Social Science Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Social Science Option</th>
<th>Natural Science Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>10 s.h.</strong></td>
<td>Social Sciences Required Courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 ECON*</td>
<td>Principles of Economics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 SOC*</td>
<td>Introduction to Sociology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 SOC</td>
<td>Courtship and Marriage or Sociology of the Family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*IAW State University Catalog, 1987-89, p. 73.
*s.h. = semester hours.
*ECON = Economics.
*SOC = Sociology.
*CD = Child Development.
*FE = Family Environment.
Table 6 shows that students enrolled in either the social sciences or natural sciences options were required to take the same number of credit hours in the social sciences course category. Because all four student teachers in this study chose to earn a degree in the social sciences home economics education curriculum option, there were basically no differences for student teachers in the social sciences course category.

Table 7 shows that students enrolled in the social sciences home economics education curriculum option took approximately the same number of home economics content credit hours as those students enrolled in the natural sciences option. However, in keeping with the emphasis on science for those students enrolled in the natural sciences option, home economics courses that emphasized scientifically-oriented home economics content were required (e.g., Scientific Study of Food and Introduction to Textiles). Those students enrolled in the social science option were required to take home economics content courses that placed a greater emphasis on family life education courses than those students enrolled in the natural science option. For example, specific courses included Parenting: Fathers, Mothers, and Children, Family Law, and Personal and Professional Communications.
Table 7. Differences Between Options - Home Economics Content Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Social Science Option</th>
<th>Natural Science Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37 s.h.*</td>
<td>Home Economics Content Courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 CD*</td>
<td>Development and Guidance of Infancy, Early Childhood, or Middle Childhood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 CD</td>
<td>Parenting: Fathers, Mothers, and Children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 FE*</td>
<td>Home Furnishings (or an art course)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 FE</td>
<td>Introduction to Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 FE</td>
<td>Introduction to Family Financial Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 FE</td>
<td>Personal and Professional Communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 FE</td>
<td>Family and Management Patterns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 FE</td>
<td>Family Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 FN*</td>
<td>Fundamentals of Food Preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 FN</td>
<td>Economics and Management of Family Food</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 HED*</td>
<td>Educational Aspects of Family Social Issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 TC*</td>
<td>Consumer and Applied Textiles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 TC</td>
<td>Fundamental Apparel Construction Processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 s.h.</td>
<td>Home Economics Content Courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 CD</td>
<td>Development and Guidance of Infancy, Early Childhood, or Middle Childhood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 FE</td>
<td>Home Furnishings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 FE</td>
<td>Introduction to Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 FE</td>
<td>Introduction to Family Financial Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 FE</td>
<td>Family and Management Patterns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 FE</td>
<td>Families as Consumers or Economics of Aging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 FN</td>
<td>Scientific Study of Food</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 FN</td>
<td>Concepts of Nutrition Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 FN</td>
<td>Economics and Management of Family Food</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 HED</td>
<td>Educational Aspects of Family Social Issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 TC</td>
<td>Fundamental Apparel Construction Processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 TC</td>
<td>Introduction to Textiles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Iowa State University Catalog, 1987-89, p. 73.*

*s.h. = semester hours.
*CD = Child Development.
*FE = Family Environment.
*FN = Food and Nutrition.
*HED = Home Economics Education.
*TC = Textiles and Clothing.
Both the social science and the natural science options require 40 semester hours of coursework. The courses are similar in both options except for the specific methods course required. The students enrolled in the social science option must take a methods course entitled *Educational Strategies in Family Life*. The course description reads as follows: "Application of methods and techniques for teaching home economics in family life programs" (*Iowa State University Catalog*, 1987-89, p. 166).

Students enrolled in the natural sciences option must take a methods course entitled *Educational Strategies for Application of Science Principles to Home Economics Programs*. The course description is as follows: "Application of science principles to the teaching of home economics. Practice in instructional strategies. Emphasis on consumer homemaking/occupational programs" (*Iowa State University Catalog*, 1987-89, p. 166).

Students who took the *Educational Strategies in Family Life* methods course received an abundance of information on issues that pupils in today's society face in their everyday lives (e.g., AIDS, teenage pregnancy, chemical dependency) along with appropriate strategies for teaching individual and family life-oriented information. Students taught lessons in
Students who took *Educational Strategies for Application of Science Principles in Home Economics Programs* received a strong background in using the scientific method. Students taught lessons in microteaching situations using the seven-step scientific method. By the end of the course, students learned how to think through practical individual and family-related issues using a specific scientific-oriented methodology.

This particular difference between the social science and the natural science home economics education curriculum options had a direct impact on one student teacher in this study, Heather. Heather actually took both methods courses. However, to understand the distinct difference in her teaching methodology, the reader must understand the major academic difference in her home economics education curriculum.

**Concurrent Course**

During the professional semester, student teachers were also enrolled in a two semester hour campus-based course entitled *Seminar in Teaching*. The purpose of this course was to examine ways to implement actions that reflect a personal philosophy of home economics and to apply management
principles and evaluation techniques to educational settings (Iowa State University Catalog, 1987-89, p. 166). Students returned to campus one full day per month to attend this class. Course requirements included a legislation-related experience (e.g., talking to a legislator or writing letters to legislators on topics that directly affect home economics); a project designed to market home economics programs; an assignment based on evaluating pupil achievement; and a project related to the development of a personal portfolio to be used when applying for home economics teaching positions. This class was particularly useful in terms of providing a vehicle through which student teachers could develop a peer support network (Karmos & Jacko, 1977).
CHAPTER V.

STUDENT TEACHERS: AN OVERVIEW

"In understanding something so intensely personal as teaching, it is crucial that we know about the person the teacher is . . . " (Goodson, 1981, p. 69).

The purpose of this chapter is to present a comprehensive overview of each student teacher's personal background, educational background, and personal perspectives about how student teachers were influenced to become teachers or how they perceive themselves as teachers. Crow (1987a) recently argued that each student teacher entered the student teaching program with a well-established image of self as teacher or a "teacher role identity" (TRI) (Crow, 1987a).

According to Crow (1987a), there are three sources of influence on TRI development: (a) a TRI is constructed from beliefs about teaching and beliefs about self as a teacher as well as beliefs about life in classrooms; (b) a TRI is influenced by former teachers, previous teaching experiences, previous education classes, and childhood experiences; and (c) a TRI is operationalized within the context of the teacher
education program. The information presented in this chapter will specifically address two of the teacher role identity components, beliefs about selves as teachers and the socializing influence of former teachers, previous teaching experiences, and childhood experiences.

The data presented in this chapter were collected through entrance interview audio tapes, insight audio tapes, and conversations that the researcher had with individual student teachers. Because interview items were fairly general in nature and because the student teacher insights were unstructured, the data collected for individual student teachers were not consistent across all four student teachers. For example, Heather and Mary were willing to share details about their personal lives whereas Nancy and Tracy were more reserved in their responses.

The underlined words or phrases in the narrative statements are those words or phrases that the student teachers emphasized on the audio tapes. The words or phrases in brackets have been added by the researcher for clarity of responses.
Heather

Personal background. Heather was a 22 year old traditional student teacher. She was approximately five feet seven inches tall with shoulder-length blonde hair.

Heather had many different work experiences during her high school and college years. Heather taught swimming lessons and was a lifeguard at her home community swimming pool during the summers for the years in which she attended Iowa State University during the school year. Heather taught Sunday school for three years and tutored nutrition students for three semesters. Heather was engaged to be married the summer following her student teaching experience and received a great deal of emotional support from her fiance during her student teaching experience.

Heather was raised in a small rural community in northern Iowa. During her student teaching experience, Heather lived in a large metropolitan community.

Heather's father was a farmer and her mother was a teacher. She had five brothers and one sister. Heather was the fifth oldest child. One of her older brothers was very talented in athletics and was highly esteemed in the community for his accomplishments.

Educational background. Heather attended both elementary and high school in small rural community schools. She
attended a community college for two years on an athletic scholarship prior to transferring to Iowa State University to pursue a degree in home economics education.

**Self as a teacher.** During her childhood, Heather enjoyed a close personal relationship with her family, particularly her mother. Insight into the relationship Heather had with her mother will be presented in the following narrative. The item to which Heather responded on the entrance interview schedule was, "From where do your beliefs, values, and attitudes about yourself as a teacher come?"

"Home! My mom was a teacher. She's such a neat lady! My mom would have to be a big factor because she's just so good with people, and she's a beautiful woman. You know [my beliefs, values, and attitudes came from] my childhood . . . the way I was raised. I had a beautiful childhood; I loved my childhood. It was hard for me to leave [my childhood]. I don't know if I have left it yet but I like to tell myself I have" (Heather, Entrance Interview, Item 39, August, 1988).

During her high school years, Heather decided that she wanted to become a home economics teacher because she had a home economics teacher whom she adored and hoped to emulate when she became a teacher. Heather provided the following insights about her high school home economics teacher:

"A lot of my skills will probably come from my high school home economics teacher. I watched her and I knew what I wanted to be. She was my role model. So, I think I watched her a lot" (Heather, Entrance Interview, Item 40, August, 1988).
When responding to the item, "Describe your favorite teacher or the teacher you believe had the greatest impact on you as a learner," Heather presents the following information:

"That's simple! It was my high school home economics teacher! I tell you what . . . she's wonderful! Not only did she know her stuff [but] she had this way of bringing out the best in everybody. She was just so encouraging. She was firm yet you wanted to respect her. She was just a really neat lady" (Heather, Entrance Interview, Item 1, August, 1988).

During her high school years, Heather developed a love for home economics related subject matter, particularly in the areas of family relationships and human growth and development. However, Heather's desire to help young people "get a good start in life through being influenced by a good teacher just like my home economics teacher helped me" (Heather, Entrance Interview, Item 49, August, 1988) was her main reason for choosing to pursue a degree in home economics education. While responding to why she wanted to become a teacher, Heather provided telling information about how she viewed not only good teachers but also poor teachers:

"I wanna help kids prepare for life. It's hard . . . it's really hard . . . and I remember my teenage years. I didn't have much self esteem. I tended to be a very sensitive child; very moody. I wanna reach those kids like my teacher reached me and like my family reached me. I wanna capitalize on those things the kids possess. I want them to realize what a wonderful, wonderful individual they are! I just want to prepare them for life, prepare them for college, prepare them for people to meet, prepare them for the hardships, if I can. That's why I wanna be a teacher because I see too many teachers that aren't fulfilling that. I see so many teachers I
don't wanna be like; I see so many teachers that shouldn't be there. I know I'll only be a drop in the bucket but at least I'll be there fighting for what I believe in and trying to edge those other teachers out cause, by God, I wanna do it! Some of those teachers are ridiculous" (Heather, Entrance Interview, Item 49, August, 1988).

Nancy

Personal background. Nancy was a 22 year old traditional student teacher. She was approximately five foot four inches tall with short blonde hair. Nancy had a variety of past work experiences including planning and implementing a county and district juvenile restitution system, supervising approximately 40 juvenile delinquents, working in a day care center, and working with the local YMCA. Nancy was involved with dancing lessons, high school athletics, 4H, and a church youth group during her childhood and teenage years.

Nancy was married during the summer prior to student teaching and was living away from her husband during her student teaching experience. Nancy commuted to her home community on the weekends.

Nancy was raised in a small rural community in southwest Iowa. During her student teaching experience, Nancy lived with relatives in a large metropolitan area.

Nancy's father was a farmer and her mother was a homemaker. Nancy's mother nearly completed a college degree
in elementary education. Nancy's husband was a farmer in
their home community. Nancy and her husband had a rural home
in her home community.

Nancy is the oldest of three daughters. Her middle sister
was a college student majoring in elementary education and her
youngest sister was four years old.

Educational background. Nancy attended both elementary
and high school in small rural community schools. She entered
Iowa State University directly upon high school graduation to
pursue a major in home economics education and a minor in
coaching.

Self as a teacher. Nancy decided at a young age that she
wanted to be a teacher and a coach because of her experiences
with being a 4H Leader, a day camp teacher, a Bible school
teacher, and a Sunday school teacher. Nancy had successful
experiences in athletics during high school which helped her
decide that she would like to coach athletics along with her
teaching responsibilities. She was also encouraged to be a
teacher by her high school home economics and business
teachers. Both of these teachers, as well as her mother,
served as role models for Nancy.

Nancy believed that her family and her childhood
experiences played an important role in helping her determine
that she wanted to be a teacher. The following narrative
statement illustrates Nancy's thinking when she responded to, "From where do your beliefs, values, and attitudes about yourself as a teacher come?"

"I think [my beliefs, values, and attitudes] came from my family . . . from the way I was brought up. I was in 4H and was always a 4H Junior Leader. I was always helping kids learn through 4H. I was a Sunday school teacher . . . I feel like my values, beliefs, and attitudes were embedded in me from the way I was raised" (Nancy, Entrance Interview, Item 39, August, 1988).

From a quantitative perspective, Nancy referred to being a 4H member, 4H Junior Leader, day camp teacher, and Sunday school teacher nine times throughout the entrance interview. In each context, Nancy also referred to the significant contribution that her family made to her decision to become a teacher, not only through providing her with the opportunity to be involved in many diversified activities as a child and as a teenager but also in terms of providing emotional support throughout her degree program.

Mary

Personal background. Mary was a 43 year old non-traditional student teacher. She was approximately five feet three inches tall with "salt and pepper" colored hair.

Mary had been raised on a farm. Mary's father was a farmer and her mother was a teacher. Mary had two brothers, both of whom lived out-of-state. Mary's father passed away
approximately 2 years ago and her mother was living in an
apartment not far from Mary's home.

Mary was recently divorced after having been married for
23 years. During her student teaching, Mary was living in a
medium-sized community in a townhouse apartment complex with
two of her three children. Mary moved from a farm into a
city, moved from a large country home to an apartment, secured
a job as a bank teller, and began a second degree program at
Iowa State University all within one year of her divorce.

Mary had three children, all of whom were interested in
agriculture and raising farm animals. Her oldest child, a 19
year old daughter, was an agriculture student at Iowa State
University and lived with her paternal grandparents on a farm
in the same community where Mary lived. Her second child, a
17 year old son, was a junior in high school and lived with
Mary. Mary's two oldest children owned a farm together and
shared all of the farm-related responsibilities between them.

Mary's youngest child, a 13 year old son, was in seventh
grade and lived with Mary. He was physically handicapped.
Because he could not write, Mary was responsible for writing
his homework assignments on paper each night while he dictated
the information for the assignment to her. Mary continued
with this responsibility during her student teaching
experience.
Educational background. Mary returned to Iowa State University to pursue a degree in home economics education after having received a bachelor's degree in advertising 22 years earlier. Mary did not use her degree in advertising as a career.

Self as a teacher. Mary decided to earn a bachelor's degree in home economics education because: (a) through the years, she had a variety of hands-on practical experiences with home economics subject matter as well as several home economics elective hours on her transcript; (b) she had a variety of teaching experiences in non-formal settings over the years wherein Mary felt that she needed to be paid for what she was already doing; (c) she had personal experiences teaching her children and other children in the community; and (d) she was influenced by her mother.

Mary took several elective courses in home economics related subjects while earning her first bachelor's degree several years ago. When Mary decided to return to Iowa State University, it was important that as many of the courses as possible count for credit toward her second degree. Time was of the essence. Mary's lifestyle had changed and it was necessary for her to be financially self-supporting and to contribute financial support to her children as quickly as possible.
Mary spent her younger years as a full-time homemaker and a mother in a farming environment. During that time, Mary had many hands-on home economics related experiences (e.g., gardening, canning, quantity cookery during harvest, raising three children, judging 4H projects, and developing close family relationships) (Mary, Conversation with the Researcher, May, 1989).

Mary had non-formal teaching experiences with young people for 22 years prior to returning to Iowa State University. Her experiences included: (a) teaching church youth groups, Bible school, and Sunday school; (b) teaching workshops for 4H groups; and (c) working with the Future Farmers of America (FFA) in a teaching capacity.

Mary believed that her values, attitudes, and beliefs about herself as a teacher originated first from her own personal experiences with children.

"I learned [how to be a teacher] from raising my own kids. I worked with lots of youth groups. I've just spent hours enjoying children ever since I was a young person. I've always wanted young people in my home. [I've wanted to] give them all the experiences I could to help start them out in life" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 39, January, 1989).

Related to Mary's attitude toward teaching young people, Mary believed that she also had some special educational experiences with her youngest son which helped her believe that she was destined to be a teacher. To the entrance
interview item, "List the personal values you hold that will have a direct influence on learners," Mary responded as follows:

"I've grown so much since [my youngest son] has been in my life. I believe that there are all kinds of learners . . . handicapped . . . average . . . talented and gifted . . . in this world. I respect each person. My son has taught me the joy of learning and I want to meet all kids where they are" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 41, January, 1989).

When Mary responded to why she wanted to be a teacher, she said:

"It feels natural to me. Even when I don't know I'm teaching, I'm teaching. When I was in the hospital for five years with my youngest son, I practically lived in the hospital with him. To pass the time when my son was sleeping or in surgery, I was teaching. I was doing everything I could to help other children [in the hospital] adapt to their lifestyles that they were in for the moment. I did it without even knowing it and became very good at it (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 49, January, 1989).

Mary believed that her mother played an important role in helping her decide to pursue a teaching degree. As a child, Mary watched her mother progress through several levels of teacher certification.

For example, Mary's mother taught in a country school. She then attended college to get a two-year teaching certificate. Over the years, Mary's mother attended college to earn a bachelor's degree in elementary education. At age 54, Mary's mother earned a master's degree in education. At
76, Mary's mother was a substitute teacher in the community where they lived and was making future plans to tutor pupils in a local community college in a new community. Mary expressed much admiration for the dedication that her mother had toward education and toward helping pupils learn (Mary, *Conversation With the Researcher*, May, 1989).

Mary referred to the importance of her mother's influence and to her family background and personal experiences with children 24 times in the entrance interview. Mary's responses indicated that family and life experiences played an important role in her decision to become a teacher.

**Tracy**

*Personal background.* Tracy was a 39 year old non-traditional student teacher. She was approximately five feet five inches tall with brunette hair. Tracy worked many years in a telephone office prior to returning to Iowa State University to finish her bachelor's degree.

Tracy was born and raised in a large metropolitan community, the same area in which she student taught. Both of Tracy's parents were teachers.

Tracy was married and had three daughters ranging from 6 to 10 years of age. Tracy's husband was a businessman.
Educational background. Tracy completed two years of coursework at Iowa State University 18 years ago and then recently returned to Iowa State University to finish her degree in home economics education.

Self as a teacher. Tracy knew that she "always wanted to be a teacher" because of the influence that both of her parents had on her when she was a child and because she had "always believed that kids were neat" (Tracy, *Entrance Interview*, Item 47, January, 1989). Tracy grew up in an education-oriented environment and she enjoyed her parents' involvement with pupils. Tracy also gained teaching experience through helping her young children with their homework. Tracy perceived the opportunity to finish the degree that she had started as a "miracle" or a "dream come true" (Tracy, *Insights*, May, 1989).

Tracy attributed much of the credit for her life-long decision to be a teacher to her parents. Insight into Tracy's thought processes are presented in the following narrative. The entrance interview item to which Tracy responded was, "From where do your beliefs, values, and attitudes about yourself as a teacher come?"

"I imagine this would go back to when I was a small child. Both of my parents were teachers, so I grew up in an educational atmosphere all my life. [My attitudes, values, and beliefs] come from my parents. Actually, what they believed [about education] are my [beliefs] also. I would have to say that my parents are
the largest source of my values" (Tracy, Entrance Interview, Item 39, January, 1989).

Tracy responded to "Where did you learn your teaching skills?" with the following narrative:

"I see my teaching skills as being ones I learned almost from infancy from my parents" (Tracy, Entrance Interview, Item 40, January, 1989).

Tracy responded to "Why did you choose to become a teacher?" with the following narrative:

"I've always thought of myself as a teacher. I think that comes from having two teachers as parents and seeing them as role models for their students. I grew up in a teaching environment . . . it was easy for me to fall into . . . I've always thought of myself as a teacher" (Tracy, Entrance Interview, Item 49, January, 1989).

Tracy indicated that she was not influenced to become a teacher by former classroom teachers. However, Tracy has a clear picture of a teacher prototype in her mind prior to student teaching:

"I had several teachers that were really my favorite but not one in particular. There were a group of many that I really liked. They were the ones who really liked children; who knew what they were doing and really liked the students that they had. They were the teachers who took extra time to explain things if the kids needed a second or third explanation" (Tracy, Entrance Interview, Item 1, January, 1989).

"I don't think any of my past teachers influenced me very much at all. I'd say that the teachers that influenced me most I never had in class. Both of my parents were teachers and being involved in their homeside of teaching probably influenced me more than any teacher I had" (Tracy, Entrance Interview, Item 2, January, 1989).
Summary

Personal and educational backgrounds. All four student teachers were born and raised in the midwest. Three of the four student teachers (Heather, Nancy, and Mary) were raised in small rural communities. Tracy was raised in a large metropolitan area. All four student teachers had brothers and sisters. Heather and Mary were not married; Nancy and Tracy were married. Mary and Tracy each had three children. Three of the four student teachers (Nancy, Mary, and Tracy) had attended Iowa State University for four years while earning a degree in home economics education. Heather transferred to Iowa State University after attending a community college for two years. Mary and Tracy returned to Iowa State University to either finish the degree that had been started several years earlier or to pursue a second degree in home economics education. All four student teachers in this study were raised in families where one or both parents were teachers.

Selves as teachers. According to Crow (1987a), part of a teacher role identity (TRI) is constructed from beliefs about selves as teachers and is influenced by former teachers, previous teaching experiences, and childhood experiences. All four student teachers in this study
provided specific reasons for why they perceived themselves as teachers.

Heather wanted the opportunity to "give kids a good start in life." Nancy had always seen herself as a teacher because she was "always helping kids learn through 4H." Mary perceived teaching as "natural" to her because of the variety of past teaching experiences that she had encountered. Tracy learned how to teach "almost from infancy" from being raised in a family where both parents were teachers.

All four student teachers reported being influenced by former teachers, previous teaching experiences, and/or childhood (or earlier) experiences. Heather and Nancy, traditional student teachers, were directly influenced to become teachers by specific important high school teachers. Both were influenced to become home economics teachers by their high school home economics teachers. Nancy was further influenced to become a teacher by her business teacher.

Mary and Tracy, non-traditional student teachers, were not directly influenced by specific high school teachers whom they could recall. However, Mary clearly remembered how she was "treated" by one teacher, a divergent teacher. This experience was negative at the time that it happened
but with internal synthesis, the memory became a positive, 
influencing memory. Specific information on how Mary was 
influenced by a former teacher is found in Chapter VII. 
Tracy was influenced by specific character traits from many 
teachers (e.g., those who liked pupils, those who "knew what 
they were doing"; those who "took extra time to explain 
things"). However, Tracy was strongly influenced to become a 
teacher through parental influence. Both of Tracy's 
parents were teachers.

Three of the four student teachers (Heather, Nancy, and 
Mary) reported being influenced to become teachers from past 
teaching experiences in non-formal settings. Teaching 
experiences included swimming lessons, 4H Junior Leader 
experiences, Future Farmers of America activities, and 
various church-related experiences. Mary reported that she 
had been influenced to become a teacher because of the 
experiences that she encountered while helping her 
handicapped child learn.

All four student teachers reported specific childhood or 
earlier experiences as being influential in their teacher 
role identities (TRIs). Heather reported being strongly 
influenced by the relationship she enjoyed with her family 
as well as her school-related experiences. Nancy was 
actively involved in dance lessons, high school athletic
activities, and 4H Junior Leader activities. Nancy also enjoyed a close relationship with her family. Mary and Tracy were directly influenced to become teachers by one or both parents who were teachers and through their own parental roles.
CHAPTER VI.

STUDENT TEACHING PLACEMENT SITES

This section provides specific information about the eight home economics student teaching placement sites as well as the eight cooperating teachers who participated in this study. This information is provided to the reader to enhance the external reliability of this study.

The data for this section were collected through researcher observations of student and cooperating teachers and from discussions with building principals. The discussions with principals were not audio taped. The researcher made contextual notes regarding the school facilities during on-site observations. The data collected on individual cooperating teachers were collected through audio and script-taped observations.

Heather

Site 1. Heather's first eight week student teaching experience was in a new, modern facility with approximately 1178 students enrolled in grades 9 through 12. The site was located in a suburban community with a population of 17,000.
This community serves as a "bedroom" community for a large metropolitan area.

The home economics facilities consisted of two six-station foods laboratories, a large clothing laboratory, and a lecture/classroom. Heather had a vast amount of recent resource material available for her use during her first student teaching experience. Heather also had access to a convenience called "The Print Shop." This duplication service was provided to all faculty members and the service guaranteed a 24-hour turn-around time for all materials submitted for duplication. Heather had an office space and access to a computer. The entire school facility was decorated in bright colors with modern equipment.

Cooperating teacher 1. Heather's first cooperating teacher was approximately 40 to 45 years of age. She was small in stature and she dressed professionally. She had approximately 13 years of experience teaching home economics. Heather's first cooperating teacher valued a neat, orderly environment, a task-oriented approach to the teaching/learning process, and an on-task learning environment. She valued helping pupils achieve their fullest potential by expecting the best from them and by helping them reach their goals. Heather's first cooperating teacher was the home economics department head in a two-teacher home economics department.
Site 2. Heather's second student teaching experience was in a small rural, farming community. There were approximately 250 students enrolled in grades 7 through 12. The facilities were older yet well-maintained. The home economics facilities consisted of one six-station foods laboratory and one multi-purpose room that served as a combination clothing laboratory and lecture facility. A small room adjacent to the foods laboratory served as a combination office and storage area. The two home economics rooms were separated by a long, narrow hallway. Heather had access to a wide variety of community resource people because the school was located fairly close to a large metropolitan community. However, due to budget constraints, teaching resources were somewhat limited. The home economics facility was well-maintained, neat, and orderly.

Cooperating teacher 2. Heather's second cooperating teacher was approximately 45 to 50 years of age. She was small in stature and dressed professionally. She had approximately 20 years of experience teaching home economics. Heather's second cooperating teacher valued using a wide range of community people as resources for her classroom, individualized instruction, and preparing information relevant for rural pupils. Heather's second cooperating teacher taught in a single-teacher home economics department.
Nancy

Site 1. Nancy's first student teaching experience was in a middle school located in a large metropolitan community. There were approximately 800 students enrolled in grades 6 through 8. The home economics facility consisted of one exceptionally large room. However, the room was somewhat small during some class periods given that there were an average of 30 pupils in each class. There were two rows of tables situated in the center of the room. The foods laboratory space was located along two adjacent walls and the clothing laboratory space was located on the other two walls. Nancy had access to a good selection of recent textbooks for pupils to use.

Cooperating teacher 1. Nancy's first cooperating teacher was approximately 40 to 45 years of age. She was tall in stature and professionally dressed. She had approximately 15 years of experience teaching home economics. Nancy's first cooperating teacher valued hands-on activities, a quick teaching/learning pace, and an orderly environment.

Site 2. Nancy's second student teaching experience was in a small rural community. There were approximately 250 students enrolled in grades 7 through 12. The school building was fairly old yet well-maintained. The home economics
facilities consisted of one eight-station foods laboratory and a combination clothing laboratory/lecture room. The equipment in the foods and clothing laboratories was new and up-to-date.

Cooperating teacher 2. Nancy's second cooperating teacher was approximately 50-55 years old. She was small in stature and dressed professionally. She had approximately 23 years of experience teaching home economics. Nancy's second cooperating teacher valued a family-like atmosphere, individualized instruction, and preparing lessons that would meet the needs of the student in the community. Nancy's second cooperating teacher also valued the Future Homemaker's of America (FHA/HERO) vocational student organization.

Mary

Site 1. Mary's first student teaching experience was in a middle school located in a large metropolitan community. There were approximately 800 students enrolled in grades 6 through 8. Parts of the school facility were modern and parts of the school facility were older. The home economics area consisted of a clothing laboratory room that was shared with a different subject matter teacher and a combination eight-station foods laboratory/lecture room. The combination room was fairly small and crowded given that there were approximately 30 students per class period using the room.
The home economics facilities were fairly modern and well-maintained.

**Cooperating teacher 1.** Mary's first cooperating teacher was approximately 50 to 55 years of age. She was small in stature and dressed professionally. She had approximately 25 years of experience teaching home economics. Mary's first cooperating teacher valued a neat, orderly classroom.

**Site 2.** Mary's second student teaching experience was in a new modern facility with approximately 1178 student enrolled in grades 9 through 12. The home economics facilities consisted of two six-station foods laboratories, a large clothing laboratory, and a lecture/classroom. Mary had a vast amount of recent resource material available for her use during her student teaching experience. Mary also had access to a convenience called "The Print Shop." This duplication service was provided to all faculty members and the service guaranteed a 24-hour turn-around time for all materials submitted for duplication. Mary had an office space and access to a computer. The entire school facility was decorated in bright colors with modern equipment.

**Cooperating teacher 2.** Mary's second cooperating teacher was short in stature and dressed professionally. She was approximately 45 to 50 years of age. She had approximately 20 years of experience teaching home economics. She was part of
a two-teacher home economics department with the other home economics teacher serving as department head. Mary's second cooperating teacher valued pupil creativity and a neat, orderly environment.

Tracy

**Site 1.** Tracy's first student teaching experience was in a large metropolitan community in a large high school with approximately 1700 students enrolled in grades 9 through 12. The school facility was fairly new and well-maintained. The home economics facility was one large multi-purpose room consisting of one eight-station foods laboratory with lecture-room tables located away from the foods laboratories. There was a foods demonstration unit located in front of the lecture tables. The clothing laboratory equipment was located on the other side of the lecture room tables. The home economics facility was modern and up-to-date.

**Cooperating teacher 1.** Tracy's first cooperating teacher was approximately 50 to 55 years old. She was fairly tall in stature and dressed professionally. She had approximately 30 years of experience teaching home economics. Tracy's first cooperating teacher valued a warm teaching/learning atmosphere and projects relevant to pupils from a metropolitan community.
Site 2. Tracy's second student teaching experience was in a large metropolitan middle school with approximately 750 students enrolled in grades 6 through 8. The school facilities were new and modern. The home economics facility consisted of one multi-purpose room which housed a six-unit foods laboratory, approximately 30 sewing machines, and tables for pupils situated in the center of the room. The laboratory equipment was modern and up-to-date.

Cooperating teacher 2. Tracy's second cooperating teacher was approximately 50 to 55 years of age. She was fairly tall in stature and dressed professionally. She had approximately 26 years of experience teaching home economics. Tracy's second cooperating teacher valued strict pupil discipline, on-task teaching techniques, and an on-task learning environment.
CHAPTER VII.
ENTRANCE INTERVIEWS

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to describe the process through which student teachers selectively acquire the attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge current in the teaching profession. In responses to entrance interview schedules, how do four student teachers perceive that their teacher role development will be influenced by student teaching? How do four student teachers perceive that they will be socialized into the teaching profession? Or, have four student teachers already been socialized into the teaching profession as a result of prior life experiences? Do the socialization variables, as cited in the literature, impact the teacher socialization process for four student teachers?

Chapter I provided a comprehensive review of the literature for each of the 11 socialization variables that have been cited as impacting the teacher socialization process. Recent socialization researchers consider the influence of life experiences pre-dating student teaching or
student teacher biography on the development of teaching perceptions, values, ideas, and behaviors (Lortie, 1975; Stephens, 1969; Wright & Tuska, 1968; Zeichner & Grant, 1981) as having a powerful effect on the teacher socialization process. There is evidence in the literature supporting the idea that student teachers have expectations about teaching and preconceived notions about teachers prior to student teaching (Crow, 1987a). Researchers who support the impact of socializing variables and/or the impact from experiences predating student teaching suggest that socialization is a unidirectional process.

Four student teachers provide verbatim information as they respond to items about each socializing variable on the entrance interview schedule (e.g., key individuals, ecological characteristics of classrooms, school bureaucracy). The purpose of this chapter is to provide insight into each student teachers' pre-student teaching thoughts and life experiences related to teaching and to provide a historical perspective on who these student teachers are as preservice teachers as they enter the student teaching component of the teacher education programs.

For example, how did student teachers perceive that they were or would be influenced by each socializing variable? How did the student teachers perceive that they would interact
with socializing variables inherent in their student teaching placement sites? How did student teachers perceive themselves as teachers prior to student teaching?

Throughout this chapter, the underlined words or phrases in the student teachers' responses are those words or phrases that were emphasized by the students while audio taping the entrance interview. The words or phrases in brackets have been added by the researcher for clarity of response. The summary at the end of this chapter will present student teacher similarities and differences by socialization variable.

The entrance interview schedule is found in Appendix C. Each student teacher was asked to respond to two or three items in each of the 11 socialization variables. Mary responded to 61 and Tracy responded to 54 of the 63 items on the entrance interview schedule. Both of these student teachers are non-traditional student teachers. Heather and Nancy, traditional student teachers, responded to two or three items in each socialization variable.

**Key Individuals**

Items for this socialization variable address how student teachers perceived that their teacher role identities were influenced by family, friends, and former teachers. Student
teachers were asked to: (a) describe the favorite teacher or a teacher that they perceived had the greatest impact on them as pupils in the classroom; (b) explain how that favorite teacher influenced them to become teachers; (c) describe how the teaching techniques used by their favorite teacher(s) would be similar to or different from the techniques that they perceive that they will utilize in their student teaching experiences; and (d) describe the influence that family and friends will have on them as they progress through their student teaching experiences.

Heather. When responding to key individuals who had influenced her thinking about teaching in general, and teaching as a career, Heather, a 22-year-old traditional student teacher, quickly presented a vivid description of her favorite high school teacher and the impact that this teacher had on her while she was a pupil in the classroom.

"That's simple! It was my high school home economics teacher. I tell you what, she was wonderful! Not only did she know her stuff, she had this way of bringing out the best in everybody . . . even [students] that weren't so popular. She had a way of making them feel incredible. And she was just so encouraging and you WANTED to go to her class. Guys and gals wanted to go to her class. She was firm and yet you wanted to respect her so she really never had any discipline problems. No one wanted to disrespect her. She was just a really neat lady. She became a really good friend of mine". (Heather, Entrance Interview, Item 1, August, 1968).
When asked how Heather perceived that her teaching methodology would be similar to or different from her favorite teachers' methodology, Heather responded as follows:

"So many of [my favorite teacher's] techniques are what I wanna be like. She influenced me to go to college; to go into home economics and, one day, reach students like she reached us. I perceive that many of my techniques will be similar to hers . . . like encouraging students. I feel I am pretty good at that and learned that from her. I can't think of any techniques that would be different cause she's just my role model; my number one person that I wanna be like" (Heather, Entrance Interview, Item 2, August, 1988).

Heather perceived that the teaching techniques she will utilize and the way she will interact with pupils as their teacher will closely resemble the techniques and interactions she experienced as a pupil in her favorite high school teacher's classroom. Heather has a clearly formulated belief about how she will interact with pupils in a teaching/learning environment prior to actually entering the classroom as a student teacher. Heather's response is also consistent with Lortie's (1975) teacher socialization theory regarding the powerful influence that student teacher biography has on the teacher socialization process.

**Nancy.** Key socializing individuals in Nancy's life included high school teachers and her family. Nancy perceived that her high school home economics and business teachers had an impact on her thinking related to how teachers 'ought' to
facilitate learning in the classroom. Nancy responded as follows:

"I think the teacher that had the most impact on me would have been my home economics and typing teachers... because they maintained a classroom where students could learn and they helped you to learn by the way that the classroom was ran. They were tough but didn't make it impossible to learn. They got along with students and they were not only a teacher but a friend. They weren't hard-core all the time" (Nancy, Entrance Interview, Item 1, August, 1988).

Prior to student teaching, Nancy believed that, in order to have an impact on pupils in classrooms, a teacher was helpful, fair, strict but not too strict, and not "hard-core" all the time. Nancy had the notion, prior to student teaching, that good teachers created a teaching/learning atmosphere that was conducive to learning.

Nancy also perceived that her family had an influence on her during her student teaching, the same kind of influence that they had on her throughout her college education. At this point, Nancy revealed that her mother and other members of her family were prepared as educators.

"I think my family will have a good influence on me during my student teaching experience. They've been very involved with me during my education... helped me through it... my worst and best times. And not only that, my mother was a teacher and so was other members of my family" (Nancy, Entrance Interview, Item 5, August, 1988).

Based on a conversation between Nancy and the researcher, Nancy's mother had a profound influence on Nancy's perceptions
of herself as a teacher through serving as a role model 
(Nancy, Conversation With the Researcher, October, 1988).

Mary. Mary could not recall a favorite teacher who had an 
impact on her as a learner or who had served as a key 
individual in her teacher role development. However, Mary 
provided insight on how she was affected as a pupil in a 
classroom by one teacher. Mary responded with the following 
narrative:

"I think one of the hardest teachers I ever had was a 
divergent teacher. She never allowed me to feel like I 
had accomplished anything! She frustrated me, but now I 
see [divergent thinking] as one of the greatest lessons I 
ever learned. Now I would like to inspire people to be 
divergent thinkers and make a little difference" (Mary, 
Enterance Interview, Item 2, January, 1989).

Mary cited one incident from her childhood that may have 
influenced her thinking on how pupils 'ought' to be taught in 
classrooms. The incident was negative in nature yet left a 
lasting impression on Mary to the extent that Mary would like 
to "help" her pupils become divergent thinkers.

Mary believed that her family and friends would have a 
positive influence on her during her student teaching.

"Most of my friends have been super supportive; they can 
hardly believe I'm practically through with this second 
degree. They give me the feeling they're in awe and I 
don't understand . . . any one of them could do the same 
thing if they just wanted to. But, I suppose at my age, 
[going back to college] is non-traditional. Most of my 
friends are super supportive, yet there are those who 
don't understand why I need to do this [get a second 
degree]" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 4, January, 
1989).
"My children are very, very supportive. They pitch right in and help ... like if I have a lot of studying to do, [my daughter] will help [my youngest son] with homework. They [children] are very supportive of one another" (Mary, *Entrance Interview*, Item 5, January, 1989).

In a study based on data collected on traditional student teachers, Manning (1977) reported that family and friends appeared to have a less significant influence on the teacher socialization process than did favorite teachers, cooperating teachers, and student teacher supervisors. In Mary's case, however, it appears that her family and friends will have a perceived significant impact on her socialization into the profession through being supportive and helping her with family responsibilities. Mary reported that "without the support of my family and friends, I wouldn't have made it" (Mary, *Conversation With the Researcher*, May, 1989).

**Tracy.** When responding to key individuals in her teacher socialization process, Tracy provided categorical information regarding the impact that character traits of former teachers had on her as a learner. Tracy responded as follows:

"I had several teachers that really were my favorites. I don't see any standing out by themselves ... but a group of many that I really liked. They were the ones who really liked children and who knew what they were doing. They were the teachers who took the extra time to explain things if the kids needed a second or third explanation" (Tracy, *Entrance Interview*, Item 1, January, 1989).
Tracy recalled the manner in which she was treated as a pupil when thinking about favorite teachers or teachers who had an impact on her decision to become a teacher. She remembered a group of teachers who liked children and who were knowledgeable. When Tracy responded to whether or not a favorite teacher influenced her to become a teacher, Tracy provided telling information about how her parents influenced her to become a teacher:

"I don't think [teachers in my past] had very much influence on me at all! I'd say that the teachers that influenced me most were ones whom I never had in class. Both of my parents were teachers. Being involved with their homeside of the teaching probably influenced me more than any teacher that I had" (Tracy, Entrance Interview, Item 2, January, 1989).

Tracy perceived that her friends, aside from fellow classmates, would not influence her student teaching experiences. However, her family would influence her student teaching experiences.

"My friends won't have any influence at all! [Coming back to school] is my decision and this is what I'm going to do! The friends that I've made while being back at school may have a little influence. I can foresee talking to each other and sharing ideas . . . a kind of support system there, but I don't see neighborhood, church, or family friends having influence on my student teaching" (Tracy, Entrance Interview, Item 4, January, 1989).

Karmos and Jacko (1977) reported that peers influence the socialization of student teachers through providing emotional or collegial support by sharing 'ordeals' on cooperating
teachers and university supervisors. Tracy had the notion, prior to student teaching, that her peers would serve as a support network and that her friends would not have an influence on her during her student teaching experiences.

Tracy, a mother of three elementary-aged children, believed that her family will play an influential role in her life as she progresses through her student teaching experiences. Regardless of how taxing student teaching is on her time, Tracy believes that the needs of her immediate family will always be her first priority.

"I see [my immediate family] as having a big influence as to how hard it is to get my work done. Already having gone through a year and a half back at school . . . when [my children] cooperate, things run smoothly. I have to say that my children and family do come first. My family has always been the biggest influence in my life. When I was little; when I was growing up; and when I had my own children. I have to take care of their needs and then my schoolwork is the next priority" (Tracy, Entrance Interview, Item 5, January, 1989).

Cooperating Teacher/University Supervisor

Items in the cooperating teacher/university supervisor section center around student teachers' perceptions of the cooperating teachers' roles during their student teaching experiences and what student teachers expected to learn from cooperating teachers and university supervisors. This section
also addresses student teachers' perceptions about taking advice from cooperating teachers.

**Heather.** Heather responded to this section by addressing her perceptions of how her cooperating teachers and the university supervisor would interact with her in her student teaching experiences rather than addressing specific roles assumed by her cooperating teachers and university supervisor. Heather perceived that her cooperating teachers were going to "watch" her as she planned and implemented lessons and would assist her if and when she needed help . . . or to be her "guardian angels." Heather met her first cooperating teacher prior to responding to the entrance interview schedule. From her preliminary impressions of her first cooperating teacher, Heather responded as follows:

"[My cooperating teacher will be] my guardian angel!! I don't think that my cooperating teacher will interject *alot*, unless I ask her to. She'll just be there in case I need her, like a guardian angel! I think she's the type of lady that is gunna offer help if I want it but otherwise [will] sit back and let me do my thing. I guess I perceive the role [of a cooperating teacher] as someone to lean on or someone to give you freedom. She [will be] a role model for me . . . to watch, observe, pick up techniques from" (Heather, *Entrance Interview*, Item 6, August, 1988).

Heather had an immediate and clear idea about how her cooperating teachers, or at least her first cooperating teacher, would contribute to her student teaching experience. Based on several telephone conversations with the researcher
(August, 1988), the researcher believes that Heather was describing her high school home economics teacher as she presented her perceptions of the role of her cooperating teachers in her student teaching experiences. Her cooperating teachers would support her and allow her the freedom to learn how to facilitate learning. Heather's perceptions supported Lortie's (1975) socialization theory suggesting that student teacher biography plays a powerful role in the student teacher socialization process.

Heather had unclear perceptions of the role of a university supervisor at the time of the entrance interview. Heather assumed that the university supervisor would have evaluative power in her student teaching experience.

"I'm not sure. The university supervisor will be someone to tell me what I really need to work on; someone that might be a little more harsh. I don't know why I perceive it that way . . . just someone to grade me. I know she's not always gunna be there so I will be more nervous when she comes. (She will be) someone to catch my mess-ups and help me out . . . maybe a once-a-month counselor. I just see her as not being as close to me as my cooperating teacher" (Heather, Entrance Interview, Item 7, August, 1988).

Edgar and Warren (1969) argued that student teachers gravitate toward professionals who have evaluative power. Heather's pre-student teaching responses do not support Edgar and Warren's findings. Heather was not sure about exactly what role a university supervisor would play in her student
teaching experiences. In a conversation with the researcher (August, 1968), Heather indicated that she had not thought about the role of a university supervisor prior to the entrance interview.

**Nancy.** Nancy believed that one role of her cooperating teachers would be to help her grow as a teacher by allowing her to experiment with different teaching techniques. However, Nancy also had a fairly clear notion of a role that she did not want her cooperating teachers to assume. Nancy wanted to learn how to facilitate learning; she did not want to be an assistant for her cooperating teachers.

"I feel my cooperating teachers should help me learn and help me find better ways to deal with different learners and also to let me experiment with teaching techniques myself, and to find out what types of teaching [styles] work best for me and not just fire the work they want done all the time. I see that [cooperating teachers] must have a little guidance because it is their classroom" (Nancy, Entrance Interview, Item 6, August, 1968).

Nancy provided information relative to how she perceived taking advice and suggestions from her cooperating teachers. Nancy's words on the audio tape were spoken slowly and with hesitation:

"I feel that the cooperating teachers need to offer their advice and suggestions. You can try [suggestions from the cooperating teachers] but every individual is different. You need to take their advice and suggestions to find out which ones [suggestions] will work with your style of teaching or which ones will fit the way you feel about things or what works for you. But, different teachers may be able to apply different things to make [the teaching
technique work" (Nancy, Entrance Interview, Item 7, August, 1988).

Nancy believed that cooperating teachers needed to offer advice and suggestions and that she could try to implement the suggestions presented to her. However, Nancy also indicated that every individual is different. Nancy believed that she had some teaching techniques and ideas that she wanted to explore while student teaching, even if those techniques and ideas were different from her cooperating teachers' techniques and ideas.

Mary. Mary's perceptions of the role of cooperating teachers were presented from the cooperating teacher's point of view. Mary responded as follows:

"I think I would really like [the cooperating teacher] to be a person who feels she's doing her best if she's sharing every piece of information she can to help me be the best I can... what worked for her and what doesn't work for her. I want her to give me constructive criticism. The cooperating teacher will be a person that really cares that I do become the very best person I can in the classroom" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 6, January, 1989).

Mary believed that cooperating teachers' roles in her student teaching experiences were to share successful and unsuccessful teaching strategies with Mary. Mary perceived that cooperating teachers were people who purposefully guided student teachers in ways that would help student teachers learn how to facilitate learning.
Mary perceived the role of the university supervisor as probably someone who would help student teachers if they needed help. However, Mary did not understand why university supervisors needed to be a part of her student teaching experiences.

"I don't understand why there really needs to be a university supervisor. If the cooperating teacher has been approved by the university, then the trust level has to be pretty high for that cooperating teacher. I find it difficult to understand how a university supervisor can come in a half a day or a day and see a holistic picture of what's happening. Probably the university supervisor should come in case a student teacher needs some help or something" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 7, January, 1969).

Mary provided information about what she expected to learn from her cooperating teachers with the following narrative. After Mary thought about what she expected to learn from her cooperating teachers, she determined that cooperating teachers could not "teach" her what she hoped to learn throughout her student teaching experiences.

"I haven't really given that any thought. I would like to get to know each one of the learners from their world and see if I could meet them where they are. I don't think any cooperating teacher can help me do that! I think it's an experience that has to do with being personable with learners and being able to separate worlds and with how to touch worlds with each other. I think it has to do with learning how to talk with learners and building trust levels where they feel like they can talk and share with you. I just don't expect my cooperating teacher to be able to help me with that. I suppose she's setting a good example that I'm not aware of" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 8, January, 1969).
Responding to advice and suggestions from cooperating teachers was a topic that sparked telling information about Mary as a person. Even though Mary indicated that she would not be adverse to taking advice and suggestions from her cooperating teachers, Mary had a clearly delineated philosophy on the power of her personal belief system.

"I'm pretty much all for taking suggestions and advice from cooperating teachers. However, I do not think that the cooperating teachers and university supervisors are gods. I think I have a lot to learn from their experiences and I am very willing to listen to them, always, but then I'll decide for myself what will work and won't work for me. I do not think I have to be a model after my cooperating teacher or my university supervisor. I think they can offer a lot and I don't ever want to be defensive. I'd always like to be a really good listener, thinking that they probably have a good reason for offering advice or suggestions. I might even try some of the things they are saying, but I'm not sure I'll always feel that I have to be in agreement with them" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 9, January, 1989).

This particular pre-student teaching response supports Lortie's (1975) socialization theory that student teacher biography plays a powerful role in the teacher socialization process. Mary is clear about how she would respond to advice and suggestions from her cooperating teachers and her university supervisor. Apparently, Mary has developed a personal philosophy about how she will interact with people in her environment regardless of the setting.

Tracy. Tracy provided information about the role of cooperating teachers and university supervisors in her student
teaching experience in a soft, pensive manner on the audio tape:

"I don't know. I see my cooperating teacher as letting me spread my wings . . . letting me try things that I want to try but also shaping me and molding me . . . guiding my techniques and my teaching" (Tracy, Entrance Interview, Item 6, January, 1989).

"I don't know. I see my university supervisor as someone who comes to observe me and spot checks to make sure that I'm doing what I'm supposed to be doing . . . that I'm growing into the kind of teacher that they want you to be . . . that you have a good relationship with your cooperating teacher as well as the students" (Tracy, Entrance Interview, Item 7, January, 1989).

Tracy did not have strong perceptions about how she would relate to her cooperating teachers or university supervisors. However, Tracy perceived that the university supervisor would have expectations about how she should grow as a teacher.

When Tracy responded to what she expected to learn from her cooperating teachers about how to teach learners, Tracy responded in the following narrative:

"I would expect my cooperating teachers to guide me in different teaching methods. If a method is not working, help me to find another method to reach kids . . . to support me. If I have something that's working well, then encourage me to continue using that method and try it again in a different manner" (Tracy, Entrance Interview, Item 8, January, 1989).

Tracy's pre-student teaching perceptions about the role of cooperating teachers and university supervisor might support Marso and Pigge's (1986) findings which suggest that student
teachers describe the cooperating teacher's influence as being primarily in the personal support and role development.

Responding to taking advice and suggestions from her cooperating teachers and university supervisor sparked a different response from Tracy. On the audio tape, Tracy spoke louder and with a pronounced personal conviction when answering the item.

"I think, in some situations, it would be very wise to listen to them and to take suggestions . . . use different methods of instruction. But, at the same time, if you feel strongly about something, you may have to go with the flow, so to speak, to complete student teaching and then you may revive your own method and try it, the same way or maybe a little differently, in your own classroom. But, I think, for the most part, they would have a lot of good ideas" (Tracy, Entrance Interview, Item 9, January, 1989).

Ecological Characteristics of the Classroom

The ecological characteristics of the classroom section addresses student teachers' perceptions of the influence of classroom settings including space, resources, and equipment on their teacher development. Items also addressed the perceived influence that geographic location of the placement site would have on student teachers' attitudes, values, and beliefs about teaching.

Heather. Heather interpreted the word "location" to mean a school building or her particular student teaching placement site rather than the geographic location of the placement.
site. As she thought about her first student teaching placement site, she compared her medium-sized and small-sized student teaching placement sites to how she may have been influenced should she have been placed in a large metropolitan site. Heather reported that:

"I don't think the location will influence my attitudes, values, and beliefs about teaching. I think I have been assigned good situations. If I were assigned bigger schools where there were problem kids, I might harden a few of my values and attitudes. Right now I have this wonderful idea of teaching and of reaching all the students but I think I'd be influenced negatively if I was in an inner city school. These attitudes might be hardened a bit and I might become more realistic so the location matters somewhat" (Heather, Entrance Interview, Item 12, August, 1988).

At this point, Heather provided information relative to her philosophy on self as teacher, or one aspect of her teacher role identity (Crow, 1987a). Heather believed, in her medium-sized school placement site, that she would have a better chance to "reach" more pupils than she would have in a larger placement site. At the end of her narrative, Heather presented a hint of awareness in terms of knowing that her philosophy on self as teacher might be unrealistic. Heather entered her student teaching experience with a preconceived idea of who she was as a teacher. She had a "wonderful idea of teaching" and she had a deep desire to "reach all the pupils."
Heather presented her perceptions on how she would be influenced by her first student teaching classroom environment in the following narrative:

"I think [I will be influenced] alot because I am placed in a more financially well-off school whereas at other schools you don't have as many resources. The school I'm in is so exciting cause it's all so professional. There's computers, a beautiful home economics room, equipment, anything I want ... it just makes me feel so professional already and I'm so excited to go there. I think if you didn't have the equipment and you were in a more dreary setting it would tend to get me down and maybe not feel quite as professional" (Heather, Entrance Interview, Item 11, August, 1988).

Heather presented more information about how she perceived teaching, in general, rather than responding only to the positive ecological characteristics of the classroom in her first student teaching placement site. Her first placement site was a modern facility. Heather visited the site prior to responding to the entrance interview schedule. Her enthusiasm about the site itself, the resources available to her as a teacher, and the prospect of teaching in a site where she will feel "so professional" might indicate that Heather had been socialized prior to student teaching about the kind of school in which she would like to teach.

Nancy. The item that Nancy responded to was, "How will the classroom environment influence your thinking about teaching."

"The classroom environment could have a great influence on my thinking as far as space and resources and equipment
goes. If you have a school that doesn't have much of that and you don't have much support to get the things in the classroom that you need, it would be tough and it might seem to hurt your thinking of being a teacher. However, I came from a smaller school and we didn't have quite as much stuff and I can see where we can get by" (Heather, Entrance Interview, Item 11, August, 1968).

Nancy presented the notion that, in order to facilitate learning, teachers need at least minimal resources and teachers need administrative support. Without minimal resources and administrative support, Nancy perceived that her attitude toward teaching might be negatively influenced. Nancy recalled the education she received as a pupil in a setting with limited resources and acknowledged that the limited resources were adequate for her education.

When asked to respond to the effect that geographic location would have on her attitudes, values, and beliefs about teaching, Nancy, like Heather, interpreted the word "location" to mean a specific student teaching placement site. Nancy knew that she would be student teaching in a large metropolitan area for her first student teaching experience.

"Being from a smaller school, it's gunna be difficult for me to go to a larger school where discipline is handled differently; the attitudes of the kids are different; the attitudes and values of the families are different. I feel the location could, if you have a bad time as far as the students and parents go, affect you negatively on your attitudes of teaching. However, if you have a good experience, it could really help [your attitude], too" (Nancy, Entrance Interview, Item 12, August, 1988).
Nancy expressed thoughts, and possibly fears, about student teaching in a large school setting for her first student teaching experience. A similar fear was addressed in the Lipka and Goulet (1979) study that addressed changes in teacher attitudes toward the profession. The authors suggest that there is a negative shift in attitude toward teaching when a student teacher is placed in a site significantly different from the one they experienced as pupils in classrooms and that such a placement has a negative influence on a student teacher's socialization process.

Nancy thought about the differences between student teaching in a larger placement site versus student teaching in a smaller placement site. Nancy listed disciplinary procedures, pupil attitudes, and family values and attitudes as characteristics that are different in a large school system as compared to a small school system. Nancy was familiar with a small school system. This segment of the audio tape was spoken with a serious voice and without hesitation. Nancy had formed a clear picture in her mind about the "location" or school site for her first placement site.

Mary. When asked to describe a "typical" school setting, Mary interpreted the item to mean "home economics classroom." Mary described a typical school setting as a room or rooms with "alot of complete kitchens, a place to study, chalk
boards, a sewing laboratory, a storage room, and an office."

Mary continued by saying that teachers can "get along with
alot less and still do a good job [teaching learners]" (Mary, 
Entrance Interview, Item 10, January, 1989).

When asked how the classroom environment would influence
her thinking about teaching as a profession, Mary provided the
following narrative:

"I guess the room environment would have alot of influence
on my life. Certainly it could make it easier but I don't
have to have things to teach. I've probably spent the
last 20 to 25 years of my life teaching in some form. I've
been very involved . . . training people for contests and
I haven't always had the very best of [teaching]
environments. What I do care about is the trust level I
set up with a student and that can be anywhere . . . a
backyard, back steps, in the kitchen, or in a really nice
classroom. I think I am creative enough that alot of
learning could take place wherever I am" (Mary, Entrance
Interview, Item 12, January, 1989).

Mary digressed from the nature of the item to include
information on her philosophy of teaching. Mary indicated
that environment was not her first priority in terms of
teaching and that she had 20 to 25 years of teaching
experiences that were conducted in a variety of "not so well-
equipped" environments.

When Mary responded to the location of her student
teaching experiences in terms of influencing her attitudes,
values, and beliefs about teaching, Mary, too, interpreted
"location" to mean student teaching placement sites.
"The places I'm student teaching both have very nice facilities [as compared] to smaller rural schools. I think it [student teaching in large school systems] might make you think that you have to have certain things or you can't teach. I was very poor as a child. I guess if you give me somebody that wants to learn, I'll teach them whether I have the facilities or super modern equipment. I'm very much a problem-solver; if somebody wants to learn, I'll really work hard to find a way to teach them" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 12, January, 1989).

While responding to the item, Mary provided information about her childhood by saying that she was very poor. Her next statement, "I guess if you give me somebody that wants to learn, I'll teach them whether I have the facilities or super modern equipment," indicated that updated facilities and access to resources were not her first priority in the teaching/learning process. Mary had learned from her childhood and her past teaching experiences that a conducive teaching/learning environment was not contingent upon materialistic resources. This belief supports Lortie's (1975) assertion that student teacher biography plays a powerful role in the student teacher socialization process.

Tracy. Tracy responded to, "Describe a typical school setting," by interpreting the item to mean "home economics classroom." Tracy recalled the equipment in her high school home economics classroom (e.g., individual kitchens, tables in the kitchens, sewing areas, and tables in the sewing area) (Tracy, Entrance Interview, Item 10, January, 1989). When
Tracy responded to how the classroom environment would influence her thinking about teaching, Tracy presented the following narrative:

"I think that classroom environment could have some influence on how you feel about teaching. If you've got wonderful resources, you're gunna wanna stay there forever. But, if you're in a situation where there's no money, there's no equipment . . . you're scrounging for every penny to buy supplies, it could be a negative experience. The arrangement of the classroom . . . has some effect on how you feel about teaching" (Tracy, Entrance Interview, Item 11, January, 1989).

Tracy shared her values in terms of having adequate resources with which to teach pupils. The severe lack of adequate resources could have a negative influence on how she perceived teaching as a profession. Her values were further delineated as Tracy shared insights about "location." Tracy, as did the other three student teachers, interpreted "location" to mean specific student teaching placement sites.

"The location will reinforce the attitudes and beliefs I already have. I'm going to be doing my student teaching in [a large metropolitan area]. I'm a product of that school [district]. I think it's going to be interesting to see how differently they do things now. But I don't really see the location as changing my opinions about teaching" (Tracy, Entrance Interview, Item 12, January, 1989).

Having the opportunity for an on-site update on her "old school district" seemed to be an exciting anticipation for Tracy. However, she also stated that the geographic location
of her student teaching experiences probably would not change her attitudes, values, and beliefs about teaching.

Cooperating Teacher/Student Teacher

Similarities and Differences

This socialization variable addresses student teachers' perceptions of how student teachers would relate to their cooperating teachers and how they perceived that they would be similar to or different from cooperating teachers in attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge.

Heather. Heather immediately responded that she and her first cooperating teacher would be "friends!" She continued by saying that she knew she would respect her cooperating teacher and that she believed her cooperating teacher would respect her. "I honestly think we will become good friends. I will be able to tell her anything and she will be honest with me. We'll relate on an equal level" (Heather, Entrance Interview, Item 13, August, 1988).

Heather provided insight into how she perceived that she would be similar to and different from her cooperating teacher in the following narrative.

"I think we will have alot of the same attitudes and values. I think my cooperating teacher will be wonderful with kids and concerned about each individual. I think I'll be really similar. I don't know for sure if I will be similar in skills. My cooperating teacher seems really
up-to-date on everything and, hopefully, I'm up-to-date" (Heather, Entrance Interview, Item 14, August, 1988).

"I think I will be different from my cooperating teacher in knowledge. I'm sure she has a lot more skills and knowledge than me because she's had experience. I think my cooperating teacher seems to be well-off financially] and I come from a background that wasn't so well-off so maybe I will have a little more dedication to individuals [pupils in classrooms] in making sure they get the best chance possible. That's really something I believe in and sometimes my cooperating teacher appears to be more involved in herself" (Heather, Entrance Interview, Item 15, August, 1988).

Heather perceived that she would be fairly similar to her first cooperating teacher in attitudes, values, and beliefs about home economics and about the teaching/learning process. Heather indicated that she detected a difference between the two of them in terms of socio-economic levels. Heather perceived her cooperating teacher as someone who was financially secure whereas she perceived herself as someone who came from a background that "wasn't so well off." Heather perceived that she would also be different from her cooperating teacher in the area of skills and knowledge. Heather's preliminary perceptions might support DeVoss's (1979) findings suggesting that when student teachers and cooperating teachers are mutually supportive and similar in philosophy, orientation, and attitudes, the student teachers were more likely to report having a successful student teaching experience.
Nancy. Nancy indicated that she would relate well to her first cooperating teacher. As Nancy considered what she knew about her cooperating teacher prior to student teaching, she provided another hint that she was fearful of student teaching in a "bigger school" even though Nancy's statements compared her high school experiences in a small school system to her cooperating teacher's present experiences teaching in a large school system.

"I figure I will relate pretty well to my cooperating teacher. The cooperating teacher I have has taught in a smaller school. She has some of the beliefs and the background that I have as far as where I came from. However, her teaching in a bigger school system [now], I see that my disciplining and styles of teaching may be different from hers and we may have to work that out cause I may need some help" (Nancy, Entrance Interview, Item 15, August, 1986).

Nancy did not respond to similarities between her and her cooperating teacher but rather provided information on the differences between them. Nancy emphasized that any differences between them would be "big" differences.

"I see that each difference is gunna make alot of difference in our attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge. Each difference alone is gunna be a big one. She has a family with kids and I just have a husband. She's been teaching before and I've never taught. Mine [attitudes, values, and beliefs] will probably be a little more lax than hers" (Nancy, Entrance Interview, Item 15, August, 1988).

Nancy knew very little about her first cooperating teacher except that her cooperating teacher had experience teaching in
a smaller school system. Nancy deduced that her cooperating teacher should be able to understand Nancy's past experiences in a small school system. However, Nancy was unsure of her immediate perceptions because her cooperating teacher presently teaches in a bigger school. Nancy also perceived that, even though her discipline techniques and teaching styles might be different from her cooperating teacher's discipline techniques and teaching styles, her cooperating teacher would help her learn how to facilitate learning.

Mary. Mary evaluated both student teaching experiences when responding to similarities and differences between her and her cooperating teachers.

"I would expect, and I don't even hesitate with this, that my student teaching experiences will be good experiences. That doesn't mean I'll agree with everything or that she'll [cooperating teacher] agree with me. I expect her to give me constructive criticism but I look at it as having a job to do. If I was working in the work world, I would have a supervisor that I would answer to. I have made a commitment to get along with people. I don't feel frightened of the cooperating teacher. I just can't imagine [student teaching] not being an excellent experience. I've worked with different kinds of people. I've run into one or two people that I haven't been able to get along with. After thinking there must be more I could do to get along, I found that they were the ones with the problem! I work hard at getting along and cooperating and working as a team with someone" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 13, January, 1989).

Mary provided information about her values and beliefs relative to relating to co-workers in the world of work when she responded to how she perceived that she would relate to
her cooperating teacher. First, Mary stated that she expected both student teaching experiences to be "good" experiences. Second, Mary stated that "good" does not mean that she would agree with everything her cooperating teachers did and "good" does not mean that she expected her cooperating teachers to agree with everything Mary did. Mary expected constructive criticism similar to the constructive criticism she has received in past work situations from supervisors.

Mary then provided information about her beliefs relative to how one 'ought' to cooperate with co-workers. She believed that she had enough past work experience to know that she would work hard and not "fear" her superiors. At that point, Mary provided revealing insight suggesting that she had a solid, positive work record indicating that she does work well with people. Mary values being a team player.

Mary believed that the university would place her in a student teaching situation where the cooperating teacher and the student teacher would be similar in attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge.

"I trust the university to find a cooperating teacher for me that has good attitudes and values and beliefs similar to mine. I'm not going to school because somebody put me up to it so [that] gives us a similar bond to be close. I'd kinda like to be the cooperating teacher sometime. I think I would enjoy helping someone else value what I value and I would guess that my cooperating teacher feels that way. She wants to supervise my experience" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 14, January, 1989).
Mary indicated that being a cooperating teacher was an experience that she might like to have in the future because she would like to help a student teacher develop values similar to her values. Mary indicated that there would be some differences between her and her cooperating teacher in attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge.

"I think some of my skills, beliefs, and knowledge are probably 1989 and my cooperating teacher hasn't been back to school since she graduated from college. So, she's probably coming out of an era slightly different than what the current one is. She doesn't have children; I have 3 children. I've been married and now I'm not married; she is married. I've lived on a farm; she's never lived on a farm. I've lived on a farm and worked on a farm; she has only taught school. We have two completely different worlds, so our perceptions of how we teach will be different and I accept that. I think of how I could just accept her background as it contributes to the content of my student teaching experience!" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 15, January, 1989).

Mary perceived that her recent knowledge gained from attending the university will probably be more current than her cooperating teachers knowledge. In terms of their life experiences, Mary asserted that she and her cooperating teacher came from two different worlds and in that way, their perspectives on teaching would be different.

**Tracy.** Tracy asserted that she wanted to be treated almost as an equal by her cooperating teachers because the only difference between Tracy and her cooperating teachers was that Tracy lacked teaching experience.
"Not knowing my cooperating teachers, I would hope that I would be not quite but almost on an equal level. I don't expect to walk in there and be accepted (in the school) the same as they are because I don't have the teaching experience to fall back upon" (Tracy, Entrance Interview, Item 13, January, 1989).

Tracy perceived that she would be fairly similar to her cooperating teacher in attitudes, values, and beliefs by virtue of the fact that they are prepared in home economics and, therefore, both would subscribe to the values inherent in the home economics philosophy. However, Tracy perceived that she would be different from her cooperating teacher in skills and possibly knowledge.

"I think, in attitude, we would be fairly much the same. To be a home economics teacher, I expect that you have shared beliefs and attitudes with other home economics teachers. I think home economics teachers enjoy kids; they care about kids; they care about the family; they care about those things that are taught in home economics classes. I think alot of your values are gunna be the same by virtue of being interested enough to pursue a home economics career" (Tracy, Entrance Interview, Item 14, January, 1989).

"I see my cooperating teachers as having alot more expertise or skills in classroom management. I think that's one place I'm kinda scared of. It's hard to tell about knowledge. You could feel very inadequate next to her knowledge; you could feel about the same; or it's possible that you could feel superior" (Tracy, Entrance Interview, Item 15, January, 1989).

The reader might get the impression that Tracy is unsure of how she might be similar to or different from her cooperating teacher in terms of knowledge. The last sentence implies that she could fall on any given spot on the knowledge
continuum but at this point, she is not sure whether she will feel inadequate, adequate, or more than adequate in knowledge compared to her cooperating teacher.

Bureaucratic Characteristics of Schools

This variable addresses the student teachers' general understanding of school rules and regulations. What is the student teachers' role in following the rules and regulations? What are student teachers' attitudes toward extracurricular responsibilities?

Heather. When responding to bureaucratic characteristics of schools, Heather presented an understanding of school rules and regulations as well as her values on school support.

"There are general rules like making sure you take attendance, write who's tardy, be on time, stay at school until the designated time, dress appropriately, and use appropriate disciplinary actions. Most schools have hidden rules (i.e., the kids should come first) and we should try to provide for them the best education possible. It is my role. I have to follow the rules in order to make the system work. I want to follow the rules" (Heather, Entrance Interview, Item 16, August, 1968).

Heather appeared to hold a clearly defined set of beliefs and attitudes about her responsibility to support the school by following the rules and regulations. Heather also has a clearly defined set of beliefs and attitudes about her participation in school-related extracurricular activities.
"I think it's a MUST! Oh, not to the point that you get involved in so many things that you burn out. But if the kids see that you're involved in outside school activities and come to the games, I just think it's so neat and it's SO important to the kids. I just think extracurricular involvement is so important" (Heather, Entrance Interview, Item 18, August, 1988).

Heather's responses lend support to Lortie's (1975) assertion that student teacher biography plays a powerful role in the teacher socialization process. Heather entered student teaching with a clear idea about how she would respond to school rules and participate in extracurricular activities.

Nancy. Nancy responded to her perceptions of following school rules and regulations in the following narrative:

"I feel you have to follow the rules in the school. My role as a teacher would be to help enforce and follow the rules myself and make the kids go by those rule also" (Nancy, Entrance Interview, Item 17, August, 1988).

Nancy continued with her perceptions about teacher involvement in school-related extracurricular activities. Nancy equates involvement with extracurricular activities with being a "good" teacher.

"I feel that, in a smaller school, sometimes you can have too many extracurricular responsibilities. However, sometimes it has to be that way. In order to be a good teacher, you need to let the students know that you are interested in the things they do such as sports, music, etc." (Nancy, Entrance Interview, Item 18, August, 1988).

Like Heather, Nancy brought to the student teaching experience a clearly defined set of beliefs about her role in following and enforcing the school rules and her
responsibilities in terms of supporting extracurricular activities. Apparently Nancy developed those beliefs prior to her student teaching experiences.

Mary. Mary responded to the bureaucratic characteristics of schools in a different manner than did Heather and Nancy, the two traditional student teachers. Mary indicated that she would follow school rules and regulations because she was a "team player." At the same time, Mary presented her values surrounding rules and regulations by suggesting that if the rules needed to be changed, she would be willing to change them.

"I don't think I'll have a problem with following school rules. I'm a team player. I'm also a person that, when they are on a team, if I can find a better play, I won't hesitate to say, "maybe we need to adjust" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 16, January, 1989).

"I AM a team player but I am also a person that will change the rules with consensus. I won't be afraid to talk with people if something isn't working. I think sometimes people get so caught up in rules that they aren't always sure if they [rules] are working or not working. I won't be afraid to present an idea" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 17, January, 1989).

Mary did not have a preconceived idea about school-related extracurricular activities but she presented her view regarding fair distribution of activities among faculty members.

"I don't have alot to say about extracurricular activities. I've never been overburdened in that area. As long as it's fair distribution among teachers, I probably won't have any objection. If I feel the pay is
representative of my responsibilities, I probably will be a team player as long as I feel the work is equally distributed" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 18, January, 1989).

**Tracy.** Tracy indicated that she wanted to be aware of *all* the school rules and regulations prior to student teaching. She wanted to follow the school rules and regulations even though she realized that many of the school rules and regulations would be learned with experience.

"I think student teachers should be presented with a handbook of the rules and regulations for both teachers and students. I think it's my *responsibility* to follow the rules to the *best* of my abilities. I don't feel that I'm adequately prepared in carrying out some of the rules. Some of the rules are a matter of on-the-job training. You find out the rules as the situation arises" (Tracy, Entrance Interview, Item 17, January, 1989).

Tracy provided the following narrative on her perceptions toward participating in extracurricular school-related activities.

"I think extracurricular activities are wonderful for students and teachers. I think it allows the teacher to contact other students not in your classrooms and you can form positive impressions with them. I think that teachers can be overburdened with extra responsibilities and I don't think that the general public is aware of how taxing those responsibilities are on your time unless you've been teaching or know someone closely who has been" (Tracy, Entrance Interview, Item 18, January, 1989).

Tracy supported extracurricular activities and believed that the general public does not fully understand the commitment made by teachers when teachers are assigned extracurricular school-related responsibilities. Tracy had
past experience watching her parents as they were involved with extra responsibilities, hence, she had clearly developed beliefs about how teachers 'ought' to believe about participation in extracurricular activities.

Changes in Student Teacher Attitudes, Values, Beliefs, Skills, and Knowledge

This socialization variable addresses how student teachers perceived that their attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge would change during their student teaching. Which changes would be positive changes and which changes would be negative? How did student teachers perceive that cooperating teachers would influence changes in their attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge during their student teaching experience?

Heather. Heather provided information regarding how she perceived that her attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge would change during student teaching. Heather perceived herself as a "perfectionist." She wanted to change the world, yet she realized that she would not be able to "reach" every pupil. Heather perceived that she had much to "learn" while student teaching and interpreted the word "learn" to mean to "change."

"I expect that some of my attitudes, values, interests, skills, and knowledge will harden. By harden I mean that
they will become more realistic, not changing to bitter, but I'm a perfectionist and I wanna save the world. Well, that's just not possible. I'm not gunna reach every student. And yet, deep in my heart, I have that attitude or value. My skills will increase incredibly and my knowledge about people, kids, how to handle them will also change. I have so much to learn. That will definitely change. I'll probably discover my strongest interest areas like what I like to teach. I don't think my interests will change; I just think I'll discover what I really love to do" (Heather, Entrance Interview, Item 19, August, 1988).

For the most part, Heather believed that her student teaching experience would provide her with an avenue toward positive change.

"Becoming more realistic might be a negative change because it might put a damper on my spirits. Otherwise, the changes will be positive like just discovering who I am; what my interests are, and becoming better skilled at being a teacher" (Heather, Entrance Interview, Item 20, August, 1988).

Heather admitted that her heart-felt desire to reach every pupil in her classroom is probably an unrealistic desire but she wanted to hold on to her value. Apparently Heather also believed that she would become more realistic as she proceeded through her student teaching experiences. Her perceptions of what she hoped to learn by the end of her student teaching experience centered around becoming a "better skilled" teacher.

Nancy. Nancy perceived that her personal values and interests would not be influenced during her student teaching
experiences. If there were changes, those changes would be in the skill and knowledge areas.

"I think that my values and interests are gunna stay the same as they are now and when I'm done with student teaching. My attitudes toward the types of teaching, different students, faculty, the ways I deal with people in a school system and my skills will improve. My knowledge will hopefully increase. My personal interests are gunna stay the same. I don't see that student teaching is really gunna change them" (Nancy, Entrance Interview, Item 19, August, 1988).

Nancy seemed somewhat apprehensive about how she would be influenced by her cooperating teacher. Clearly, Nancy did not want her cooperating teacher to "force" values on her even though Nancy stated that there was a possibility that the cooperating teacher's influence might be positive.

"I see that my cooperating teacher could definitely influence my attitudes and my skills and knowledge and probably a little on my values and interests, depending upon how involved she becomes in my life and how much she forces her values on me. Her influencing me will probably be good or maybe it will just open my eyes and help me see other peoples' points of view. Or, perhaps her influencing me will get me more involved in the teaching profession and learn more about myself, not only in teaching" (Nancy, Entrance Interview, Item 22, August, 1988).

Nancy appeared to be open to learning more about herself as a teacher. Her responses lend support to Lortie's (1975) theory that student teacher biography plays a powerful role in the teacher socialization process. Nancy believed in her present attitudes, values, and beliefs and asserted that student teaching will have little impact on them.
Mary responded to her perceived changes in student teacher attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge in the following narrative. Mary expected to change with regard to interacting with pupils.

"Probably one of the first changes will be placing a higher value on teachers and what goes on in the learning environment. I think I'm gunna start caring more about learning differences and what I can do to meet their needs. I think I will get to know the students and be concerned about some of them and about what I can do to meet their needs. I will learn to value each person even though their background may be different than mine. I want to be a good listener (for students) so I can understand them better and see how they fit into my world" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 19, January, 1989).

The following two narratives presented insight in terms of how Mary perceived that she would change specifically, both positively and negatively, during student teaching.

"I think anytime new people put new ideas in our heads, it's positive. When we limit ourselves to ideas, that becomes a negative feeling. So, just getting acquainted [with new people] contributes to my life and helps make me a richer person" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 20, January, 1989).

"If I thought I was better than some of the students or if I was too good to do something, that would probably make me feel bad about myself and be a negative change. I guess I would like to meet people where they are and if I couldn't do that, I would feel like I probably shouldn't be in teaching and that would be a really negative change. If I didn't want to teach certain people because they came from a certain lifestyle, that would be a negative change" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 21, January, 1989).

Mary did not present specific perceived positive and/or negative changes during student teaching. Mary presented
conjecture. When she meets new people, she becomes a "richer" person and that is a perceived positive change. In the event that Mary could not relate to specific pupils because of background diversity, that would be a perceived negative change.

Mary perceived that the cooperating teacher would help her change her attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge by presenting her with teaching ideas and teacher attitudes.

"She'll [cooperating teacher] have more ideas because I will probably copy many. That's the only thing I'm going to know to do. I think I'm gunna want to incorporate many of my cooperating teacher's attitudes. I think she is going to be a tremendous influence in my life" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 22, January, 1989).

Tracy. Tracy presented responses to this section without hesitation. Tracy perceived that if she student taught several years ago, student teaching and cooperating teachers would have had more influence in terms of influencing change. Tracy perceived that her teaching skills would change during student teaching and that such a change would be positive. In the event that her knowledge level changed, that particular change would be self-perpetuating rather than a change influenced by her cooperating teacher. Tracy perceived that her attitudes, values, and interests would not change.

"I don't see my values, attitudes, beliefs, and interests changing at this point. When I started college, I could see them changing alot but now I don't see them changing. My opinions are formed and my values and attitudes are established. I see my skill level changing, my ability to
handle classrooms, becoming more effective" (Tracy, Entrance Interview, Item 19, January, 1989).

"I think the increase in skill level would be a tremendous positive change as far as classroom management. I can see knowledge changing in that you have to dig down and pull this information out. Using all your knowledge is not something that you deal with everyday. I think student teaching is a way of bringing that knowledge up to the surface and making it relevant" (Tracy, Entrance Interview, Item 10, January, 1989).

Again, Tracy adhered to the belief that her attitudes, values, and beliefs were determined prior to student teaching and probably would not change during student teaching. She believed that her skills and knowledge would increase. Tracy's thoughts lend support to Lortie's (1975) theory that student teacher biography is a powerful force in the teacher socialization process.

Philosophy of Education

This socialization variable addresses student teachers' perceptions on the value of public education. Items in this section addressed personal philosophies of education; school administrative hierarchy; conceptual learning; lesson and unit plans; being flexible with learners; and the importance of involving the community in the teaching/learning process.

Heather. Heather seemed interested in discussing her philosophy of education. Heather was quick to acknowledge that "education" was the "building block" for society.
"I believe public education is utmost! I believe that it's everything! It's the building block; it's working with the people of tomorrow. Education has got to be valued; it's so incredibly important to society, to the world, to the future. I believe education has gotta be number one and we always gotta be changing education or improving it to meet the needs of people" (Heather, Entrance Interview, Item 23, August, 1988).

"The kid does come first and to try to meet individual needs to get them ready to face the world. It's NOT standing at the blackboard writing down formulas which students will never use. My idea of education is getting students prepared to cope so they'll be able to survive. Hey! It's a jungle out there and I wanna be right there helping students get ready and take the world by storm! It's preparation! Preparation for LIFE! That's what education is and it continues throughout your life. Education should never stop" (Heather, Entrance Interview, Item 24, August, 1988).

Heather strongly believes in the value of public education and has a well-developed philosophy on education. Heather not only articulated the value of education in her personal life but also articulated her role in facilitating that same philosophy of education for pupils in classrooms.

Nancy. Nancy was slow and methodical as she presented her view on education:

"I feel every person needs a good education. It's tough to get along in the world without an education and definitely everyone needs to know how to read, write, arithmetic and they need to know the basics of life or life skills. I feel that education will just generally make them (students) well-rounded people" (Nancy, Entrance Interview, Item 23, August, 1988).

Nancy's comments on education were general in nature. She believed that education for pupils was necessary to prepare
them for a "tough" world. Along with the "basics," Nancy perceived that pupils also needed life skills or preparation in home economics. A working knowledge of both "basics" and "life skills" would help pupils become well-rounded individuals.

Being flexible with learners was something Nancy strongly believed in but Nancy perceived that there was a fine line between being flexible with learners and showing favoritism among learners.

"I feel that you have to be flexible with learners . . . they learn at different rates. However, you can't be flexible to the point that the kids feel you're being unfair . . . that they're being thrown at each other. You have to be flexible with your lessons like if they want to discuss a problem with the class. I think being flexible is necessary. However, you have to watch how you do it" (Nancy, Entrance Interview, Item 28, August, 1988).

Mary. Mary presented a fairly clear picture of the value she places on education and her philosophy of education up to this point in her entrance interview. However, when responding to a specific item addressing the value of public education, Mary simply said, "I think it's great" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 23, January, 1989). The next item on the entrance interview schedule addressed Mary's specific philosophy of education. Mary said, "I just think education is broad for an individual and no one can take it away from you" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 24, January, 1989).
Mary did not believe that she knew enough about school administrative hierarchy to respond to the item. However, she offered the following narrative:

"I don't know alot about administrative hierarchy. I suppose it's alright. The present system has been working and I suppose it will go right on working. I suppose there are some things that need changed but I don't know enough about administrations and school systems to really answer that" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 25, January, 1989).

"Conceptual learning" seemed to be a foreign concept to Mary when she responded to "What do you believe about conceptual learning?"

"I don't know anything about conceptual learning" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 26, January, 1989).

However, Mary's response to "What do you believe about lesson plans and unit plans" indicated that Mary did understand the process for a conceptual teaching/learning style.

"Everybody struggles with [unit and lesson plans] but, interestingly enough, [it becomes] a way of thinking. Sometimes it seems painful to write these [lesson and unit plans] out but I don't start organizing until I have listed concepts that I want my students to know. It becomes such a natural way of thinking. I don't think I'm ever going to let go of that" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 27, January, 1989).

Mary believed that she did not have trouble being flexible with learners even though she might need to develop flexibility skills during student teaching.

"I don't ever have trouble with being flexible. If somebody has a good idea and they are interested in it,
I'm willing to change gears immediately and go with the tide. But in flexibility, I need to learn to relax a little. I'm a little tense right now. It's not like it is just me in my own classroom. I've taught for years in a non-formal setting and given all kinds of workshops, but I've never felt the pressure I feel now. I've never been evaluated so harshly and that tends to make me less flexible" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 28, August, 1988).

Mary wanted to be flexible with pupils but she did not have a firm grip on exactly how to be flexible with a group of pupils in a classroom. She compared her thoughts on being flexible with pupils in classrooms with her experiences in being flexible with pupils in her past non-formal teaching experiences. Mary noted that the scrutiny of evaluation was a major difference in her perceptions of the two teaching settings.

Mary strongly supported utilizing community people in the teaching/learning process. She presented her thoughts in such a way that utilizing community resources should be "mandatory."

"I think we can't do enough to combine education with community. What greater way to get support than to involve the community. I just think it's mandatory" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 29, January, 1989).

Tracy. Tracy presented her beliefs about lesson and unit plans and flexibility with pupils in the following narrative:

"Having had to do [unit and lesson plans] for classes, I think they are alot of work! They are even more work as I consider what I have to do in student teaching. I can see where they are very useful in planning out what activities you are going to do but I think we get wrapped up in
details on how to select the proper word rather than actually getting the point across to the students" (Tracy, Entrance Interview, Item 27, January, 1989).

"I think you have to be flexible with learners. I really believe in the "teachable moment." If you have a student who is questioning something that relates to what you're talking about or if they have a valid concern, I feel like you better take the time to answer the question because they are ready. They are ripe! Go ahead and take a sidetrack and consider something they have a real concern about instead of forcing them [students] to conform to your expectations" (Tracy, Entrance Interview, Item 28, January, 1989).

Tracy hinted at the notion that she does not want to get "caught up" in the planning process to the point that she does not get the actual intent of the lesson across to the pupils. In addition to her philosophy on lesson plans, Tracy strongly supported being flexible in the classroom to allow for taking advantage of the "teachable moment."

Tracy presented the following opinion on community involvement in the teaching/learning process.

"In many situations I think that [community resources] are useful. It's good to have community people come into the classrooms and talk about different subjects. I think it can help the students and help the businesses relate to the kids" (Tracy, Entrance Interview, Item 29, January, 1989).

Role Expectations

This socialization variable addresses student teachers' perceptions of the roles that teachers assume as a part of being employed in school systems. What roles do student
Heather. Heather listed several roles she expected to assume as a part of her student teaching experience rather than addressing the roles that a teacher assumes as a part of being employed in a school system.

"One role is that you do need to set an example in dress, mannerisms, and the way you handle situations which is part of being professional. You need to be an educator who presents information so that the child will understand. You need to be a learner to learn what the kids need. You have to observe and hear what people are saying so you have to be a listener. You have to be a counselor. I think a lot of the kids can't go to their parents or don't have anyone to talk to and if they need us, we need to be there to counsel, to listen, and to give advice. Just being a friend, someone to smile and share some good things. I want kids to tell me what they are feeling and to know they've got a friend. I don't mean best of buds but just a friend" (Heather, Entrance Interview, Item 30, August, 1988).

Heather believed that she would be a role model, a caring teacher, a learner, an observer, a listener, a counselor, and a friend in terms of the roles she would assume as a teacher in a school system. Heather believed that the roles she expected to assume as a part of her student teaching
experience included a learner, a teacher, a role model, and possibly a friend to the pupils.

"I expect to assume the learner role because I have a lot to learn like how to handle people and what they need. I'll do a lot of teaching so I need to learn the educational role and maybe how to be a role model. I might be kinda important to the learners because I might be closer to their age so they might be more likely to use me as a role model. I would love to become their friend but I don't know if I'll be there [student teaching] long enough to have [learners] really trust me. And, I don't wanna start off being too nicey, nicey cause I do wanna earn their respect and I think you have to be kinda tough at first" (Heather, Entrance Interview, Item 31, August, 1988).

Heather had a fairly clear perception of what her role as a teacher would be prior to student teaching. She also had clearly delineated ideas about how she would like to interact with learners even though she admitted that her relationships with learners should preferably develop over time.

Nancy. Nancy believed that the most important roles for a teacher to assume were to teach the pupils, counsel the pupils, and to be involved in the activities of the school system.

"The number one role is that the teacher has to be there to teach the kids and to be involved in the things that go on in the school and to help the kids out that come to you with a problem" (Nancy, Entrance Interview, Item 30, August, 1988).

Nancy presented information on how she expected to be treated by her cooperating teacher during her student teaching experience.
"I would hope that my cooperating teacher would treat me with respect and as a colleague. However, I can see that it probably won't work that way and she'll look at me as an underdog because I haven't been out in the field yet. I would hope that she would have respect for my ideas as I will have respect for her suggestions and beliefs" (Nancy, Entrance Interview, Item 33, August, 1988).

Nancy was explicit about her most important roles as a teacher, that of helping pupils learn and helping pupils with problems. She also had fairly strong opinions about how she would hope to be treated by her cooperating teacher even though she admitted that her "hopes" were idealistic because she lacked teaching experience.

Mary. Mary presented an overall role expectation for a teacher in a school system by saying, "I guess that the school could expect student teachers to conduct themselves in a way that we are setting good examples for children because sometimes what we do teaches more than what we say" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 30, January, 1989). Mary responds to the roles that she expected to assume as a student teacher.

"Even though I'm student teaching, sometimes I think that I'm [perceived as] not quite an adult or I'm not quite "there" yet. I am an adult. I am assuming adult roles already in that I set examples for my own children. I've taught Sunday school and 4H for a long time. Any type of education is a role expectation and I don't expect that to change at all as a student teacher" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 31, January, 1989).

Mary expressed a concern about not being perceived as an "adult" during her student teaching. She believed that she
had assumed adult roles prior to student teaching by setting and example for her children and by being a teacher in a variety of settings prior to student teaching. She perceived that her roles, as she currently defined them, would not change during student teaching. Mary responded to being a role model for pupils in the following narrative:

"As a role model, I would like to be the best I could be. I would like to be positive, motivate others, and help people be problem-solvers. I happen to believe that absolutely every single problem has a solution! I'm not saying there is a perfect solution but there is a solution and I'm very, very much a problem-solver" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 32, January, 1989).

Mary indicated that she would use the same disciplinary methodology in her classroom while student teaching that she used in raising her three children. Mary also perceived that her teaching methodology would be similar to the methodology that she used teaching in non-formal education settings.

"I like to share personal experiences because I think students enjoy it and it makes you a much more real teacher. I don't want alot of barriers between me and the students" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 34, January, 1989).

"I will probably use some of the same disciplinary techniques I've used in raising my children that are 19, 17, and 13" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 35, January, 1989).

"In preparing lessons I'll do alot of research. I'll probably be very creative and I will incorporate my artwork into [lessons]. I believe in a bright environment. I just want to involve the students in everything I do" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 36, January, 1989).
Mary expected to build relationships on trust and respect with her pupils, cooperating teachers, and others in the school system.

"I would build high trust levels and respect. I would like to respect my students. I would like them to respect me. The same is true with the cooperating teacher and the others in the building. I have a lot to learn from them but I also think I can contribute to their broadening [of their] horizons. In fact, there's no doubt about it in my mind" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 37, January, 1989).

Mary perceived that building relationships with pupils in classrooms and with school-related personnel was a two-way street. She noted that she had "a lot to learn from them" but also contended that she had much to contribute to their lives.

Tracy. Tracy responded to how she expected to be treated by her cooperating teacher during her student teaching experience.

"I expect to be treated somewhat like a newly hired employee. I expect to be groomed for the job that I am learning and I expect my cooperating teacher to provide things for me as far as resources to help me with what she expects from me. I want to know what is expected of me rather than to be left floating in midair. At the same time, I want to be given the freedom to try some of my own ideas" (Tracy, Entrance Interview, Item 33, January, 1989).

Tracy envisioned that she would be treated like a new teacher in a school system. Tracy hoped that her cooperating teacher would assist her with the resources that she needed to teach pupils and would inform her of what was expected of her as a student teacher. At the same time, Tracy expected some
academic freedom in the classroom so that she could try her own ideas with pupils in the teaching/learning process.

**Student Teacher Biography**

This socialization variable addresses student teachers' perceptions of their personal attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge as they relate to the teaching/learning process. For example, what values do they hold that will impact the teaching learning process? What are the attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge components of the teacher they aspire to become? From where did the student teacher learn those attributes? Where did the student teachers learn their teaching skills? What are their personal values and attitudes? From where did their knowledge base come? What personal character traits do student teachers possess that will be beneficial to pupils in classrooms? How will the student teachers react to negative criticism? Why did student teachers choose to become teachers? How would the student teachers describe an ideal learning environment?

**Heather.** Heather responded to this entire section with enthusiasm.

"I love talking about this one . . . the teacher I want to be. I want my attitude to be that the child always comes first and then I'd try to reach his needs and put out the best learning situation for each person. I know it's not possible, but I wanna have the attitude that I'm gunna try 110% to achieve that. I want to value education, value
the individual, value their success, value encouraging pupils. I wanna be interested in what I teach and also have outside interests. I want to be skilled in discipline. I want to handle each situation with grace and finesse and do the right thing and that's scary. I want to be a good speaker. I want the skill of looking at a classroom, studying it and finding the best way of presenting information to this group of people. I need more experience to gain more knowledge. I will acquire a lot of knowledge just through experience" (Heather, Entrance Interview, Item 38, August, 1988).

Heather described the teacher she "aspired" to become as well as the person she wanted to be while she taught pupils. Heather wanted to be a teacher who places the needs of pupils first; she wanted to create the "best" learning situation for each pupil complete with knowing what to teach and using good classroom management techniques; and she wanted to value education. Heather wanted to be interested in what she taught as well as an interesting person. She indicated that her knowledge level would increase through experience.

Heather responded to the source of her beliefs, values, and attitudes about herself as a teacher.

"Home! My mom was my teacher. She's such a neat lady. My mom is... just so good with people and she's a beautiful woman. Of course I got my beliefs, values, and attitudes about teaching from being taught, from my high school home economics teacher. I got them from my fiance. I got them from my childhood. I had a beautiful childhood. I loved my childhood; it was hard for me to leave it. I don't know if I've left it yet but I like to tell myself I've left it" (Heather, Entrance Interview, Item 39, August, 1988).

"A lot of my skills came from my high school home economics teacher. I watched her and I knew what I wanted to be. She was my role model. I watched her a lot! Some of my
skills came from my education. I think I see Iowa State University as a really good program like the microteaching with the critiquing" (Heather, Entrance Interview, Item 40, August, 1988).

Heather presented a great deal of insight when she responded to, "Why did you choose to become a teacher?" She recalled her adolescent years and the needs that she had as a pupil.

"I chose to become a teacher because I wanna help kids prepare for life. I remember my teenage years and I didn't have much self-esteem. I tended to be a very sensitive child. I want to reach those kids like my teacher reached me and like my family reached me. I believe that kids have good stuff inside and they can succeed. I want to capitalize on those things that the kids possess. I want them to realize what wonderful individuals they are! I want to make them feel good about themselves and to encourage them to learn all they can. I want to just prepare them for life, for college, for meeting people, for the hardships. I want to be a teacher because I see too many teachers that aren't fulfilling that. I see so many teachers I DON'T want to be like; I see so many teachers that shouldn't be there. I believe in trying to edge those other teacher out cause, by God, I wanna do it! Some of them are ridiculous" (Heather, Entrance Interview, Item 49, August, 1988).

Heather presented clear ideas about her attitudes and values as they related to her choice to become a teacher. She knew what she wanted to accomplish when she created a classroom atmosphere. She was quick to give credit to her mother and her home economics teacher when she discussed the source of her attitudes, values, and beliefs. Heather also had a preconceived notion of how teachers 'ought' to relate to learners in classrooms. Apparently, Heather also remembered
the negative influence that teachers with different attitudes, values, and beliefs had on her as a pupil.

**Nancy.** Nancy responded to the source of her attitudes, values, and beliefs with the following narrative:

"I think my attitudes, values, and beliefs came from my family and the way I was brought up. I was in 4H, a Junior Leader, and I was always helping kids learn. I was a Sunday school teacher and I feel my attitudes, values, and beliefs were embedded in me to be a teacher" (Nancy, Entrance Interview, Item 39, August, 1988).

Nancy believed that she has "always" had the qualities and the desire to be a teacher.

"I chose to be a teacher because I've always felt that I possess the qualities that a teacher needs and I've always wanted to be a teacher. In high school, we'd have mini-practicums and I would go watch a teacher. I've always felt that my place was in the classroom" (Nancy, Entrance Interview, Item 49, August, 1988).

**Mary.** Mary provided a wealth of information about herself as a person and about her personal background when she responded to the items in this section. Mary had a clear picture in her mind about the teacher she "aspired" to become. However, her ideas were not specifically related to what she hoped to achieve during her student teaching experiences. Mary apparently held the following values for quite some time.

"I want to try something new and not be afraid to do it. I am willing to evaluate at any time. I would just like to accept people where they are and see how it fits into what I'm doing. I must know that I made a little bit of difference in some peoples' lives in teaching. I think that would make my life worth living! I don't mean everyday, but often. I would like to make this world a better place. I think that goes back to the purpose of
home economics which is improving the lives of individuals and families. There's just no other way to do it. That's the way I've been living my life anyway and now I'd like to share it with alot of other people" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 38, January, 1989).

The following narrative provides information with regard to where Mary perceived that she learned her attitudes, values, and beliefs about herself as a teacher.

"I learned my skills from raising my own kids and working with lots of youth groups. I've just spent hours enjoying children ever since I was a young person" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 40, January, 1989).

Mary responded to the personal values, attitudes, knowledge base, and skills that she perceives will have a direct influence on pupils in classrooms in the following narratives:

"My values have changed and I've grown so much since [my youngest son] has been in my life. I believe that there are all kinds of learners. I think that I have alot of respect for each person and I would like to meet each person where they are and challenge them and expect the best from them" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 41, January, 1989).

"I have a really broad knowledge base. I'm really rural and I've lived in the city. I have an artistic, a public relations, and a banking background. I have a home economics background. I think that knowledge background is going to have a tremendous effect on what I do. It's not just from one perspective. I am the mother of a handicapped child. I know what experiencing death of a close family member is like. I think I'm going to have empathy for other people having the same crises. I think that in 20-25 years I have some skills that I would not have had at age 22" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 43, January, 1989).

"Personal characteristics, well I'm a very caring person. If somebody needs help I will find the time. One of my
greatest assets is in developing high trust levels with people. They know they can count on me. I am very responsible and that's a very high priority in my life" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 47, January, 1989).

Mary expounded on her perceptions of how she would react to negative criticism from her cooperating teacher or her university supervisor.

"As far as negative criticism goes, I would probably like to hear the negative criticism and evaluate it in time. I need to get past the initial "negative" and look at the information. Sometimes I agree and sometimes I do not agree with it. I take negative criticism extremely well because I know that negative criticism is coming from their perspective and it may not fit into my perspective. When a cooperating teacher and a university supervisor are in charge of my grades, they are in control so usually I play the game. Whatever I need to do, I will do. I may or may not agree. No one can make me do anything unethical or something that goes against my personal standards. I refuse to do that and would not be afraid to say so. When I look at the information I will decide to apply it into my world or I will decide that it's not going to work and I will go on. I may go on silently and not let anyone else know (about my decision). I don't feel I have to agree with everyone" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 48, January, 1989).

Mary presented strong opinions on accepting negative criticism from her cooperating teacher or university supervisor. She already believes that she needs time to synthesize negative criticism and she has a well-developed plan of action relative to what she will do in the event that she does not agree with the negative criticism. Mary took a strong stand on doing anything unethical or anything against her standards. Mary had a well-developed philosophy relative
to being in agreement with those in positions of authority in her university education.

Mary indicated that she chose to become a teacher because being a teacher "felt natural" to her and she described an ideal classroom in terms of actual facilities.

"I chose to become a teacher because it feels natural to me. I find myself teaching even when I don't know I'm teaching. I decided, why not get paid for doing it, not that I'm ever going to get rich, but why not at least get my certification" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 49, January, 1989).

"The ideal classroom has fresh air and sunshine. I won't keep the blinds closed. It would be nice to have beautiful facilities but I doubt that there will ever be the ideal classroom and that's ok with me" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 50, January, 1989).

Tracy. Tracy responded to the source of her personal values and the source of her teaching skills with the following narratives:

"My values go back to when I was a child. Both of my parents were teachers. I grew up in an educational atmosphere. What my parents believed are my values also. My parents were the greatest source of my beliefs and values. Not very many of my beliefs and attitudes came from other teachers" (Tracy, Entrance Interview, Item 39, January, 1989).

"My teaching skills I learned almost from infancy from my parents. I've always seen myself as a teacher and this college education is a chronology to go through to do what I feel I have always been able to do" (Tracy, Entrance Interview, Item 40, January, 1989).
From a personal perspective, Tracy described character traits that she perceived would be beneficial to pupils in classrooms:

"One of my greatest character traits is that I like the kids. I think kids are really neat and unique people. Each one has something special about them. Some just take longer in finding out what that something is. I have very strong personal beliefs. I think a strong individual is good for students to be around. I don't smoke, I seldom drink, I don't drink coffee. I don't really have very many vices in my life. I've never done anything that I've ever been ashamed of. I think kids need to have a person like that to be a role model and to be a strong person for them to watch. I think kids don't have very many good role models to fashion themselves after. I'm not trying to make myself out to be a saint, at all" (Tracy, Entrance Interview, Item 47, January, 1989).

Tracy presented a strong personal conviction on her character traits. Tracy believes that she likes "kids," values individual pupils, and that she has "strong" personal beliefs. Along with those strong personal beliefs, Tracy believes that she would be a good role model for pupils because she leads her life in a way that is worthy of emulation. She believes that pupils need a strong, moral role model.

The following narrative explains why Tracy chose to become a teacher:

"I chose to be a teacher because I've always thought of myself as a teacher. My parents are teachers. It was something I was familiar with and easy for me to fall into" (Tracy, Entrance Interview, Item 49, January, 1989).
Communication Skills

This socialization variable addresses a description of student teachers' perceived communication skills. What is the importance of communication skills in teaching? What is the value of two-way communication? What is the importance of active listening in the teaching/learning process?

Heather. Heather presented information about her communication skills and about the importance of her communication skills as she prepares to become a teacher:

"I think I have good facial expressions. I can talk pretty good and I do a lot of hand gestures. I'm really good at encouraging kids and pouncing on a good answer and making them feel good about themselves. I think I'm pretty good at simplifying things. I was the type of student that always had to have things explained to me 50 million times. I was persistent when teachers were talking above my head. I made them explain it to me 10 times if that's what it took" (Heather, Entrance Interview, Item 51, August, 1988).

"Communication skills are very important because if you can't communicate with a child, then you've lost them! Their attention has gone right out the window! You gotta be a feeling person to them and you gotta be real" (Heather, Entrance Interview, Item 52, August, 1988).

Nancy. Nancy responded to the importance of good communication skills and the importance of active listening skills:

"I feel that good communication skills are very important in teaching not only to the students but to other teachers, to the faculty, to the parents. You gotta have good communication skills to help those kids learn. They will need good communication skills when they get out of your classroom" (Nancy, Entrance Interview, Item 52, August, 1988).
"Active listening skills are very important because what a kid is saying to your face may not be what he's really trying to tell you. You need to be able to read between the lines to actively listen to them and hear what is going on with them" (Nancy, Entrance Interview, Item 55, August, 1988).

Mary. Mary indicated that she may need to improve her communication skills and provided information about how she perceived the importance of good communication, two-way communication, and active listening skills.

"I have to work on speaking skills. I believe that people know what I'm thinking but I don't believe that I say it well. I do feel I'm a good listener. I happen to think my super verbal skills are excellent which means intuition. My sensitivity is very keen" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 55, January, 1989).

"Two-way communication is the only way you get to know the students and they can get to know what you're thinking and feeling. I think it's important" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 53, January, 1989).

"Active listening skills are imperative all the time even when class is an information session. It needs to be done even when students are talking. It's one of the best ways to get to know students" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 55, January, 1989).

Tracy. Tracy presented information on her perceptions of her personal communication skills and the importance of good communication skills, two-way communication with pupils, and two-way communication with the cooperating teacher during student teaching.

"I think I have excellent communication skills. I think I'm very sensitive to other people and I try to listen to what they are saying and not what I wanna hear from them. I try to say the information in a gentle way that gets the point across without being harsh. I think there are too
many people who just blurt out blunt, harsh, cruel statements that really hurt people and it's not necessary. You can say what you want without being crude" (Tracy, Entrance Interview, Item 51, January, 1989).

"I think communication is one of the most important skills there is in teaching. You have to communicate your ideas. If you have a student who is not getting the information, you've gotta think of another way to make your point like use a situation that relates and then they can transfer that knowledge from one skill to another situation" (Tracy, Entrance Interview, Item 52, January, 1989).

"Two-way communication is very, very valuable. You have to be open to the students coming to talk to you and not just you pouring information into their minds" (Tracy, Entrance Interview, Item 53, January, 1989).

"I want to be able to talk to my cooperating teacher and pull information from her. At the same time, I might have a good idea that I could share with my cooperating teacher. Two-way communication is extremely important" (Tracy, Entrance Interview, Item 54, January, 1989).

Acquiring Teacher Behavior

This socialization variable addresses the importance of participating in continuing education activities and professional organizations. How do teachers learn to teach pupils? What do student teachers expect to learn from their student teaching experiences? What influence do student teachers perceive that they will have on learners? What is the value of student teaching in two sites and the value of student teaching under the direction of two cooperating teachers?
Heather. Heather presented her perceptions of the importance of continuing education and of belonging to professional organizations. Heather provided information about where she perceived that she learned her teaching skills.

"I think continuing education is very important. The world is changing all the time and new information is coming in. There are new situations and more needy situations facing teachers. If you're not out there learning and making yourself better, you're gonna be a Miss Peabody or someone that is stuck in the dark ages! I think continuing education is incredibly important and it is just a part of life-long learning" (Heather, Entrance Interview, Item 56, August, 1988).

"I don't know what I think about professional organizations. I think it's probably important to realize that going to the meetings will give you more support and good connections for meeting with people that have the same goal in mind. They are important for helping you know that you're really a team and you're not out there facing the world alone. I don't know about professional organizations. Sometimes I think they are a pain but they are probably really important" (Heather, Entrance Interview, Item 57, August, 1988).

"Learning to teach comes with experience and from watching others and watching the students. I think alot of times the students control the situation so you have alot to learn from the students like how to handle them, knowing what reaches them, and what excites them" (Heather, Entrance Interview, Item 58, August, 1988).

Nancy. Nancy responded to the importance of professional organizations and what she expected to learn from her student teaching experiences.

"I feel that professional organizations are very important because you need to keep up with the new things. You don't want to be a teacher in the 1980s teaching 1960s stuff! You need to keep up with the times and keep
yourself knowledgeable about what you are teaching and how you are teaching it" (Nancy, Entrance Interview, Item 57, August, 1988).

"From my student teaching experience I expect to learn about myself and different ways of teaching and dealing with discipline problems and the levels of teaching" (Nancy, Entrance Interview, Item 59, August, 1988).

Mary. Mary responded to the importance of continuing education, the importance of belonging to professional organizations, and what she expected to learn from her student teaching experiences. Mary also expounded on her perceptions of student teaching in two sites and under the direction of two cooperating teachers.

"I think continuing education is mandatory! I think it's exciting and gives some depth to what you are doing" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 56, January, 1989).

"Professional organizations are a problem for me. I wanna be there and to contribute. It's nice to know what other people are doing and to decide what might be able to fit into what you're doing. If you're isolated, it's even worse" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 57, January, 1989).

"I want to learn classroom management from my student teaching experience, like coping with the pressure of preparations day after day and coping with trivial problems in the classroom when you're trying to set goals" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 59, January, 1989).

"I would hope that teaching in two schools would enrich me and broaden me because I will be seeing what works in one area or another area and seeing what type of conditions teachers have to work under" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 62, January, 1989).

"Being able to student teach under two cooperating teachers will be excellent! I think I need all the help, experiences, and perceptions from different people that I
can get to help me be the best I can be" (Mary, Entrance Interview, Item 63, January, 1989).

**Tracy.** Tracy responded to the importance of continuing education, the importance of belonging to professional organizations, and what she expected to learn from her student teaching experiences. Tracy also presented information relative to student teaching in two different student teaching placement sites under the direction of two different cooperating teachers.

"I envision myself as continuing to take a class every now and then to keep up my certification and also working toward a master's degree. We get hung up on taking little "brown-nosing" classes, whether they are a one-day class or a two-day class. I think a lot of time is wasted in those classes. I think if you can continue to grow and continue to increase your knowledge, experiences, and education, that's good. Somebody once told me that if you stop learning, you stop growing. If you stop growing, you start to get stagnant and you just quit. Your mind quits and I think it's important to keep the education process going" (Tracy, Entrance Interview, Item 56, January, 1989).

"I think the Certified Home Economist certification is extremely important to present yourself as a professional and to attend those meetings but I think it's possible to go too far or to be too involved and then your work, job, schooling starts to suffer" (Tracy, Entrance Interview, Item 57, January, 1989).

"I expect to learn how to manage things and how to handle discipline problems and students. No matter how much you talk about it in college or read it in a textbook, you're never really prepared for it until you're on the job" (Tracy, Entrance Interview, Item 59, January, 1989).

"I'm not sure what I think about student teaching in two schools. It will probably be a good experience to be with the different age groups. I do think 16 weeks is a little

"As far as student teaching under two cooperating teachers, I would hope that both of my student teaching experiences would be just fantastic and that both cooperating teachers will be supportive or do everything for me as far as support and helping me become a better teacher. I think it's going to be a real growing experience" (Tracy, *Entrance Interview*, Item 63, January, 1989).

Summary

The student teachers presented pre-student teaching perceptions on each of the 11 socialization variables. The researcher collected detailed insights from student teachers through asking them to respond to the socialization variables from a variety of perspectives. The entrance interview schedule was designed to provide several responses from student teachers on each variable. The purpose of providing the opportunity for several responses on each socialization variable was to monitor student teacher responses for consistency regardless of which items they addressed.

The purpose of this summary is to describe student teacher similarities and differences on their perceptions of each socialization variable. Heather and Nancy are traditional student teachers and Mary and Tracy are non-traditional student teachers.
Key individuals. Heather and Nancy indicated that they were recently encouraged by key individuals to select teaching as a profession and influenced on how to teach pupils by using similar teaching and disciplining methodology they had encountered by high school teachers. Mary and Tracy were influenced to become teachers and to teach pupils using particular teaching and disciplining methodology through past teaching experiences and their parents, friends, and immediate family. Because Mary and Tracy were strongly influenced by an accumulation of life experiences directly related to teaching and to home economics content pre-dating student teaching, they could be considered key individuals in their own teacher socialization processes.

Cooperating teachers and university supervisors. All four student teachers had expectations about the role of their cooperating teachers during their student teaching experiences. Heather thought her cooperating teacher would be her "guardian angel." Nancy thought her cooperating teacher would be a person who would help her grow and develop as a teacher. Mary and Tracy thought that cooperating teachers would serve as resource people for them. Mary perceived that cooperating teachers could not help her learn what she expected to learn from her student teaching experiences (i.e., how to meet individual pupils' needs). All four student
teachers had no preconceived notions about the role of a university supervisor in their student teaching experiences. Mary believed that there was no real need to have a university supervisor because university supervisors would not spend enough time with her as she facilitated learning in order to adequately evaluate her as a teacher. Tracy thought a university supervisor was a "spot checker."

Ecological characteristics of classrooms. Each of the student teachers perceived that access to resources was necessary to facilitate learning, particularly in home economics. Heather equated new, modern, and many resources with "feeling professional." Nancy perceived that adequate resources were necessary but that teachers could manage in classrooms with the resources that were available to them. Mary admitted that the availability of resources was "nice" but that she had many experiences facilitating learning in settings where resources were limited. Tracy believed that access to a wide variety of resources would be "nice" but that she could facilitate learning without many resources.

Cooperating teacher/student teacher similarities and differences. The student teachers perceived that, in general, they would be similar to their cooperating teachers in attitudes, values, and beliefs about home economics and how to facilitate learning. However, the student teachers perceived
that they would differ from their cooperating teachers in skills and knowledge. All four student teachers believed that they needed to develop classroom management skills and perceived that their cooperating teachers would know how to manage classrooms because of their experiences.

Heather, Mary, and Tracy believed that the knowledge bases that they developed while attending Iowa State University would probably be more current than the knowledge base currently held by their cooperating teachers. Mary reported that her life experiences, experiences that she perceived contributed to her knowledge base, were different than her cooperating teachers' experiences. Tracy adopted a "wait and see" attitude as she compared her knowledge base with her cooperating teacher's knowledge base. She may not know as much, know about the same, or know more than her cooperating teachers know about home economics subject matter.

**Bureaucratic characteristics of schools.** All four student teachers perceived that it was their responsibility to follow school rules and regulations and to strongly support extracurricular responsibilities. Mary perceived that she would support extracurricular responsibilities as long as she perceived that the responsibilities were distributed fairly among faculty members. None of the student teachers addressed different learning styles, teacher-pupil ratio, or classroom
space availability as ecological characteristics of classrooms.

Changes in student teacher attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge. All four student teachers agreed that their attitudes, values, and beliefs about who they were as teachers and about how they would facilitate the teaching/learning process would not change during their student teaching experiences. Concurrently, all four student teachers agreed that their skill levels would increase with regard to classroom management. Heather believed that her attitudes, values, interests, skills, and knowledge would become more realistic given that she entered student teaching with an idealistic picture of how teachers facilitated learning. Nancy anticipated that changes in her skills and knowledge levels would be positive changes or one of the reasons for students to participate in student teaching experiences. Mary and Tracy indicated that their classroom management skill levels would increase. However, Mary and Tracy were adamant about their perceptions that their fundamental values, attitudes, beliefs, and interests as people and as preservice teachers would not change during student teaching.

Philosophy of education. All four student teachers strongly supported the value of public education and provided
similar reasons for their support (i.e., a good education is necessary in our society; education is preparation for life; education is a "building block" for future generations; good educations produce well-rounded individuals). All four student teachers believed in being flexible with learners to a certain extent. Nancy perceived that teachers must be flexible but must not show pupil favoritism. Tracy believes that "flexibility" is equated with taking advantage of "teachable moments."

**Role expectations.** Tracy perceived that her roles, during student teaching, were that of teacher and role model. Heather, Nancy, and Mary perceived that they would assume a variety of teacher roles beyond teacher and role model (i.e., listener, observer, counselor, friend, an adult example).

**Student teacher biography.** Each student teacher presented a different biographical picture of themselves as teachers. Heather believes that "kids come first" and that it is her responsibility to create a supportive learning environment for pupils. She believes that she is interested in each pupil and that she is an "interesting" teacher. Heather believes that she is a good communicator and has the ability to be a good teacher for pupils because pupils are very important to her.

Nancy believes that her past teaching experiences will contribute to helping her become a better teacher. Nancy also
believes that because she "always wanted to be a teacher," she will become a good teacher.

Mary indicated that she was creative, well-educated, and caring. Those qualities, in her opinion, would contribute depth to her teacher development. Mary also believes that her diversity in life experiences will enhance classroom experiences for pupils.

Tracy believes that the opportunity to teach pupils is a "dream come true." Because of her deep desire to teach and because of her family background, Tracy believes that she will be a good teacher. Tracy grew up in a family where education was their livelihood. Both of Tracy's parents were teachers. Tracy indicated that, for as long as she could remember, she liked school. She likes pupils and she believes in the value of public education.

**Communication skills.** Each student teacher indicated that good communication skills were absolutely necessary in the teaching/learning environment. Heather indicated that she had good facial expressions and that she communicated both positive and negative messages through her non-verbal communication skills. Nancy indicated that communication skills are important but did not delve into her personal communication qualities. Mary indicated that, even though she was a good listener, she needed to improve her communication
skills and that was one of the reasons she looked forward to student teaching. Tracy indicated that she had excellent communication and listening skills.

Acquiring teacher behavior. All four student teachers strongly believe in continuing education as a way of continually acquiring teaching behavior. However, Heather, Mary, and Tracy indicated that there are positive and negative aspects related to belonging to professional organizations. The primary negative aspect was the time commitment necessary to be actively involved in professional organizations.

All four student teachers indicated that student teaching in two sites under the direction of two cooperating teachers would contribute positive learning experiences for them as future teachers. Two sites and two cooperating teachers would provide them with two different perspectives relative to how to facilitate learning and provide them with opportunities to student teach two different ways. Each student teacher indicated that they were aware that their cooperating teachers and placement sites would be different from one another. Student teaching under the two-site system would broaden their teacher perspectives and contribute positively to their teacher role development.
CHAPTER VIII.
STUDENT TEACHER OBSERVATIONS

The purpose of this chapter is to present an overview of student teacher portfolios that include researcher observational data, an overview of a computer program entitled The Ethnograph (Seidel, Kjolseth, & Seymour, 1988) used for data analysis, and data analysis procedures for analyzing the observational data collected for this study. The researcher script-taped an average of 26 class hours for each of the four student teachers in both placement sites for a total of 210 class hours of on-site observations. Specific information on researcher observations per student teaching site was presented in Chapter III.

Student Teacher Portfolio

The researcher compiled a field note portfolio for each student teacher. The portfolio contained script-taped teaching observations, placement site contextual information, and interactions between the student teacher, cooperating teacher, and pupils before and after the student teacher
taught a lesson. An explanation of each type of information collected will be presented.

**Script-taped observations.** The researcher script-taped continuously upon entering the classroom until leaving the classroom. An excerpt from one typical observation is presented in this section so that the reader will understand the observational procedures utilized by the researcher. All of the observations (OBS) recorded in this chapter are researcher observations.

**Script-tape excerpt.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Class Title</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Student Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/6/88</td>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>ST1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observation (OBS): Arrived at 8:26. 8:31 Class had 5 pupils enrolled; 3 were present; one male and two females. Cooperating teacher (CT1) not in room as class begins; CT1 enters approximately 5 minutes into the lesson. Pupils sit at tables facing ST1. Blackboards located on two walls. Student teacher (ST1) wrote important points on blackboard. ST1 appeared nervous waiting for bell to ring and class to begin. ST1 was trying out a movie as researcher entered classroom. CT1 was dressed in a beautiful suit with matching scarf; ST1 dressed in a matching skirt and sweater.

Observation contextual information noted by the researcher was recorded. Contextual information included the date, time, class title, placement site, and the name of the student teacher. Next, the researcher recorded specific information about the class in an attempt to describe the school setting. For example, the researcher recorded the number of pupils in
the class; location of the cooperating teacher before, during, and after the lesson; equipment used for the lesson; information written on the blackboard; observable emotions displayed by the cooperating teacher and the student teacher; and the physical appearances of the student teacher and cooperating teacher.

As the class began, the researcher script-taped and audio taped the lesson. OBS is observational information noted and recorded by the researcher. KID is a response from a pupil. STl is the student teacher being observed. CTl is the cooperating teacher.

Observation excerpt.

OBS 8:31 STl taking roll

STl "How's everyone coming on their projects?" "You will have time to work on them today." "Have any of you guys . . . I mean you people . . . got any questions?"

OBS 8:33 STl presented handouts on closet storage. STl voice cracks; appears nervous. STl presents laminated pictures of closet storage space-saving techniques taken from a local newspaper. STl discusses each picture.

CTl 8:39 "Let's tell them why we should use plastic hangers."

OBS CTl interjected the statement after she had seen plastic hangers used in one of the pictures; STl thought for a moment and then responded with an answer. STl looks at her lesson plan; appears nervous. STl holds up a picture of closet storage.

KID 8:43 "I have those things in my closet; they hold my shoes and sweaters. They're really neat. I also have milk creates to store my purses in."
STI 8:44 "That would be very neat!" "I hadn't thought about that before."

OBS CTI offers comments on personal closet storage; talks about her home. CTI standing directly behind the pupils with arms crossed; STI standing directly in front of the pupils. CTI told pupils about a recent home show in the area and the storage ideas she gathered from attending.

OBS 8:47 STI holds up a picture of a very elaborate bedroom.

STI "Whose bedroom looks like this?"

OBS 8:51 Pupils snicker and laugh because the picture is from a very expensive home. STI shows pictures of other bedroom storage areas and discusses each picture. A pupil appears sick. STI fills out a pass for pupil to leave class. Pupils work on projects.

STI 8:56 "What other ideas do you have about closet storage?"

KID Many examples given from storage techniques used in their own bedrooms.

STI 9:01 "Yooooooou did a GREAT job!"

OBS STI used a warm voice for the lesson; worked closely with the pupils on their projects; responded to their ideas about storage in a positive manner but did not wait very long before she answered a question that she had asked of a pupil. STI used "gunna (8), wanna (11), ok (14), and whatever (6)" in her communication throughout the lesson. Pupils worked on individual projects most of the class period.

Placement site contextual information. The researcher collected as much specific information about each particular student teaching placement site as possible. This information came from either school secretaries or building principals. Specific contextual information for each placement site was presented in Chapter VI.
The placement site contextual information found in the daily field notes included such things as the number of pupils enrolled class, the number of males and females enrolled in the class, and space and equipment availability. The researcher exercised care in making notations about each particular class being taught by the student teacher. Did the student teacher have access to a variety of current resources and equipment? Did the student teacher have adequate space in which to teach the number of pupils enrolled in the class? Were classes mainstreamed to include pupils with different learning ability levels? Was the environment a bright environment or was the environment a dreary environment? What responsibilities, aside from teaching, did the cooperating teacher have (i.e., extracurricular activities)?

**Student teacher interactions.** The researcher noted the interactions between the student teacher and pupils as they entered the classroom. Was the student teacher aware that pupils were entering the classroom? How did the student teacher greet the pupils as they entered the classroom? How did the student teacher handle disruptive behavior as pupils were entering the classroom? What kinds of conversations did the student teacher initiate with the pupils? What kinds of conversations did the pupils initiate with the student?
Similar information was noted during the class and as pupils left the classroom.

The researcher attempted to collect data before and after teaching interactions with the cooperating teacher. However, this information was not as easy to collect because most of the conversations occurred in other parts of the room away from the researcher. The researcher did note the outward appearances of the interactions (e.g., facial expressions, who was talking to whom, length of conversation, and general noticeable atmosphere between the student teacher and cooperating teacher).

Data Analysis Procedures

*Mechanical and interpretive aspects of data analysis.*

Data collected for this study were analyzed with a computer program entitled *The Ethnograph* (Seidel, Kjolseth, & Seymour, 1988). This computer program was developed by qualitative social scientists as "an efficient alternative to the often cumbersome task of managing field notes, transcripts, documents, and other types of text data collected and analyzed in ethnographic research" (p. 1-2). *The Ethnograph* is a set of interactive, menu-driven computer programs designed to assist the qualitative researcher in some of the mechanical aspects of data analyses.
Seidel, Kjolseth, and Seymour (1988) argue that there is a conceptual distinction between the interpretive (or thinking) aspects of qualitative data analysis and the mechanical aspects of qualitative data analysis. The interpretive aspect involves "cutting and pasting" activities which include: (a) mentally organizing the data into categorical and conceptual collections; (b) coding, recoding, and sorting data files into analytical categories for comparison and interpretation; and (c) revising the coding schemes with the addition, deletion, or modification of codes. By utilizing the computer to perform the mechanical aspects of the data analysis, the researcher is free to devote more time to the critical interpretive aspects of qualitative data analysis.

Data analysis cycle. The Ethnograph allows the researcher to continually code and recode the data. A schematic framework for The Ethnograph is presented in Table 8. A brief explanation of each step in the schematic framework for The Ethnograph is presented. Step one entails collecting the data and step two entails transcribing verbatim raw data and entering the data into the computer. Step three is the conversion of raw data into a standard computer file, a form that The Ethnograph can manipulate. Step four entails a procedure whereby The Ethnograph numbers the lines of the verbatim data and prints the raw data. The first four steps
are the preliminary mechanical steps for qualitative data analysis.

Table 8. A Schematic Framework for *The Ethnograph*

1. Collect Data  
2. Transcribe Raw Data  
3. Convert Data (Computer Entry)  
4. Number and Print Raw Data File  
5. Code Mapping  
6. Enter Codes  
7. Search for Codes  
8. Reflect on Data (Interpret Data)  
9. Modify Codes  
10. Re-search Codes  
11. Report the Data


After the document has been printed, step five allows the researcher to reflect on the data, comment on the data, mark the data, code the data, and analyze the text. Prior to discussing the remaining steps of data analysis using *The Ethnograph*, the reader must conceptualize the difference
between the "emic" and "etic" realms of qualitative data analysis.

The Ethnograph is an interactive computer program allowing for the researcher to interact with the data. The "emic" realm of the data is the verbatim data as entered into the computer program or a map of the student teacher's progress through the student teaching experience. The "etic" realm of the data is the researcher's record of reflection or the researcher's comments about the data or the researcher's mapping of what the student teacher is actually doing (see Table 9).

Comments on or interaction with the data included code mapping procedures such as noting certain things about the data. In this study, the researcher noted specific socialization variables as they impacted the socialization process for each of four student teachers. The verbatim data were not altered during this process.

Step six entailed entering code words into the computer. The Ethnograph allows for inserting, changing, modifying, and printing code mapping schemes with "great facility and unending variety" (Seidel, Kjolseth, & Seymour, 1988, p. 3-6). Step seven, the search step, entails searching the files for specific codes. The printed output combines similar codes to allow the researcher to capture a sense of code frequencies.
For example, one particular file for one student teacher revealed that there was student teacher/cooperating teacher interaction twice during four hours of observation while another file for a different student teacher revealed that there was student teacher/cooperating teacher interaction 27 times during four hours of observation.

Table 9. Etic and Emic Realms of Data Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBERED VERSION OF FILE OBS1.ETH</th>
<th>6/10/1989</th>
<th>10:46</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ST3 OBS1 Jr/Sr Foods 1/30/89</td>
<td>1 -------- ID*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBS The foods.lab is huge; 6-8 individual labs; majority pupils black; happy atmosphere</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST3 8:10 pacing back and forth watching kids make pizza</td>
<td>7 -------- TCH*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>****************************************</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECORD OF ACTION RECORD OF REFLECTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓ OBSERVATION MAPPING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMIC REALM (raw data) ETIC REALM (coded data)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ID = student teacher identification.
*CTXT = site contextual information.
*TCH = teaching methodology utilized during lesson.
Steps 8 through 10 repeat steps 5 through 7. In other words, step 8 allows for researcher reflection similar to the preliminary code mapping step (step 5); step 9 allows for code modification similar to the preliminary code entry (step 6); and step 10 allows for a re-search of the data similar to the preliminary data search (step 7). Thus, *The Ethnograph* is noted for its cyclical, interactive capabilities. The researcher enters into a series of steps which allow for thinking about and re-thinking the data for interpretive purposes.

Analysis of Data by Socialization Variables

An analysis of on-site observational data collected on four student teachers is presented for each student teacher. Each student teacher student taught in two different student teaching placement sites for eight weeks in each site. Chapter VII presented in-depth information from entrance interview schedules for each student teacher by each of the 11 socialization variables. The purpose of Chapter VII was to present student teacher perceptions of how they believed they were influenced prior to student teaching or would be influenced by each of the 11 socialization variables during student teaching.
Chapter VIII includes researcher observations for several of the socialization variables. The researcher combined some of the socialization variables. For example, the key individuals, cooperating teachers/university supervisors, and student teacher/cooperating teacher similarities and differences variables were combined into a key individuals and cooperating teachers socialization variables. The key individual and the ecological characteristics of classrooms variables were directly observed by the researcher. The remaining socialization variables (e.g., bureaucratic characteristics of schools; changes in attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge; philosophy of education; role expectations; student teacher biography; communication skills; and acquiring teacher behavior) were not directly observed by the researcher.

Specific variables cited in the review of literature as impacting the student teacher socialization process observed by the researcher and discussed in this chapter include: (a) key individuals and cooperating teachers and (b) ecological characteristics of classrooms. The socialization variables will be discussed as they relate to each of the four student teachers.
Key Individuals and Cooperating Teachers

Key individuals (e.g., cooperating teachers, university supervisors, university professors, peers, family, friends, other faculty in schools, pupils in classrooms) have been cited in the literature as impacting the student teacher socialization process. For example, Edgar and Warren (1969) suggest that by the end of student teaching, student teachers change to become like their cooperating teachers in attitudes and methodology. DeVoss (1979) reported that when student teachers and cooperating teachers were mutually supportive and similar in philosophy, orientation, and attitudes, student teachers reported successful student teaching experiences. Southall and King (1979) argue that key individuals can have a negative impact on student teachers. These authors found that a lack of student teacher/cooperating teacher communication and unrealistic cooperating teacher expectations were the two most frequent problems with which supervisors had to contend.

This section provides researcher observations relative to the impact that key individuals had on four student teachers. Each student teacher will be discussed separately.

Heather. Heather student taught first in a large, modern school system. The home economics facilities were spacious and well-equipped. The pupils ranged from grades 9 through 12. Heather's first cooperating teacher was a middle-aged
woman with several years experience teaching home economics. At the onset of her first student teaching experience, Heather reported being welcomed into the school system by her cooperating teacher and other teachers in the school system.

"My cooperating teacher has been really good. The first day she introduced me and the next day I was included in class discussions. Today my cooperating teacher had me walk around and help with worksheets and get films ready. The other teachers have been great, too. Teachers will come up to me and introduce themselves. They act interested in me" (Heather, Insights, September, 1988).

The researcher observed that a warm, friendly, and encouraging atmosphere existed between Heather and her first cooperating teacher, the pupils, and other teachers in the school system from the first through the last observation. The researcher observed Heather's first cooperating teacher while she taught three classes. The researcher described the cooperating teacher's teaching methodology as well-organized and task-oriented. The cooperating teacher was strict and did not allow off-task behavior from the pupils.

The researcher observed that Heather used similar teaching and disciplining methodology as her cooperating teacher used during the teaching/learning process. Heather was warm and friendly with the pupils as she executed her lessons. She was firm, fairly quick-paced, and on-task. However, these similarities were observed during the second week of Heather's first student teaching experience suggesting that Heather was
probably not influenced by her cooperating teacher in terms of her teaching and disciplining methodology. Heather entered her first student teaching experience with clearly developed teaching methodology. Apparently her teaching methodology resembled that of her first cooperating teacher's methodology.

Heather completed her first student teaching experience feeling confident about herself as a teacher, her contributions to pupils during the teaching/learning process, and her relationship with her first cooperating teacher. The researcher did not observe specific examples of Heather being influenced in her teaching and disciplining methodology by her cooperating teacher. However, the researcher observed that Heather's first cooperating teacher positively influenced her perception of teaching as a profession as well as her positive perception of her first student teaching experience. Heather was treated with dignity and respect while she student taught and she was allowed to develop her own personal teaching methodology with guidance from her cooperating teacher.

"In my first experience, I felt [my cooperating teacher] guided me more and was almost warning me before I fell. I really needed that guidance because I am not a confident person" (Heather, Exit Interview, Item 6, December, 1988).

Heather's second student teaching experience was in a small, rural school system. The pupils ranged from grades 7 through 12. The facilities were not as modern as they were in
her first experience. Heather's second cooperating teacher was a middle-aged woman with several years of home economics teaching experience. During the third week of Heather's second student teaching experience she provided information about how she perceived her second student teaching experience up to that point:

"It's the third week of my second student teaching experience and I feel like hell! I want to say that I'm really happy and I want to be teacher of the year . . . but I don't think I'm going to make it . . . Oh, I don't have it that bad and my cooperating teacher is a really nice lady. She's really involved with the kids and with lots of out-of-school programs for the kids. She's doing all of neat things and I think she's really student-minded. It's just that I'm spoiled by [my first cooperating teacher]. [My first cooperating teacher] encouraged me and she would say good things about me. Even when I really knew I was doing worthless, she'd pick out good points and she just make me feel like I had a lot of potential. But, I tell you what, I just don't hear much from [my second cooperating teacher]! She's not mean and I know I'm just spoiled. She doesn't have time for me . . . which is ok because someday I'll be thrown into a situation like that where I won't have someone to guide me. [My second student teaching experience] is just an unstructured atmosphere and . . . I'm the kind of person who needs to know what the hell is going on. I need to be organized because I don't feel any student deserves a teacher losing a paper or messing up their grades" (Heather, Insights, November, 1988).

Heather perceived that there were specific differences between her two cooperating teachers. Heather had enjoyed continuous feedback and encouragement from her first cooperating teacher. Her second cooperating teacher was reserved and apparently busy with outside activities. The
researcher observed that Heather's second cooperating teacher was also busy with a variety of activities during the time the researcher came to observe Heather.

The researcher observed Heather's second cooperating teacher teach three classes. There were marked differences in teaching and disciplining methodology between Heather and her second cooperating teacher. Heather's second cooperating teacher appeared to be more relaxed than Heather in her teaching and disciplining methodology. For example, the researcher observed that Heather prepared organized, detailed lessons for class. Heather also had clear expectations with regard to how pupils ought to behave in the classroom.

At the onset of her second student teaching experience, Heather was concerned about the differences in teaching and disciplining methodology between herself and her cooperating teacher:

"I can prepare all night and the next day it just doesn't go like it's supposed to. I'm supposed to teach the 7th and 8th graders how to sew and that's my weakest area. I feel like the kids deserve somebody who has the skills and the knowledge . . . but it's just a really unstructured atmosphere. Like today, [my cooperating teacher] told me the kids were pretty noisy [when I was teaching] and she said, "go ahead and be mean and slap detention on them" whenever they talk. She tells me to do that but whenever I observe her classes, I feel she has no more control on her classes than I do. People are always doing other homework. They are always talking when other people are talking. I guess I'm the type of person who needs a little more structure and control" (Heather, Insights, November, 1988).
By the middle of Heather's second student teaching experience the researcher observed that Heather's teaching and disciplining methodology was similar to the teaching and disciplining methodology that she began to develop throughout her first student teaching experience. The researcher believes that Heather's second cooperating teacher did not have an influence on Heather's teaching and disciplining methodology.

However, by the end of her second student teaching experience, Heather had developed a friendship with her cooperating teacher. The two of them spent time together socially and professionally working on several projects involving pupils. After having evaluated both cooperating teachers, Heather offered the following summary of the impact that her second cooperating teacher had on her second student teaching experience:

"My second cooperating teacher was there to pick me up after I fell. In my second experience I probably had more freedom to make mistakes . . . she just let me take the classes over right away and she let me keep them for a long time so I had plenty of chances to make mistakes" (Heather, Exit Interview, Item 6, December, 1988).

Heather was directly influenced by responses from pupils in her classes. During both student teaching experiences, the researcher observed that Heather was interested in whether or not pupils comprehended the lesson. She was patient and she
paced the lessons so that pupils were assured of the time they needed to understand the concepts. Heather was quick to evaluate her lessons in terms of ways that she could have made her lessons better or more relevant for pupils. When pupils did not respond to the lessons the way that she had hoped they would respond, Heather was quick to believe that she was not a good teacher.

Heather was influenced by her fiance, her family, and her friends during both of her student teaching experiences. Those people close to Heather were very supportive and would allow her the freedom to express herself openly and often about her student teaching experiences.

"Without my friends and my family support I would have never made it. They suggested ways for me to deal with students or they suggested to me that I 'get my ducks in a row.' They just helped me out alot and they were really supportive. They had alot of confidence in me and they encouraged me" (Heather, Exit Interview, Item 1, December, 1988).

In her first student teaching experience, Heather developed a professional relationship with the second home economics teacher in the department. Heather noticed the way that the second home economics teacher conducted classes, organized lessons, and interacted with pupils. The researcher observed Heather as she interacted with the second home economics teacher and observed that Heather was provided with another example of how to teach home economics and how to
facilitate the teaching/learning process. The second home economics teacher used a teaching/learning methodology that appeared less structured than the teaching/learning methodology utilized by Heather's first cooperating teacher.

Heather did not develop close relationships with other faculty members other than home economics teachers in either student teaching placement site. The researcher believes that Heather was not influenced by other faculty members.

The researcher observed that Heather's teaching/learning methodology was directly influenced by another key individual, a university professor, while enrolled in a course entitled Educational Strategies for Application of Scientific Principles to Home Economics Programs. This methods course was developed specifically for the natural science home economics education curriculum option. (A comparison of the natural and social science options is presented in Chapter IV.) The course description states that students will learn how to apply scientific principles to teaching home economics subject matter (Iowa State University Catalog, 1987-89, p. 166).

Heather was instructed, over an 18-week period of time, on how to logically think through practical individual and family-related issues using a specific scientifically-oriented methodology. Through observing her professor, microteaching
experiences, and peer observations, Heather apparently had enough experiences to commit the scientifically-oriented teaching methodology to memory and to internalize the approach to the extent that she incorporated the process into her teaching/learning methodology.

The researcher observed Heather using the scientifically-oriented approach almost at the onset of her first student teaching experience. The following observation took place during the second week of her first student teaching experience (Heather, Observation 3, August, 1988). The researcher observations are denoted as OBS; Heather is denoted as ST1; and the cooperating teacher is denoted as CT1.

OBS  ST1 teaching interior design class; 8:40; ST1 dressed professionally; important points written on board; topic - closet storage space; 4 pupils present; CT1 in room

ST1 "What problems are associated with storage space in bedrooms?"

OBS kids brainstorm; offer many storage problems

ST1 "Let's see if we can narrow many problems to one or two specific problems and then see if we can experiment with ways to solve it."

"What, out of all the problems listed, is one that we can use today to research and solve?"

OBS kids decide specific closet arrangements and storage planning was where to start

ST1 "I have some pictures here to look at that might give ideas about ways to organize closets."

[lecture/discussion continues]
OBS 9:15; ST1 begins closure

ST1: "We looked at bedroom storage problems; we narrowed the problem to one we could learn about; we discussed cheap and easy ways to organize closets; you determined for yourselves how you could adapt these ideas to your own rooms; tomorrow we will continue the topic after you have looked at your own rooms and thought about the topic; we will also have time to work on your projects."

This particular teaching/learning methodology was utilized throughout Heather's student teaching experiences. However, based on conversations with the researcher, Heather apparently was unaware that she integrated this scientifically-oriented approach into her teaching methodology. Heather was the only student teacher in this study who enrolled in the methods course for the home economics education natural sciences curriculum option.

Nancy. Nancy's first student teaching experience was in a large metropolitan middle school. Nancy had no previous experiences with large schools. The pupils ranged from grades 6 through 8. Her first cooperating teacher was a middle-aged woman with several years of home economics teaching experience in at least two different schools. The facilities were modern and appeared spacious until the room filled with approximately 30 pupils per class.

The researcher observed Nancy's first cooperating teacher teach two classes. The researcher described Nancy's first cooperating teacher's teaching and disciplining methodology as
strict and quick-paced. She frequently used the 'drill and practice' teaching technique. Nancy's first cooperating teacher used a variety of hands-on teaching materials.

Nancy appeared nervous during the first researcher observation. During the first observation, the researcher observed a conference between Nancy and her cooperating teacher. The researcher observed that the cooperating teacher assumed the role of "teacher" at the onset of the conference. The first question the cooperating teacher asked Nancy during the conference was, "What are your strengths?" Nancy did not answer the question but rather asked another question:

"What will I be required to do as far as lesson plans are concerned" (Nancy, Observation 1, September, 1988).

Nancy's cooperating teacher did not answer the question. The researcher observed that two-way communication between Nancy and her cooperating teacher was nearly non-existent during the conference. After the conference, Nancy provided the following information:

"[During the conference] I was bummed out because my cooperating teacher changed my schedule. I didn't get to teach at the time she told me she was going to let me teach and there was no reason. I didn't understand what she wanted me to say in the conference. She seemed so mad at me" (Nancy, Insights, September, 1988).

The following observation will further illuminate the apparent lack of communication between Nancy and her first cooperating teacher:
ST2 asked [her cooperating teacher] a question

CT1 gave ST2 a stern look back

OBS ST2 was monitoring pupils as they were watching a movie; she was constantly walking between the tables; ST2 stands directly behind pupils who were causing a disruption; ST2 asks a pupil who was causing a disruption to move to another seat in the room

ST2 asks [her cooperating teacher] another question

CT1 begins to answer the question

OBS something catches the cooperating teacher's attention; CT1 laughs; question does not receive an answer; class was over; CT1 left the room saying "you gotta like kids to be a good teacher."

Aside from the apparent lack of communication between Nancy and her cooperating teacher, the researcher also observed that there was very little positive interaction between Nancy and her cooperating teacher during the teaching/learning process. The cooperating teacher generally sat at the back of the room grading papers while Nancy taught the lessons or the cooperating teacher was not present in the room while Nancy was teaching.

The researcher did not observe that Nancy was positively influenced in an observable way in her teaching and disciplining methodology by her first cooperating teacher. As an illustration, during the fourth week of her first student teaching experience the researcher observed Nancy's cooperating teacher as she taught a lesson to a particular
age-group of pupils one hour and then observed Nancy teach the same lesson to the same age-group of pupils the following hour.

Nancy attempted to imitate the cooperating teacher while teaching the same lesson. Nancy tried to use the same examples and the same teaching techniques with the pupils. The lesson was not successful. Nancy referred to the notes she had taken on her cooperating teacher's lesson but could not quickly interpret her notes. Nancy forgot to tell the pupils about an assignment she expected from the pupils at the end of the hour. When she asked for the assignment from the pupils, the pupils were confused and upset.

Nancy appeared to have personal conflicts with her first cooperating teacher from the beginning of her first student teaching experience. The first conflict evolved prior to the beginning of her first experience. Nancy was coaching volleyball in a separate school as a part of a coaching practicum requirement. Her first cooperating teacher did not believe that a home economics student teacher could adequately manage both coaching responsibilities and student teaching responsibilities. The cooperating teacher perceived that coaching responsibilities would detract from the time needed for adequately fulfilling Nancy's student teaching
responsibilities. This particular conflict permeated throughout the eight-week student teaching experience.

Throughout the student teaching experience, Nancy was confronted with classroom situations that she did not understand and problems that she could not solve. The following script-taped observation illustrates one conflict that existed between Nancy and her cooperating teacher.

OBS 11:15 pupils walking in; ST2 looks pale; takes roll; CT1 walks in room

ST2 "Ok! Everybody! Listen up! LISTEN UP!! I'm going to give the assignment to Group 2."

OBS Large class of approximately 30 pupils divided into 2 groups; one group assigned to study at tables; one group assigned to work on sewing project

ST2 "OK. Kids who study [Group 2], get your books. Open your books and get started!"

OBS 11:21 Group 1 goes to sewing machines; 11:22 ST2 answering questions from pupils in Group 2; ST2 tells Group 1 pupils to leave the machines alone; hands out papers to Group 1; 11:24 ST2 still handing out papers; kids are chaotic

OBS CT1 sitting at table close to researcher taking notes on ST2

CT1 [out loud within earshot of researcher] "ST2 made the wrong choice for how to teach sewing. I called her university supervisor over the weekend. She is not fulfilling her student teaching responsibilities. She is too involved with volleyball."

ST2 Begins to demonstrate on sewing machines

OBS Group 1 pupils standing behind ST2; pupil comes to CT1 and asks a question; CT1 sends pupil to ST2 to get the answer for the question [while ST2 is presenting a demonstration]; most pupils in Group 2 not paying attention to ST2; most pupils in Group 1 working on book
assignment; 11:28 pupil from Group 1 goes to CT1 to ask a question; CT1 send pupil to ST2 to get the answer

ST2 [stops demonstration] attempts to answer the question but did not know the answer

OBS 11:30 second pupil from Group 1 goes to CT1 to ask a question; CT1 sends pupil to ST2 for the answer

ST2 [stops demonstration] attempts to answer the question but does not know the answer; tries to answer the question anyhow

OBS Nearly all pupils in Group 2 lose interest in sewing machine demonstration; 11:39 pupils in Group 2 go to individual machines; pupils in Group 1 raise hands with questions; ST2 does not see the raised hands

ST2 11:43 "NO SLAMMING OF THE MACHINES!!"

OBS Pupils in Group 1 [study group] restless; some taking off shoes; walking around; one pupil in Group 2 [machine group] pretends that the sewing machine is a drum; two pupils in Group 1 walk into kitchen area and play with timer buzzers on stoves; 11:56 two pupils in Group 1 enter into an argument; 11:58 ST2 working with pupils at sewing machine; CT1 sitting close to researcher at the back of the room

OBS Bell rings

ST2 "I NEED ALL OF THE QUESTIONS!" [as pupils leave the room]

Nancy provided audio-taped insights directly following that particular class period. Apparently Nancy was confused and upset.

"I have never been so frustrated! I didn't want two groups. There are too many kids. [My cooperating teacher] made me do the groups and then she said "it didn't work." I'm mad. I knew she was making those kids come ask me questions. I can't do anything right for her" (Nancy, Insights, September, 1988).
By the end of the sixth week of her first student teaching experience, Nancy considered terminating her student teaching and leaving the university without a degree.

"I don't want to go back there ever!" I can't do anything right. [My cooperating teacher] says my volleyball makes me miss important school things. I never leave the school until 3:45 or 4:00. I try to come very early so she'll see I'm doing my work but nothing is right. [My cooperating teacher] calls my [university] supervisor and now she's angry with me, too. [My university supervisor] didn't even watch me teach. She says I better get everything straightened out with my cooperating teacher but I can't do that. I've tried. I've tried to talk to [my cooperating teacher] but I can't make her hear me" (Nancy, Insights, September, 1988).

Nancy was afraid to begin her second student teaching experience. She looked forward to student teaching in a small school system, a school system with which she was familiar, but she lacked confidence in her own abilities as a teacher and she was afraid of "the system" (Nancy, Insights, October, 1988).

Nancy's second student teaching experience was in a small, rural school system. Her second cooperating teacher was an older woman with several years of experience teaching home economics. The pupils ranged from grades 9 through 12. The school building was an older building. The home economics facilities were older but well-maintained. There were two home economics rooms with enough space to accommodate the pupils.
The researcher observed the interaction between Nancy and her second cooperating teacher from the onset of Nancy's second student teaching experience. During each observation, the researcher noticed that Nancy and her second cooperating teacher seemed at ease when they talked with one another. There was evidence of laughter and a light atmosphere between the two of them. The researcher observed that the cooperating teacher was willing to assist Nancy when she asked for clarification or guidance and that the cooperating teacher was willing to allow Nancy to teach the lessons using her own teaching methodology.

The researcher observed the cooperating teacher teach three lessons in a clothing laboratory setting. The researcher did not observe similarities between Nancy and her second cooperating teacher in teaching and disciplining methodology.

Nancy did not develop close relationships with other teachers in either school system during her student teaching. Therefore, Nancy was not influenced by other faculty members during her student teaching experiences.

The researcher did not observe Nancy being personally influenced by reactions from pupils in her classrooms. During her first student teaching experience, there were approximately 30 pupils per class. In her first student
teaching experience, Nancy managed only to cover the material slated for the lesson. During her second student teaching experience, Nancy began to relate spontaneously to the pupils and to develop a personal teaching methodology. The researcher did not observe an influence on Nancy's socialization process from the pupils.

Mary. Mary's first student teaching experience was in a metropolitan middle school. The facilities were not large enough to adequately provide for approximately 30 pupils per class. The lecture room also served as a foods laboratory. The clothing laboratory was housed in a room shared with another teacher in the school. The pupils ranged from grades 6 through 8. Mary's first cooperating teacher was an older woman with several years of home economics teaching experience.

Mary quickly developed a professional rapport with her first cooperating teacher. Mary entered her first student teaching experience believing that she wanted to learn as much as she could about the teaching/learning process from her cooperating teacher. At the same time, Mary believed that her cooperating teacher should assume the responsibility of teaching Mary everything that she could about how to facilitate learning.
The researcher observed very little interaction between Mary and her first cooperating teacher. The researcher observed that Mary's cooperating teacher was in the classroom while Mary was teaching the lesson observing Mary as she taught the lesson, standing behind disruptive pupils, or tending to supplies and equipment. Mary's first cooperating teacher appeared to be a quiet, soft-spoken woman whereas Mary was more outgoing in her personality.

The researcher observed the cooperating teacher teach two lessons. Her teaching methodology was quick-paced and task-oriented. By contrast, Mary's teaching methodology was conversational and task-oriented. It appeared that there was a difference of opinion between Mary and her cooperating teacher on how best to facilitate learning for middle school pupils. Mary's cooperating teacher provided activities for the pupils to do during the class period and moved quickly between activities as the lesson progressed. Mary provided hands-on activities for the pupils during class periods but also interjected personal experiences and examples in an attempt to generate pupil interaction. The end result of Mary's methodology was that pupils became disruptive.

By the end of Mary's first student teaching experience, Mary had almost eliminated the conversational aspect of her teaching methodology. Mary became quick-paced and task-
oriented in her teaching methodology. In Mary's particular socializing experience, the researcher believes that Mary was influenced by her cooperating teacher's teaching and disciplining methodology. Mary had adopted several of her cooperating teacher's techniques, particularly in the area of discipline techniques.

Mary's second student teaching experience was in a suburban setting. The facilities were modern, spacious, and adequate for the pupils enrolled in the classes. Mary's second cooperating teacher was a middle-aged woman with several years teaching experience teaching home economics. The pupils ranged from grades 9 through 12.

Mary developed a professional rapport with her second cooperating teacher at the beginning of her second student teaching experience. The researcher observed Mary's second cooperating teacher teach two lessons. The cooperating teacher taught with a relaxed methodology. She was conversational with pupils and she interacted with conversations that pupils had with one another.

The researcher observed that Mary's second cooperating teacher possessed a teaching methodology similar to the teaching methodology Mary attempted to utilize at the beginning of her first student teaching experience. Therefore, the researcher believes that Mary's second
cooperating teacher did not influence Mary in her teaching and disciplining methodology.

Mary did not develop close relationships with other faculty members at her placement sites during her student teaching experiences. Therefore, the researcher believes that Mary was not influenced by other faculty members.

Mary was influenced by the way that pupils responded to lessons that she taught. Mary had a great concern for the teaching/learning process and had a deep desire to make sure that pupils were learning the information that she provided for them. Mary attempted to take time with individual learners during her first student teaching experience but it appeared that there were too many pupils in a class for Mary to attend to specific individual learner needs.

In Mary's second student teaching experience, Mary was influenced by the way that pupils responded to her lessons. If pupils did not respond to the lessons in a positive manner, Mary was quick to take a personal interest in trying to rectify the situation. In her second student teaching experience, Mary had fewer pupils per class and was, therefore, able to interact with pupils on a more personal basis.

Mary was influenced by her immediate family members during both of her student teaching experiences. Mary was obligated
to assist her younger son with his homework for several hours every night before she could begin planning for her teaching responsibilities. This responsibility took away from the time that Mary could have spent on her teaching responsibilities and especially from doing "extra" things for pupils to facilitate learning.

The researcher noticed that during the beginning of Mary's first student teaching experience, Mary used hand-drawn cartoons and characters to illustrate points that she wanted to emphasize during her lessons. As she progressed through her student teaching experiences, Mary's time was cut short because of two specific family crises. Mary could not contribute "extras" to the teaching/learning experience and still maintain her responsibilities at home.

**Tracy.** Tracy's first student teaching experience was in a large metropolitan high school setting. The facilities were spacious and ample for the pupils enrolled in the classes. The majority of classes that Tracy taught were foods laboratory classes during her first student teaching experience. Her first cooperating teacher was a middle-aged woman with many years of home economics teaching experience. The pupils ranged from grades 9 through 12.

The researcher observed Tracy's first cooperating teacher three times and noticed that the cooperating teacher utilized
an organized, semi-relaxed, on-task teaching methodology. Tracy's first cooperating teacher was somewhat intolerant of pupil disruptive behavior and had a tactful approach to bringing pupils back on task.

At the beginning of Tracy's first student teaching experience, the researcher observed that Tracy was organized and utilized on-task teaching methodology, a methodology that was similar to her first cooperating teacher's teaching methodology. Both were task-oriented and organized. The foods laboratory lessons consisted of a lecture, demonstration, and practical laboratory sequence. The lectures presented by both Tracy and her cooperating teacher were similar.

The researcher does not believe that Tracy was influenced in her teaching methodology by her first cooperating teacher because the similarities between Tracy and her first cooperating teacher's teaching methodologies were apparent from the first observation to the last observation. The researcher believes that Tracy brought to the student teaching experience a methodology similar to that of her cooperating teacher's methodology.

However, the researcher believes that Tracy was influenced in her disciplining methodology by her first cooperating teacher. In the beginning of her first student teaching
experience, Tracy was not adept at handling disruptive pupil behavior. By the end of Tracy's first student teaching experience, Tracy developed disciplining techniques that were similar to those of her first cooperating teacher.

Tracy's second student teaching experience was in a large metropolitan middle school. The facilities were modern but not spacious enough to comfortably house approximately 30 pupils per class. Tracy's second cooperating teacher was an older woman with several years of home economics teaching experience. The pupils ranged from grades 6 through 8.

The researcher observed Tracy's second cooperating teacher for three class periods. Her second cooperating teacher used a strict disciplining methodology and rigid, on-task teaching methodology. Tracy's second cooperating teacher did not tolerate disruptive behavior from pupils under any circumstances. Pupils had a specific place to sit for each class and were not allowed to sit anywhere else. She had very clear and precise ways of facilitating learning. This methodology appeared to the researcher to be successful because pupils appeared well-behaved, seemed motivated by what they were doing in the classes, and, in general, appeared not to be disruptive.

The researcher observed that Tracy did not imitate her second cooperating teacher's teaching and disciplining
methodology. Tracy developed a unique methodology of teaching during her first student teaching experience. This particular methodology was conversational and relaxed. The researcher did not observe negative interactions between Tracy and her second cooperating teacher. However, Tracy offered the following comments as she summarized the influences she perceived from both of her cooperating teachers:

"The two cooperating teachers that I had were very different. The first cooperating teacher was a mentor, a counselor. She molded and guided my teaching and really helped me. She provided me with all the resources that I could ever need. She sat down almost daily and went over the plans for the next several days' lessons to see what we're doing and where we were going from here. The second cooperating teacher was very different. I felt almost as though I was intruding into her space. She didn't provide me with anything like resources automatically" (Tracy, Exit Interview, Item 6, May, 1989).

"My first cooperating teacher believed in the 'teachable moment' like I do. She believed that students have something positive to offer regardless of what percentile they fall in. A lot of the kids that we had were lower ability kids and they needed good positive experiences. With my second cooperating teacher, I tried a few little things with the class as kind of a break from the lesson that would only take 20 seconds at the longest and I was told several times, "You can't do that. You can't ask so many questions. You can't do what you just did! Do you see what happened when you just did that? When they are active, you just have to lecture to them and make them sit still so they won't do anything else." I had some difficulties with that [philosophy]" (Tracy, Exit Interview, Item 8, May, 1989).

The researcher observed Tracy being conversational, interactive, happy, and apparently comfortable with her teaching responsibilities in her second student teaching
experience. However, contrary to what the researcher observed, Tracy was not positively influenced by her second cooperating teacher in her teaching and disciplining methodology. Tracy developed a teaching and disciplining methodology unique to her personality and could not adjust to the rigidity of the atmosphere in the learning environment created by her second cooperating teacher.

Tracy did not develop close relationships with other faculty members in either of the school systems. Therefore, the researcher believes that Tracy was not influenced by other faculty members.

The researcher did not observe ways in which Tracy was influenced by pupils in her classes. She was very well prepared with her lessons and made every effort to keep her lessons on-task. When pupils asked questions during a lesson, Tracy would take the time to answer the questions or facilitate a class discussion. The researcher did not observe Tracy interpreting negative responses from pupils to her lessons to mean that she was not a good teacher.

Summary. The researcher observed that, on occasion, Heather, Mary, and Tracy utilized teaching and/or disciplining methodology that resembled their cooperating teachers' teaching and disciplining methodology. Heather, Mary, and Tracy may have been partially socialized into the teaching
profession through the power of positive reinforcement by at least one cooperating teacher. Nancy did not emulate either of her cooperating teachers' teaching and disciplining methodology. Therefore, the cooperating teacher as a key socializing variable, may have had an impact on three student teachers in the socialization process.

The researcher did not observe any of the four student teachers gravitating toward their cooperating teachers or university supervisors because their cooperating teachers or university supervisors had evaluative power. There is ample evidence to document that each of the four student teachers wanted to student teach in order to learn ways to facilitate learning rather than to simply earn a letter grade.

With the exception of Nancy's first and Tracy's second student teaching experience, student teachers developed professional working relationships with their cooperating teachers. In general, the positive influence from the cooperating teacher as a key socializing variable apparently transpired because of the relationships that student teachers developed with their cooperating teachers and vice versa. Six of the eight cooperating teachers seemed to be encouraging and helpful to the student teachers as well as involved in providing them with positive learning opportunities.
Ecological Characteristics of Classrooms

Doyle and Ponder (1975) define the classroom ecological system as "that network of interconnected processes and events which impinges upon behavior in the teaching environment" (p. 183). Environmental demands (e.g., teacher-pupil ratio, space needs, availability of resources, presence or absence of exceptional pupils) establish limits on the range of teacher behaviors. Copeland (1978) provided evidence that ecological classroom characteristics were influential in developing the cooperating teachers' teaching practices and beliefs and that those same ecological classroom socialization factors were also instrumental in shaping similar teaching practices and beliefs in the student teacher.

Heather. Heather's first student teaching experience was in a suburban school system. The facilities were colorful and modern. The building was carpeted and beautifully decorated. The home economics facilities were no exception. There were two complete eight-unit foods laboratories, a spacious clothing laboratory, teaching space in each foods laboratory, a lecture room, a huge storage room, and an office for the teachers.

By contrast, Heather's second student teaching experience was in a small, rural school system. The building was old yet well-maintained.
"I just can't get used to the school building that I'm in. It's not bad . . . it's just very different. I was spoiled (at my first site). I sometimes get really mad at having to walk through a hallway to get to my other home economics room. The hallway is dark and there are pipes everywhere. My first experience was in a dream world, I think" (Heather, Conversation with the Researcher, November, 1988).

Heather had a very difficult time adjusting to the differences in placement sites relative to her second student teaching experience. The researcher observed that Heather began to adjust to the second site midway through her second experience. Evidence of the adjustment was documented in her insight statements. Heather talked at great length about the condition of the facilities during the first three weeks of her second student teaching experience. By the fourth week, pupils and pupil learning experiences consumed the majority of her insight conversations. The researcher believes that Heather was negatively influenced by the physical surrounding in her second student teaching experience at the onset but the influence waned as other aspects of the teaching experience became more important.

The researcher also observed that Heather was influenced by the limited resources in her second student teaching experience. For example, she was encouraged to be careful about the number of copies that she requested for duplication in her second student teaching experience whereas in her first
student teaching experience, Heather did not have to justify her duplication requests.

Nancy. Nancy was influenced by the high teacher-pupil ratio during her first student teaching experience. She taught in a middle school where there were approximately 30 pupils per class. The facilities appeared spacious but when the pupils entered the classroom, the space was limited. The foods and clothing laboratory equipment was situated around the tables in the center of the room. Simply walking between the tables was sometimes difficult. Nancy was limited in terms of the activities that she perceived that she could utilize because of space limitations. During Nancy's second student teaching experience, ecological classroom limitations appeared to be minimal. There were approximately 10 to 15 pupils per class. The facilities and resources appeared to be adequate.

Mary. Mary was influenced by the high teacher-pupil ratio during her first student teaching experience. She taught in a middle school where there were approximately 30 pupils per class. The facilities were not adequate to accommodate the number of pupils enrolled per class. Mary was a creative student teacher. She liked to plan activities that would allow pupils to create pictures or plan other hands-on activities to reinforce important learning concepts. There
simply was not enough space to allow Mary the freedom to teach in that manner.

Mary's second student teaching experience was in a modern, spacious school system. Because there was no limitation on space or teaching resources, Mary could utilize her creative abilities in the teaching/learning process. However, Mary's second placement site did not have access to windows. Mary was influenced negatively to a certain degree because she could not see outside while she was inside the home economics classroom.

"I don't know what's worse, having windows and not being allowed to open the shades to see outside or not having windows. I'm a farm girl. I love nature. I love fresh air. I think kids need fresh air. [In my first experience] my cooperating teacher would not let me open the blinds because she thought that being able to see outside would be disruptive for the kids. [In my second experience] there were no windows. Sometimes I just wanted to get up and go outside and breathe fresh air" (Mary, Insights, April, 1989).

**Tracy.** Tracy was influenced by the teacher-pupil ratio during her second student teaching experience. She taught in a middle school where there were approximately 35 pupils per class. The space was barely adequate to seat the number of pupils enrolled. The room arrangement was somewhat inhibiting. The tables were situated in the center of the room with the foods and clothing laboratory equipment surrounding the perimeter of the classroom tables. Walking
between the tables was not always easy. The researcher observed that Tracy liked to use interactive, hands-on teaching strategies but due to space limitations, Tracy could not utilize her chosen teaching strategies.

**Summary.** Three student teachers were influenced by ecological characteristics of the classrooms (e.g., space allocation per pupil; high teacher-pupil ratio; age of classroom and school facilities; lack of access to windows). Two of these three student teachers (Mary and Tracy) student taught in metropolitan middle school settings for one student teaching experience. Home economics was a required course in the middle school placement sites thus accounting for a high number of pupils enrolled in each class. In these placement sites, high teacher-pupil ratio emerged in this study to be a socializing factor.

The third student teacher, Heather, was influenced to a certain degree by the physical facilities in her second placement site. This influence was noted particularly at the beginning of her second student teaching experience. It was during this period of time that Heather contrasted the facilities for both of her student teaching placement sites. Her first student teaching placement site was in a beautiful suburban school setting. Her second student teaching placement site was in an older, yet well-maintained, school
setting. Based on observations and conversations with the researcher, the researcher believes that the preliminary negative impact from the older physical facilities in her second placement site did not have a lasting socializing effect on Heather.
CHAPTER IX.
EXIT INTERVIEWS

This chapter provides verbatim information from four student teachers as they responded to socializing variables on the exit interview schedule. The first purpose of this chapter is to provide insight into the student teachers' post-student teaching thoughts as they relate to the socializing variables. The second purpose is to compare and contrast exit interview responses among student teachers on each socialization variable.

The exit interview schedule is found in Appendix C. The exit interview schedule was developed by rewording the entrance interview schedule with the items written in past tense, in most cases. The entrance and exit interview schedules underwent the same validity and reliability scrutiny. Heather and Nancy, traditional student teachers, responded to two or three items for each of the 11 socialization variables. Mary and Tracy, non-traditional student teachers, responded to nearly all of the items on the exit interview schedule.
The summation at the end of this chapter will present information on how student teachers perceived each socialization variable at the end of their student teaching experience. For example, how did student teachers perceive that they changed during sixteen weeks of student teaching? The underlined words or phrases in the student teachers' responses are those words or phrases that were emphasized by student teachers while audio taping the exit interviews. The words or phrases in brackets have been added by the researcher for clarity of response.

Key Individuals

Items in this section address the influence that cooperating teachers, friends, and family had on student teachers' teaching experiences. A second aspect of this section included student teachers' responses to suggestions from cooperating teachers or other key individuals that were presented to them about how they should teach or what they should teach learners.

Heather. Heather indicated that her teaching techniques were similar to her high school home economics teacher's techniques (Heather, Exit Interview, Item 3, December, 1988). Heather believed that her friends and her family influenced her teacher role development in that they were supportive
throughout her student teaching experiences, particularly in the confidence that they had in her as she progressed through her student teaching experiences.

"I found [my teaching techniques] to be alot like my favorite teacher in high school. I can see so many similarities. She was definitely student-oriented and that's probably why I chose to go into teaching and probably why she was my favorite teacher. I liked the way that she taught and I knew that's how I wanted to be" (Heather, Exit Interview, Item 3, December, 1988).

Nancy. Pursuant to the information about Nancy's first student teaching experience in Chapter VIII, Nancy did not have a rewarding first student teaching experience. When responding to "key individuals" and the impact that they had on her socialization process, Nancy reported that her friends and family were responsible for her decision to continue with her second student teaching experience.

"[After having gone through my first experience], I know that my family and friends played a very big role in my student teaching experience - not only my husband but my mom, dad, and siblings. They just kept pushing me to go on and not quit" (Nancy, Exit Interview, Item 4, October, 1988).

Nancy reported that her cooperating teacher, family, and friends were also influential during her second student teaching experience. Her second cooperating teacher provided nurturing support and the freedom that Nancy needed to develop a personal teaching and disciplining methodology. Nancy's family and friends provided emotional support along with
conveying a sense of pride in Nancy for her accomplishments during her successful second student teaching experience.

**Mary.** In her entrance interview, Mary perceived that her family and friends would be very supportive throughout her student teaching experiences. At the end of her experiences, Mary praised the support that she had received from her family and friends.

"My friends and family had an incredibly supportive influence on me in that they influenced my ability to concentrate during my student teaching" (Mary, Exit Interview, Item 1, May, 1989).

**Tracy.** Tracy indicated that she developed teaching techniques similar to "a particular category" of favorite teachers that she had in her mind prior to her first student teaching experience. This particular category of teachers believed in the "teachable moment," a concept that Tracy strongly supported in nearly every description of her student teaching socialization process.

"My favorite teachers were ones who always had a story to relate. They were the ones who had a personal interest in the students and took time to explain things. They really believed in the "teachable moment." That's one thing I believe in and one thing I saw carried through with one of my cooperating teachers" (Tracy, Exit Interview, Item 3, May, 1989).
Cooperating Teacher/University Supervisor

Items in this section address student teachers' perceptions of the role their cooperating teachers and university supervisor played during their student teaching experiences and student teachers' perceptions of what they learned about how to facilitate learning. Student teachers were also asked to provide specific examples of teaching techniques used during student teaching that they knew prior to their student teaching experiences.

Heather. Heather perceived that her cooperating teachers assumed two different roles during her student teaching experiences. Heather was not sure about the role of her university supervisor.

"[In my first experience my cooperating teacher's] role was to guide me and almost warn me before I fell. [In my second experience my cooperating teacher's] role was to answer questions if I had any and to pick me up after I fell" (Heather, Exit Interview, Item 6, December, 1988).

"I don't know what the role of my university supervisor was. When she came to visit, we never really talked about how I was doing or whether my objectives were in the right domain or level or anything related to student teaching. I suppose she came to check up on me and see how everything was going" (Heather, Exit Interview, Item 7, December, 1988).

Heather believed that she learned "how to make do with what you have" from her second cooperating teacher. Heather's second cooperating teacher believed that, though teaching
resources are nice, a teacher can get by with less and still facilitate learning.

"[My second cooperating teacher] was so creative and there is a way to do things. You don't have to have the best of the equipment or the best of food or facilities. You can have fun and that's what I learned from [my second cooperating teacher]" (Heather, Exit Interview, Item 8, December, 1988).

Nancy. Nancy compared both of her cooperating teachers relative to the influence that they had on her teacher role development.

"In my first experience, the role of my cooperating teacher was negative. She was there to help me fail. In my second student teaching experience, it was extremely different. She was very cooperative and she encouraged me. She gave me help and yet she let me go on my own and she'd be my teacher. She was a very caring, supportive teacher herself" (Nancy, Exit Interview, Item 6, December, 1988).

Nancy reported strong perceptions about what she believed the role of a cooperating teacher 'ought' to be after her first student teaching experience. The researcher believes that Nancy reported the characteristics that she needed to be a successful student teacher during her first student teaching experience, but found missing.

"I really know now that you need [a cooperating teacher who] is there [for you] as a friend. Maybe that should be her number one purpose. You need someone that is person-oriented and it is very important for a cooperating teacher to be a role model. [She] needs to practice what she preaches; to guide and yet give [the student teacher] room to grow and develop. Most of all the cooperating teacher really needs to be open and honest - very open and honest in their communication" (Heather, Insights, October, 1988).
In her entrance interview, Nancy reported that she would "relate well" to her cooperating teacher (Nancy, Entrance Interview, Item 15, August, 1989). Nancy believed that her shortcomings for her first student teaching experience would be that she entered student teaching being unfamiliar with a larger school system and that she would have less teaching experience than her cooperating teacher.

However, during her first student teaching experience, Nancy's perceptions changed about her perceived role of a cooperating teacher. At the same time, her fears were allayed relative to being capable of teaching in a larger school system.

Nancy's post-student teaching response to taking advice and suggestions from her cooperating teacher and university supervisor supports Edgar and Warren's (1969) findings that student teachers gravitate toward professionals who were perceived to have evaluative power over the student teacher's performance. The researcher does not believe that Nancy "gravitated" toward her cooperating teacher in terms of imitating her cooperating teacher's teaching and disciplining methodology. Rather, Nancy determined that she would be submissive to her cooperating teacher in order to earn a satisfactory grade for her first student teaching experience.
"From my first experience, I can relate that you need to take your advice from your cooperating teacher and university supervisor whether you like it or not. You have to take it because, let's face it, it's a grade and if you don't follow what they want you to do then you're in trouble. But, it gets a little tough when your cooperating teacher thinks one thing and your university supervisor thinks another. You have to survive and satisfy whichever one is there at the time" (Nancy, Insights, October, 1988).

Mary. Mary was analytical in her post-student teaching responses about the role of her cooperating teachers. Mary perceived that both of her cooperating teachers had their own teaching styles. Along with that perception, Mary provided the following statements:

"Some [of my cooperating teachers' teaching styles] would work for me and other things I left behind knowing that they wouldn't work for me. I let [my cooperating teachers] be who they needed to be and I tried to be who I needed to be. I did not go into to student teaching trying to change their systems. I strictly entered student teaching to learn what I could learn" (Mary, Exit Interview, Item 6, May, 1989).

Mary provided specific examples of ways that she facilitated learning using strategies that she developed prior to student teaching. She reiterated previous teaching experiences in Sunday school, 4H, seminars and workshops.

"When I taught Sunday school, 4H, and all kinds of seminars and workshops, I used to worry about filling the time and whether the kids would be bored. I've taught all ages from kindergarten through adult. One of the key ideas I've had in the past 20 years is to have more things to do than you could possibly ever get done. Never be unprepared!" (Mary, Exit Interview, Item 9, May, 1989).
Mary did not change her teaching strategies during her student teaching experiences. She entered student teaching with very clear ideas on how to facilitate learning, ideas that she had developed during the years prior to pursuing her teacher certification degree. The researcher believes that Mary's strategies were not influenced by either of her cooperating teachers.

Mary perceived her university supervisor as a person who offered support and encouragement. Mary did not address specific ways in which her university supervisor encouraged her other than to say that her university supervisor offered helpful suggestions.

"My university supervisor supported me and had confidence in me. She expected nothing but the best from me and she knows she'll get the best from me. She had a tremendous belief in me as a person and believed that I had qualities to contribute to teaching. She made suggestions to me and I received them well. She never made me feel inadequate. She was positive" (Mary, Exit Interview, Item 7, May, 1989).

Tracy. Tracy finished her student teaching experiences with two different perceptions of how to facilitate learning. Tracy compares her cooperating teachers in such a way that the negative aspects of her second student teaching experience emerge.

"[My first cooperating teacher] really believed in the "teachable moment" like I do. She believed that all students had something positive to offer. She was my mentor and counselor. She spent time with me everyday planning and evaluating. [My second cooperating teacher]
made me feel like I was intruding into her space. She didn't provide me with resources automatically. [My second cooperating teacher] told me "You can't do that. You can't ask so many questions. You can't do what you just did! You just have to lecture and make [the students] sit still so they won't do anything else!'" When I did try something else, I got the clamps put on me and started to feel like "why should I even try." One of my "best" lessons as far as [my second cooperating teacher] was concerned, was when I stood up and regurgitated information to the students. I didn't feel like I did any teaching. She thought it was fabulous because the class was quiet. We had some real [methodological] differences" (Tracy, Exit Interview, Items 6 and 8, May, 1989).

Tracy was hesitant when responding to her perceptions of the cooperating teachers' roles in her entrance interview. She did not know what the role of a cooperating teacher was; she only knew how she wanted to interact with her cooperating teachers. However, Tracy was quick to respond with her perceptions of the cooperating teachers' roles in her exit interview. The researcher believes that Tracy was positively and negatively influenced by cooperating teachers during student teaching.

Tracy indicated that her university supervisor provided suggestions that were appropriate and that her university supervisor was supportive and encouraging.

"My university supervisor was fabulous! She never made me feel intimidated by her presence. She would give suggestions where she thought they were appropriate and she always had positive, supportive comments to make" (Tracy, Exit Interview, Item 7, May, 1989).
Ecological Characteristics of Classrooms

Items in this section center around the student teachers' perceptions of the influence of the teaching environment (e.g., the ideal classroom, space allocations, equipment availability, and resource availability) on attitudes, values, and beliefs about teaching. This section addresses the influence of the geographic location of the student teaching placement sites on student teachers' socialization processes.

Heather. Heather responded to the "ideal" classroom by indicating the type of pupils that she enjoyed teaching in a classroom. Heather also compared resource availability in both placement sites and decided that having adequate resources influenced her socialization process.

"[The ideal classroom] I think is my first student teaching placement site. All of the students were college bound, eager, hardworking, and wanted to learn. That's an ideal classroom! I loved to see a kid want to learn. It's the most amazing thing and really refreshing" (Heather, Exit Interview, Item 10, December, 1988).

"I think [resource availability] has alot of bearing on how I think about teaching. I had alot of resources [in my first experience] and didn't have very many resources [in my second experience]. I'm glad I had my student teaching experiences in the order that I did because not only would I be starting out student teaching, I would have tried to get around the limit on resources" (Heather, Exit Interview, Item 11, December, 1989).

Nancy. Nancy responded to the resources available at her first student teaching placement site and cited the availability of resources as not having an impact on her
teacher role development because resources take a second priority in terms of what Nancy believes to be important in a classroom. Nancy also responded to the geographic location of placement sites. Nancy interpreted "geographic location" to mean a comparison of "big" and "small" school systems for student teaching placement sites.

"I used to think that resources were very important [in teaching] but at my [first site] I had a great environment - great resources, equipment, and space. But, it wasn't good enough to cover up other problems such as getting along with the cooperating teacher and how the cooperating teacher got along with me. You can learn to make the best of what you have. You can always create new space or resources" (Nancy, Insights, October, 1988).

"I think that the attitudes, values, and beliefs are very much different [in a metropolitan school] than the background I came from. Because of that, I see that there is a different outlook on teaching. The big school setting may have been a little bit of the trouble between me and my [first] cooperating teacher. In the second experience, the location was just like what I had grown up in; a small farming community. The size of the school, the beliefs of the people, attitudes, and values was the same [as my background] and I think it really influenced my student teaching experience as far as making the experience better" (Nancy, Exit Interview, Item 12, December, 1988).

Mary. Mary was influenced during her student teaching by the physical arrangements of the classroom, the presence or absence of windows in the classrooms, and the socioeconomic status of the pupils. The classroom in her first student teaching site was arranged in rows. Mary preferred to teach in U-shaped room arrangement. Mary quickly became aware of a
difference in beliefs between her and her cooperating teacher about whether or not the windows should be exposed or covered with shades. Through student teaching, Mary learned that regardless of socioeconomic status, pupils want to learn and that Mary cared about all pupils.

"At times [the ecological characteristics of the classrooms] really bothered me. I felt locked in, contained, and rigid. We were in rows or a very rigid format because that's what had always been done. I found it frustrating because it took time to change my class [arrangement] from the way the teacher before me had it. I felt locked up. I couldn't express myself in my room because it wasn't my room" (Mary, Exit Interview, Item 10, May, 1989).

"[In my first experience], the rooms were well-equipped but [in my second experience] the rooms were even better. I had more space. The class size was smaller so it was easier to do many things with students. [In my first experience] there were windows along the walls in both classrooms and yet the blinds were always pulled. It used to drive me crazy. I like to see outside and probably there are students who would like to see the sunshine instead of having the blinds pulled. Everytime I would open the blinds, the next time I turned around they would be closed. [In my second experience] there were no windows so I couldn't see outside. It really gave me a claustrophobic feeling" (Mary, Exit Interview, Item 11, May, 1989).

"[My first experience] was in an area where you quickly became aware of the economic status of that [poorer] side of the city. I found that those types of student weren't supported at home nearly as much as [students were supported] in [my second site]. I learned that those [poorer] students wanna learn just as much as the students that come from better economic conditions. I found out that I cared about them just as much as I cared about some of the students that came from better economic situations" (Mary, Exit Interview, Item 12, May, 1989).
Tracy. One ecological characteristic of Tracy's second placement site seemed to negatively affect her progress toward developing her unique teaching perspectives. Tracy's second placement site was in a middle school setting. The home economics facilities had been reallocated to include one rather than two home economics classrooms. Consequently, the resources that were once housed in two rooms were now located in one room. Tracy perceived that more cupboards in one classroom meant less space for pupils and, consequently, a more cluttered environment. Tracy addressed storage constraints and the presence or absence of windows as she described the "ideal" classroom.

"In one of my classes, there were alot of portable cupboards and closets that had been brought in. It made me feel like the room was cluttered. It think storage is really important, especially in a subject like home economics, where you have to have so many resources. The ideal classroom would also have a few windows. The classroom at my first site was a lovely room but it didn't have windows" (Tracy, Exit Interview, Item 10, May, 1989).

Cooperating Teacher/Student Teacher
Similarities and Differences

This section addresses the student teachers' perceptions of how they related to their cooperating teachers. What were the similarities and differences between them?
Heather. Heather addressed perceived personality differences between her and both of her cooperating teachers. Adjusting to the differences between Heather and her second cooperating teacher took approximately half of her second student teaching experience.

"[My first cooperating teacher] was warm and friendly. I loved her right from the start. With [my second cooperating teacher] I ended up loving her but she was distant and hard to get to know. She was really scary at first. I understand her now. I know how she acts and I can handle her. I can accept that she doesn't give a lot of encouragement. I wanted encouragement so much at first when I went there. Just to have [my cooperating teacher] say, "You did a really good job or thank you for doing that" was so important to me. I guess I'm like a dog looking for a pat on the head. I probably related a lot easier to [my first cooperating teacher] just because she was more open and friendly" (Heather, Exit Interview, Item 13, December, 1988).

Heather continues with specific similarities and differences between her and her cooperating teachers. However, Heather was quick to indicate that the way she personally related to the pupils in her classes was similar to the way her high school home economics teacher related to Heather while she was in high school.

"I'm similar to both of my cooperating teachers because they are concerned about the students. So am I, but I learned how to be that way from my [high school] home economics teacher. I'm most similar to [my second cooperating teacher] because she is so into the students and into what she can do to help them. [My first cooperating teacher] was more interested in herself. I love her to death but she's got a high interest in herself, like not coming to school early and not wanting to stay after school, and that's how we would be
different" (Heather, Exit Interview, Item 14, December, 1988).

Nancy. Nancy was quick to respond to how she related to her cooperating teachers, in general, and cited one specific difference between her and her second cooperating teacher.

"I did not relate at all to [my first cooperating teacher]! The second [cooperating teacher] I related to very well. She was so unique, open, and enthusiastic. People sometimes thought she went over the deep end being enthusiastic and I'm not quite that enthusiastic of a person. If anything, that would have been the difference between us. Everything else seemed to compare really close" (Nancy, Exit Interview, Item 13, December, 1988).

Mary. Mary perceived that she "tried hard" to relate in a positive, professional manner with both of her cooperating teachers. However, Mary provided some insight in terms of how she felt as she executed her relationship with cooperating teachers.

"There were certainly times that [my cooperating teachers and I] had differences and many times I didn't express my differences. I tried to be a very good listener. I tried to take suggestions from [my cooperating teachers] because I felt they had more experience. I tried to be really open and flexible with them" (Mary, Exit Interview, Item 13, May, 1989).

Mary expounded on how she perceived the similarities and differences between her and her cooperating teachers. She presented a detailed description of how she felt "boxed" and in stifled with regard to trying new ideas.

"I got neat ideas that I wanna try and many times I felt so locked in because of the "this just won't work" attitude. I was told that [my ideas] wouldn't work and I had to accept that. I wanted to try some new things and
to see what would work and wouldn't work and they weren't willing to risk something that wouldn't work. For example, I heard a lecturer talking about individualized projects [for students]. When [students] run out of things to do during a lesson, they could have their projects to work on and then could be working on a presentation for the class. I talked to my cooperating teacher about that and she felt that it would be a hassle to have every person with their own project for her or me to keep track of or to give them the help that they might need. I felt like I was put in a box before I hardly got the words out of my mouth. I think someday when I have my own job if I wanna try it, I may find out that it absolutely doesn't work but then it might work, too" (Mary, Exit Interview, Item 15, May, 1989).

**Tracy.** Tracy compared herself to both of her cooperating teachers and determined that she was similar to her first cooperating teacher and different from her second cooperating teacher on teaching and disciplining methodology. Tracy indicated that she felt as though two-way communication and a professional relationship did not develop between her and her second cooperating teacher.

"My first cooperating teacher and I had some very similar beliefs as far as teaching and students were concerned. I never felt any closeness with my second cooperating teacher. She told me a number of times, "I have had lots of students per year and I have taught this class over so many times." Sometimes that came across in a condescending manner. There was never a complete elimination of that wall . . . between us" (Tracy, Exit Interview, Item 13, May, 1989).

Tracy cited specific examples of how some teaching values and beliefs held by each of her cooperating teachers were similar to her personal values and beliefs about the teaching/learning process. However, Tracy cited some
differences. Tracy perceived that her teaching skills and knowledge levels were different from the teaching skills and knowledge levels of her cooperating teachers.

"I would say the values and beliefs are pretty much the same between both of [the cooperating teachers] and me. We value good education. We value the kids and believe that there are good kids. But our attitudes were definitely different. The first teacher that I had, we had fairly similar attitudes. As far as the second [cooperating] teacher and I, on classroom discipline, we were very different. I believe in having not quite as tight a rein on the kids as she does. She believed that any drop of freedom that you dangled in front of [pupils'] noses, they would just go crazy. The skills and knowledge portion - I feel that my skills and knowledge can't be as polished or as practiced as [my cooperating teachers]. Having just come out of college, the knowledge [I have] is really good but there is also a part of my knowledge that is 14 years old that needs to be dug up and aired out. I'd say that was probably the most difficult part of my student teaching was digging deep down inside myself and saying "You do have this knowledge inside you, where did you put it?" (Tracy, Exit Interview, Item 14, May, 1989).

Bureaucratic Characteristics of Schools

This section addresses general school rules and regulations in both student teaching placement sites. Beyond student teacher perceptions of school rules and regulations, this section addresses whether or not student teachers believed it was important to follow the rules.

Extracurricular school activities were also addressed. Heather, Nancy, and Mary responded to this variable while Tracy chose not to respond to the variable.
Heather. Heather maintains, after student teaching, that school rules and regulations must not only be respected by teachers but also by pupils. Pupils must be taught to respect school rules and regulations through examples set before them by teachers. Heather also offered her philosophy on how she perceives performing extracurricular responsibilities.

"If you don't respect the rules and regulations that schools set down and respect the principal [or school authority], you can't respect [those in leadership positions in schools] or follow those rules. It's just gunna be a cycle. The kids aren't gunna respect your rules and they are going to know if you're against the principal or against the [school] rules. If you want a school system to work, I firmly believe in teamwork and respect. That's why when I go out to look for a job that's one of the things I'm going to look at. Is the faculty or staff someone I can really work with and get close to because I really believe in camaraderie" (Heather, Exit Interview, Item 17, December 1988).

"There's always going to be something extracurricular that you have to do [in a school system]. That's what a good teacher is. It's dedication. It's a very unique job. Not everyone could do it because you have to dedicate so much of your time and yourself to a job. It's not a 9 hour job. You take it home or you stay there longer than you should to get everything accomplished" (Heather, Exit Interview, Item 18, December, 1988).

Nancy. Nancy interpreted school "rules and regulations" as "the way (teachers) discipline the kids." Nancy provided information about who is responsible for enforcing the school rules and regulations and why it is necessary to follow them.

"[School rules and regulations are] the way you discipline the kids. However, in both [student teaching] schools it was basically up to the teachers, but you had to follow rules. In [my first site] [students] couldn't eat candy or chew gum; neither could the teacher. You had to be at
school at 7:00 a.m. and things like that. In [my second site] we had very similar things " (Nancy, Exit Interview, Item 16, December, 1988).

"You're a teacher. When you are teaching, you need to follow the rules and regulations of the school system. My role is to act like a teacher and follow the rules" (Nancy, Exit Interview, Item 17, December, 1988).

Nancy had some reservations about participating in extracurricular activities. Nancy did not include a reason for why she believed that teachers had to assume responsibility for extracurricular activities.

"Sometimes, being a teacher, you have to take on the extracurricular responsibilities. You may not always think that it is fair but every teacher usually takes their turn. It's important to do that" (Nancy, Exit Interview, Item 18, December, 1988).

Mary. Mary responded to school rules and regulations by reiterating the rules of placement site schools. Mary was privy to more information about what was expected from the building principal in her second site than she was in her first site.

"... [the rules are] to be on time, [hand in] your admit slips, [hand in] your papers and forms that have to be filled out and lesson plans into the office. [In my first site] I had to have lesson plans in on Friday to [my cooperating teacher] but I don't know whether they had to be in the [principal's] office. I never got in on any of the bureaucratic school characteristics [in my first site]. [In my second site] I was very much involved with being sure that the lesson plans were written in the book and taken to the office. [My second cooperating teacher] let me be in on much more of the running of the department than I was in [my first site]" (Mary, Exit Interview, Item 16, May, 1989).
When responding to whether or not Mary believed that it was important to follow school rules and regulations, she provided additional insight about herself as a person and as a teacher. Mary wanted to know how school systems operated, to synthesize school rules as they relate to the educative process, and to follow school rules as long as she was student teaching. Then, when she was employed in a school system, she perceived that she would evaluate the rules to "see" whether or not the rules would "work for her." Mary also stated that she did not mind participating in extracurricular responsibilities even though she mentioned that she had not been overburdened with extra responsibilities.

"I think [it is important to follow school rules and regulations]. [School rules and regulations] were just handled in very different ways [in both of my student teaching sites]. I'm a person that's a game-player. I follow rules and regulations. I want to do well and I feel that in order to do well you do have to be a game-player and follow the rules and regulations whether you agree or whether you don't agree. When you have an ultimate goal in mind, and mine was to get through school and get through school well, I'm not out to buck a system. I figure that when I'm on my own then I will decide what works for me and what doesn't work for me" (Mary, Exit Interview, Item 17, May, 1989).

"Right now my attitude is really good [toward extracurricular activities]. I went on several field trips with my students. I took them to a daycare center. Supervising extracurricular activities is ok with me as long as I can work it in. I just don't have a problem with that at all" (Mary, Exit Interview, Item 18, May, 1989).
Changes in Student Teacher Attitudes, Values, Beliefs, Skills, and Knowledge

Items in this section address student teachers' perceptions of how their attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge changed during student teaching. They were asked to respond specifically to particular changes that were positive and negative changes. Student teachers indicated whether or not they thought their cooperating teacher influenced the perceived changes in attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge.

Heather. Heather believes that she has more confidence in herself as a teacher after student teaching. She knows, now, that she can "hold down a classroom" and give the pupils "the best that I can give them." Heather wants to provide a supportive environment for learners. Her response to this section illuminated her values with regard to how to facilitate learning.

"The positive changes [in my attitudes, values, and beliefs] were that I just got more confidence and I believe in myself more now. I can actually hold down a classroom and work with kids and give them the best that I can give 'em. Once in a while my cooperating teachers would really frustrate me but I now realize that they made me alot stronger. They made me realize that I'm not going to have someone there to pat me on the back all the time. I'm going to have to know I'm doing the best I can and that I am the best that I am and the best I could ever damn-well be. It's exciting to know that I can do it and that I am graduating. I wanna get out there and get a classroom of my own. I wanna build that rapport and give those kids every little bit I have. Anything that I can
offer them I wanna give 'em not just teaching [them] but also being a good friend just so that they know that they matter in this world and that they are worth something. I see so many kids and their self-concept is so low. It's so scary" (Heather, Exit Interview, Item 19, December, 1988).

Nancy. Nancy indicated that her attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge changed at the end of her first student teaching experience in the following narrative, audio taped in October 1988. She provided information about the changes that had occurred in her attitudes, values, and beliefs after her second student teaching experience in the second narrative, taped December 1988. Nancy indicated, at the end of her second student teaching experience, that she is still somewhat afraid to enter the teaching profession.

"Through my first experience I can see that my values and attitudes have changed alot. My attitudes towards teaching and towards life itself has really changed alot! I think I've grown as a person, not only as a professional but as a person through my student teaching. I didn't have a good [first] student teaching experience but I think that [my first experience] really helped me to grow and to see my weaknesses and to see other people's weaknesses and how I can change to be a better person. I also feel that my skills and my knowledge have increased about teaching and about the subject matter. You don't really know what it's like to student teach and to teach all the stuff you have been learning at college until you actually teach it. It's a hands-on learning experience" (Nancy, Exit Interview, Item 19, October, 1988).

"[My attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge] changed greatly! For one thing it's not a nice world out there and my attitude toward teaching diminished. After my first experience, I'm not so sure I would have ever wanted to be a teacher. I feel lots better now [after my second experience] and I feel I am ready to be a teacher but I still have this little thing in the back of my mind
from the first [experience] that maybe I'm not cut out to be a teacher. My knowledge has expanded greatly through my student teaching experiences" (Nancy, Exit Interview, Item 19, December, 1988).

Nancy addressed whether or not she believed that the changes in her attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge were influenced by her cooperating teacher(s).

"Through my first experience I can see that your cooperating teacher can really affect your attitude and bring out some values in you, maybe, that you didn't know you had. If there is a conflict of interest, it can change your attitude [toward teaching]. Knowledge and skills - as far as ideas, and opening your interests - the cooperating teacher can try to push their interests on you but when you get done with [student teaching], it's really you; that's what's left. The cooperating teachers can really influence you and you can see that you've changed alot. Maybe you have gathered some of their [ideas] but not always. Maybe you can look at the experience and [see that you've] changed your values, attitudes to your benefit because you know what you don't ever want to be like" (Nancy, Exit Interview, Item 22, December, 1988).

Mary: Mary contended that her attitudes, values, and beliefs have not changed during her student teaching experiences. She recalls the values she developed while teaching in non-formal settings. Mary believes that her skill and knowledge levels increased during her student teaching experiences.

"I don't know that any of my real values have changed that much. They seem to be pretty set and have been for years. For example, I place a very high value on young people and their ability to learn. I place a high value on trying to find ways to motivate people and find out what feels good to them. My skill level certainly increased, believe me! I was so rigid in the beginning and now I'm alot more relaxed and feel alot more comfortable. I think that could only come with experience. I have a better
understanding of classroom management than I used to. That was a big thing for me to learn. I didn't know how to do all these different things at once. There were all these forms to fill out and all these things to get done like marketing for foods labs and lesson plans to get done and keeping everything neat and clean in the lab and in the office. My skill level and knowledge certainly has changed and I'd like to think it certainly has improved" (Mary, Exit Interview, Item 19, May, 1989).

"Certainly my [teaching] skills have increased and I feel more confident than I did when I began. I don't know if my attitudes, values, and interests changed that much. I'm still in home economics. I believe in helping people find what it is for them to feel comfortable and get going like to set goals for themselves. All those things are the very same for me. They are givens and have been for years" (Mary, Exit Interview, Item 20, May, 1989).

Mary was quick to express the changes that "felt" negative to her as she responded to the negative influences she perceived from her cooperating teachers. However, the reader can conclude that Mary did not adopt similar attitudes about the teaching/learning process. Rather, Mary may have taken mental notes on those cooperating teacher traits that she may not want to adopt when she becomes a classroom teacher. The second narrative addresses the positive influences that Mary believes her cooperating teachers had on her attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge.

"One of the things I heard repeatedly from both teachers was "they [students] can't do it anyway so we're not going to bother." I don't want that attitude. I want an attitude like "just because it didn't work once doesn't mean it isn't going to work the next time. Or if this doesn't work, we'll find a way that works." Many times I felt that they [cooperating teachers] didn't wanna try if they thought there was a low level of academic achievement. Perhaps this is based on my experiences
with my handicapped son]. Many times [my son] couldn't learn or didn't wanna learn. I kept thinking that there has to be a way to turn a light on in his mind to get him excited. [In student teaching] I felt that I was stomped on when I wanted to spend time doing something and that [my cooperating teachers] were a little burned out and just didn't want to be bothered. That felt negative to me and at times I sort of got tired of bucking the system and trying to do things. I just thought my situation is to finish student teaching and not change their way of teaching. I was wanting to try many new things and felt unable to do so and that became negative to me" (Mary, Exit Interview, Item 21, May, 1989).

"One of the things I liked about both of my cooperating teachers was that they were very flexible with students. They had a great sense of humor with students. Students came to them wanting to talk about things because of their sensitivity and I admired that in both people. I felt that [my first cooperating teacher] always represented a really positive appearance and represented home economics so very well. That really influenced me that we need not be ashamed of who we are. Home economics and vocational programs are not well-received in many areas and I really liked the idea that she takes such pride in home economics as did [my second cooperating teacher]. I think that [my cooperating teachers'] positive stand on home economics as a profession really reinforced the belief that I already had—that vocational education needs to have a turnaround and some of us have got to try to make a difference. I think [my cooperating teachers] had a big influence on me] in that they felt proud of what they were doing" (Mary, Exit Interview, Item 22, May, 1989).

Tracy. Tracy believed that she is less judgmental with regard to minority pupils than she was prior to student teaching suggesting that being less judgmental is a positive attitudinal change. Tracy indicated that the negative experiences that she encountered during her second student teaching experience did not necessarily result in a negative change in her attitudes, values, and beliefs. She resolved
that she was proud to be a teacher and proud of pupils in her classroom.

"I am less judgmental [after student teaching] than [I was] before. I [student taught] in a class that was over half minority students and you may get a little bit intimidated. I think I adjusted very quickly. My attitude was, "So what! Over half the class is minority students. This is my class! Let's see what we can do with it" (Tracy, Exit Interview, Item 20, May, 1989).

"I had some negative experiences [during student teaching]. But, [those negative experiences] didn't result in permanent negative changes [in my attitudes, values, and beliefs]. There were some things I was repeatedly told "you can't do" in my second student teaching experience. I still think that even though those were negative experiences, there were positive changes [in me] because some of them I can use under certain situations. Maybe I know about how I don't want to be in a class. I don't think I really had any negative "changes" as far as my attitudes, values, and interests. I think both my teaching experiences encouraged positive changes for me" (Tracy, Exit Interview, Item 21, May, 1989).

Tracy delineated ways that her first cooperating teacher influenced her thoughts about how to facilitate learning and her thoughts about pupils in her classes.

"My first cooperating teacher influenced me tremendously. Actually both [cooperating teachers] did but the first one was in a more positive way. She constantly nurtured and guided and really helped me develop. She helped me see things in students that I could appreciate better than I probably would have before. She could help me see certain students in a different light. That really helped me understand where the student was coming from and helped me become more tolerant of their performance or attitude in class" (Tracy, Exit Interview, Item 22, May, 1989).
Philosophy of Education

This section addresses student teachers' perceptions of the value of public education. Aside from thoughts on public education, student teachers were asked to describe their philosophy of education after student teaching. Student teachers were asked to respond to their perceptions of school administrative hierarchy. This section contains specific items about conceptual learning, unit and lesson plans, and utilizing community leaders and business persons as classroom resources.

**Heather.** Heather believed that education is preparation for life. Her philosophy was developed prior to student teaching. After student teaching, Heather seemed more convinced about the importance of her original philosophy of education.

"[My philosophy of education] hasn't changed very much because I always knew that I wanted to be student-oriented all the way. I believe that [teaching] is preparation for life and that preparation is not only in skills for survival, which is a very big part of my type of education, but it's also [helping students develop] their self-concepts; [helping them] believe that they are valuable citizens in our society and that they are worth something. [Teaching is helping students know that] once they graduate from [high school], they are not going to decay. [My type of education's] gotta start in the schools but it can't start in high school. It's gotta start [when students are] younger. [Education should] all be student-oriented. I wanna make sure my kids are getting everything they need in their education and not just formulas written on a blackboard" (Heather, Exit Interview, Item 24, December, 1988).
Heather indicated that lesson plans and unit plans were easier to conceptualize after student teaching. Heather reported that after learning how to write lesson and unit plans, "working on what you're going to do or thinking up neat new ideas" became more of a focal point than did the mechanics of lesson and unit plans.

"[Lesson plans and unit plans] were much easier to conceptualize after student teaching. I became really good at [lesson and unit plans]! You could go through it quicker and not spend so much time on domains and levels and [then] really start working on what you're going to do or thinking up neat and new ideas" (Heather, Exit Interview, Item 27, December, 1988).

Being flexible is definitely a part of Heather's philosophy of education. She responded to the item with a strong, convincing voice. Heather believes that she must be very prepared prior to teaching her classes but, at the same time, she must be flexible. She must have alternatives ready for her pupils. She must remember that pupils learn at different rates, understand material on different levels, and respond differently on different days depending on what is happening in their lives.

"Baby, if you're not flexible, you ain't gunna be worth shit in the classroom! You can plan all night and not get any sleep and there's no way on this earth that the next day is going to go exactly how you planned it. There are too many circumstances. Kids are different. They understand different. They learn different. They have their ups and downs. They might be perfect model students one day and the next day they are all hell-fire. So, what I believe about "flexible" - you gotta be 100% flexible
Nancy addressed the value of public education by indicating that pupils need a good education in order to have the opportunity to grow into productive citizens in society. Nancy shares her philosophy of education by stating that "teachers have to be the best teachers possible." Being the best teacher possible, for Nancy, means that even if pupils do not want to be in a particular class, teachers must "get to them" with one little bit of information that might be helpful to them in their futures.

"I feel that it is very important and that every child out there needs the chance, the opportunity, to good public education and that us, as teachers, have to be the best teachers possible" (Nancy, Exit Interview, Item 23, December, 1988).

"I feel that the value of public education is very, very important. Even if there are kids that don't wanna be there, if you could just get to them and somehow get to 'em in one little way with something that they could remember and learn. It's very important" (Nancy, Exit Interview, Item 23, December, 1988).

Nancy believes that it is important to be flexible with lesson plans and with pupils in classes. Being flexible, for Nancy, means that she must insist that pupils do assignments but at the same time, she must allow for learning differences and educational background differences especially in terms of reading levels. Nancy believes that she must work with all pupils in the teaching/learning process.
"It is very important to be flexible with plans and with learners. You need to be tough on [students] to make 'em do things and be responsible for their work and yet you need to be flexible. [Students] are human. Some kids learn at slower paces and some kids may not be able to read as well as others; some kids may not be able to follow directions as well. You need to really work with all the students" (Nancy, Exit Interview, Item 28, December, 1988).

Mary. Mary discussed the importance of public education and changes in her philosophy of education since student teaching. After student teaching, Mary believes that sometimes there are too many pupils per classroom which, in turn, impinges on the teaching/learning process. However, Mary was convinced that pupil numbers did not cause teachers, in general, to stop caring about pupils. Mary provided information on how she perceived teachers who appeared to be "burned out."

"... on the value of public education, ... because I haven't had any experience in private education, [public education] is all I know. Sometimes I think there are too many students in the classrooms and there's not enough of me to go around, but I think most educators really do care [about students and education]. They want [students] to be a success; they weren't out to "get them"; and, they weren't there, certainly, for the money. I agree that public education is the best that we know how to make it [today]" (Mary, Exit Interview, Item 23, May, 1989).

"My philosophy of education goes back to [working with] my younger [handicapped] son. If [students] care enough to want to learn, I'll try to find a way to help [them]. [That help] may not be through me, but I will find help for you, if you care enough to let me know. I believe education, regardless of who you are, can open a whole new world through your mind and it doesn't matter what your physical health is. I think [educators] have to be really driven and motivated and that's how I feel about
education. I am driven and I am motivated to help others. Many times I met people [who] were my age that, after 20 years of teaching, were starting to feel burned out and here I am all fired up. I had a hard time relating to that [attitude] and I wanted to say "Why are you so tired" but then I haven't been where they are, so maybe in 20 years I'll be really tired too" (Mary, Exit Interview, Item 24, May, 1989).

Mary responded to school administrative hierarchy as administration impacted her as a parent and as a student teacher. Mary holds strong opinions about teacher evaluations performed by building principals.

"I have not had alot of experience with [administrative hierarchy]. I've only followed [school] rules to get through student teaching. But, as a parent, I felt the channels of communication [between parents and administrators] were really open. We went [into meetings with counselors and principals] with a positive approach and I feel most of the time [our positive approaches] worked. I think one of the things I do object to is principal evaluation. Principals come into your classroom one morning or two periods and observe [teachers] and in those two periods [teachers] were marked on their ability to handle the classroom. I resent that type of evaluation being done in just one time. I think [evaluation] needs to be a constant thing, say three days in a row, to see the progress on a unit plan. Different days the class has different personalities. I had one class of nearly all boys and when there was a track meet, it really affected what happened in my class. For a principal or an administrator to evaluate your class on a one time basis and put that down as your ability . . . somehow I resent that" (Mary, Exit Interview, Item 25, May, 1989).

Mary presented her perceptions on unit and lesson plans, flexibility with pupils, and utilizing community people as classroom resources. Mary's perceptions of unit and lesson plans, flexibility, and utilizing community resources present
a vivid picture of Mary's philosophy of education. She believes that it is important to be resourceful in planning for lessons but that, over time, teachers develop a personal planning style. Mary believes that it is vitally important to be flexible with learners but that she was stifled in her student teaching experiences. Mary perceives that bringing community people as outside resources into the classroom is a mutually beneficial endeavor. The community people have an opportunity to view the pupils and the pupils have the opportunity to learn about the world of work through hearing from community resource people.

"[Unit and lesson plans] were easier to conceptualize after student teaching because I didn't have time to worry about it. I just had to decide [my plans were] everything I know. If [what I had planned] isn't good enough that's ok, [my cooperating teachers] can tell me. I pulled together [every resource] I knew to write my lesson and unit plans, but I didn't labor over them like I used to in methods classes where every little word had to be absolutely correct. I let go of that and what I did do was be sure that the idea was there. I refused to worry about it any longer. I had other things going on in my life with my family and there just was not the time to spend hours over every sentence that I wrote" (Mary, Exit Interview, Item 27, May, 1989).

"I certainly believe in being flexible [with learners]. That's one of the things that made me feel so boxed in [during student teaching] because many times I didn't feel like I could be as flexible as I wanted to be or I wasn't allowed to meet the needs [of the learners] my way. I think each teacher develops her own technique and I certainly have my techniques in teaching. Many times I felt like I had to conform to the way my cooperating teacher wanted things done. That's just the way it was. Each [cooperating] teacher had her style and I have my style and I wasn't really able to exhibit [my style] the
way I would have liked" (Mary, Exit Interview, Item 28, May, 1989).

"[Using community resources is] a great idea! It breaks the monotony of the classroom and it brings the [world of work] into the classroom. [Using the community as resources] lets the community people see that there are young people that really do care about what's going on in their worlds. I did [meet] a teacher who doesn't like to have speakers come into the classroom from the community. She feels uncomfortable because she doesn't have any idea of what's going to be said [to the students by the guest speaker]. I think I would like to risk a little bit and give confidence to the people in our community" (Mary, Exit Interview, Item 29, May, 1989).

Tracy. Tracy developed a clear and distinct philosophy on the importance of education for pupils. Tracy addressed how those perceptions have changed since her student teaching experiences. Tracy learned, from experience, that teaching pupils is very different than being a pupil in a classroom. Tracy believes that children should be encouraged to appreciate learning and teachers should "spark an interest in students."

"I have always believed that public education is priceless. [After student teaching] I'm able to see [education] in a different perspective. I have been a student for many years and [now] being able to see what it takes to put together teaching presentations is really something. I think public education is one of the most important things we can do for our children; to really encourage [students] to appreciate learning; to teach them in a way that really sparks an interest in students" (Tracy, Exit Interview, Item 23, May, 1989).

Tracy presented a unique perspective when she responded to the influence of the administrative hierarchy in schools. She
believes that administrators need to be informed as to what is actually occurring in classrooms.

"[Working in schools is] a different structure than other work atmospheres I have been in. It seems as though teachers [work] at an extremely high level of performance and at the same time, [teachers] have a tremendous amount of knowledge and skills. I think it's important for administrative people to keep in touch with what the classroom is like. I really believe that strongly" (Tracy, Exit Interview, Item 25, May, 1989).

Tracy compared her student teaching experiences in terms of how she felt as a teacher when she described unit and lesson plan methodology. Tracy believed that she was the teacher in her first student teaching experience. She was responsible for all that encompassed the teaching/learning process. In her second experience, Tracy believed that preparing lesson plans was easier but she learned that she could not "assume" that pupils knew background information. Also in her second experience, Tracy believed that she was never really the teacher in the classroom. The lessons were pre-planned by her second cooperating teacher.

"[On unit and lesson plans], during the first student teaching experience, I completely took ownership of each one of those lessons. Those lessons were truly mine! They were difficult to do. During the second student teaching experience in the middle school, [lesson plans] were easier because I didn't have to go into as much detail. But that also made [lesson plans] more difficult because I would automatically assume that the students had a certain amount of base knowledge and a lot of times, they didn't. With junior high kids, you had to make things so simplistic for them and it was hard. I never felt as though I took ownership of the plans during [my second experience]. I wasn't allowed to develop the plans and to
really delve into them. I didn't have the resources available the second time as I did the first. That made a difference, too, in terms of how I felt about the lesson plans" (Tracy, Exit Interview, Item 27, May, 1989).

Throughout her student teaching experiences, Tracy indicated that she strongly believes in the "teachable moment." Tracy interprets the "teachable moment" to mean being flexible with pupils and teaching to the needs of the pupils at any given point in time.

"[Being flexible is] one of the most important things you do [as a teacher]. There are questions, attitudes, or beliefs students have that need to be addressed and it's important to be flexible with kids. If you've got a "teachable moment," that's like a little ripe apple waiting to be picked, then "go for it". Go ahead and tackle something that wasn't planned because the time was right to discuss it" (Tracy, Exit Interview, Item 28, May, 1989).

Tracy believed that utilizing people from the community as classroom resources is an important part of the teaching/learning process. Tracy believes that community people have access to many more resources than classroom teachers.

"I think using people from the community can be a tremendous resource in the classroom. They can present more in-depth information on a subject; they can offer community help in a manner that the students would be able to understand; they have the resources of a corporation behind them. I think community people are great!" (Tracy, Exit Interview, Item 29, May, 1989).
Role Expectations

Items in this section address the roles that student teachers expected to assume and roles student teachers assumed as student teachers in local school settings. Student teachers addressed their perceptions of themselves as role models for pupils. Student teachers addressed how they expected to be treated and, in retrospect, how they were treated by their cooperating teachers. Student teachers addressed their teaching and disciplining methodology as well as perceived relationships that they developed with their pupils.

*Heather.* Heather believed that she assumed many roles in the classroom as a student teacher. She was a counselor, a teacher, and a role model. Heather perceived that all three roles were extremely important to the teaching/learning process.

"As far as roles assumed, [in my second student teaching experience] I found out that I was a counselor. I had a lot of students asking questions and talking to me about things. I was also as a teacher. I assumed full [teaching] responsibility [in my second experience] and it was the best experience! I couldn't thank [my second cooperating teacher] more!" (Heather, *Exit Interview*, Item 30, December, 1988).

"You are a role model. The kids start talking or doing things like you do. Your attitudes rub off on how [students] perceive education. You're [in front of students] everyday. You are in a position where [students] are admiring or maybe not admiring you, but they are watching you. You're a teacher. You're supposed to know more [than students] and [students] are looking to
you as a role model. I see myself as a caring role model who does not put down students. I felt I worked very hard. Hopefully they got that from me as a role model" (Heather, Exit Interview, Item 32, December, 1988).

**Nancy.** Nancy suggests that one aspect of teaching is that of being a role model for pupils. Another role is keeping parents and faculty informed of what she is teaching in classes. Nancy strongly believes that she needs to be able to defend her program to interested parties. Nancy believes that she was the teacher in her second student teaching experience in that she assumed all the roles of being a teacher in that setting.

"The roles of being a teacher include being a role model. You teach the kids what they need to learn and you inform the faculty and parents. Whoever wants to know about your program or the students' programs, you are able to back it up and able to justify what [students] are doing. In my second student teaching experience, I was the teacher. I did everything that a real teacher does such as checking in in the mornings and ordering my own films and finding out about field trips" (Nancy, Exit Interview, Item 30, December, 1988).

Nancy had clearly formulated perceptions of how she hoped to be treated by her cooperating teacher. After having student taught in a setting where Nancy was treated differently than she expected to be treated, Nancy was quick to reiterate that she hoped to be treated like an individual and a "learning teacher."

"[Having gone] through my first [student teaching experience] and, I hope in my second one, I hope that I will be treated as an individual and as a learning teacher, not someone who gets stepped on and stomped.
around during a student teaching experience" (Nancy, *Insights*, Item 33, October, 1988).

**Mary.** Mary addressed the roles that she assumed in both placement sites and in her personal life during student teaching. She perceived that she was a teacher, parent, disciplinarian, student, adult, and role model.

"I assumed the role of a teacher. I was also a mother. I had a son at the high school. I was certainly a disciplinarian. I was a student. I felt like that being flexible was very difficult for me. [My cooperating teachers] wanted me to assume full teaching responsibilities and yet many times, very subtly, I felt like a little child being looked after. Bouncing back and forth, sometimes hourly and sometimes by the minute and sometimes even by the conversation, was very hard for me to adjust to" (Mary, *Exit Interview*, Item 30, May, 1989).

Mary perceived that the way pupils related to her after student teaching in a non-school setting served as a basis for her to believe that she was a good role model for students.

"[When I think about being a role model for students] I think about a neat thing that happened to me [after I was finished student teaching]. A carload of high school students [who] were in my independent living class rolled down their windows and said "Hi! How are you?" and talked to me in the parking lot for about 10 minutes. These kids weren't even my best students. I think [those students] knew that they could approach me and that I was their friend. To me that was an incredible feeling of success. I really didn't know that they felt that way, so I felt really good that they thought I was approachable even after I was out of their classroom" (Mary, *Exit Interview*, Item 32, May, 1989).

Mary hoped to be treated differently by her cooperating teachers during her student teaching experiences. Mary was a non-traditional, adult student teacher. She perceived that
she should have been treated as an adult. In reality, Mary perceived that there were times when she was treated like a "little child." Throughout the narrative, the reader can sense Mary's confusion about her role as a student teacher.

"I expected to be treated sort of different than I was treated [by my cooperating teachers]. Sometimes I felt like a little child [who] didn't know anything and I was treated that way. Other times I was expected to know more than I really knew. I was confused and didn't know what I knew and so there was some frustration. Sometimes [my cooperating teachers] assumed I knew things that I didn't know. Other times [my cooperating teachers] assumed I didn't know anything and would give me everything by teaspoon or spoonful and I resented that" (Mary, Exit Interview, Item 33, May, 1989).

In the realm of teaching techniques, Mary shared a learning experience over time with regard to utilizing the "lecture" method of teaching. Mary perceived that she was caught in a dilemma. She wanted to use "hands-on" teaching techniques during the teaching/learning process. At the same time, she wanted to prepare pupils for college. Preparing pupils for college, for Mary, meant instilling quality note-taking and study habits in the pupils.

"[My teaching techniques were] very much hands-on. I wanted the kids to experience certain things and to see that some action in the classroom. I probably made some mistakes in that I did a little lecturing. I'm realizing that maybe [lecturing] isn't the best way [to teach] except that I believe one thing that is being lost [for students] is really preparing young people for college. None of my students wanted to take notes unless I specifically made them [take notes]. I had to tell [the students] that if they heard me say something or if [the students] saw information on a transparency or on the blackboard, they were going to see it on the exam. I had
a hard time with the lack of maturity and understanding on the part of the students. I had a hard time with how [students] could daydream without taking notes. I worked hard on that many times. I wanted to increase their responsibility levels and their ability to do well. It was important to me that they do well. I wanted them to understand what I was trying to teach them" (Mary, Exit Interview, Item 34, May, 1989).

Mary shared a specific example of a discipline technique that she believed was successful for her middle school-aged pupils. The underlying philosophy of her technique was to help pupils take responsibility for their actions. Mary also perceived that, at the time, her chosen disciplinary techniques were not accepted by her cooperating teachers.

"[As far as my disciplining techniques are concerned], I remember one boy [at my first site] who talked constantly and while he was talking, obviously [other students] were listening. I told him there would be three warnings [when he talked]. Then, after the third warning, not only would he, but also the entire table [of students where he sat], would receive the discipline. That really did seem to help immensely. When [students] were "visiting," I would stop teaching and let silence reign. That [silence] made my cooperating teachers uncomfortable and they would not allow me those few seconds for [students] to notice that I wasn't teaching. Usually, if I could have had that minute, you could have heard a pin drop. But most of the time my cooperating teachers felt nervous for me. When things got loud, I usually tended to get softer. I told the students that if you don't choose to follow classroom procedures, then you are choosing the consequences of not following the rules. [When students made that choice], I did not feel responsible for what the consequences were. When [students] felt that [their behavior] was their choice, they usually followed the rules" (Mary, Exit Interview, Item 35, May, 1989).

Mary prepared her lesson plans after she researched the topics. "Research," for Mary, included reading books and
gathering materials from a variety of sources, including her friends. Mary believed that researching topics was important for her in order to be equipped with a clear understanding of the topic and to answer questions for pupils. She also believed that it was important to set before the pupils an example of being resourceful.

"[In preparing my lessons for students] I did a lot of research and reading. I used all kinds of resources and books or anything I could get my hands on - even from friends. I had some special learners and a friend [of mine] who is in counseling and who had taught gifted and talented as well as special needs, would loan me books on special learners. I really tried to do some research and to be competent so that if there were questions asked [I could answer them]. I was probably the first to admit it if I didn't know the answers and tell [students that] I would research [the question] and try to come back with the answer" (Mary, Exit Interview, Item 36, May, 1989).

Mary perceived that she developed good relationships with pupils in her classes. In fact, she expressed surprise that pupils were as responsive to her as they were. On the other hand, Mary was aware that there were some pupils who did not like her.

"I think [my relationships with learners] were pretty good. There were students who didn't like me. I accept that. I developed some real friendships, too, which I really appreciated. It surprised me that [students] ended up caring. I got some notes from kids when I left [student teaching] saying they were going to miss me" (Mary, Exit Interview, Item 37, May, 1989).

Tracy. Tracy perceived that she was a teacher, wife, mother, college student, counselor, and resource person during
her student teaching experiences. As Tracy discussed the
roles that she assumed, she compared her two student teaching
experiences in terms of how her roles differed. During her
first experience, Tracy perceived that she was an "equal" with
her cooperating teacher.

"I assumed the role of being teacher. I was a student and
also an equal to my [first] cooperating teacher. I was a
college student. I was a wife and mother at home. As far
as the kids at school, they felt free to ask me questions
when they needed to regardless of whether it pertained to
the subject or not. I think they saw me as a resource
that they could turn to without feeling threatened and I
think, for the most part, the roles I assumed in the first
teaching experience were pretty much what I expected. In
the second [experience], I expected to assume more
ownership of my role as the teacher than I really did"
(Tracy, Exit Interview, Item 30, May, 1989).

Tracy believed that she was the kind of person that pupils
needed as a role model. She perceived that pupils need strong
people as their teachers. Part of her "role" as a role model
included helping pupils understand that being "non-
traditional" is acceptable in today's society. The variety of
"roles" that Tracy assumed during her student teaching became
a focal point during a family living class.

"As a role model, I don't smoke, I don't drink, and I've
never done anything I've really been in trouble for. I
don't even like coffee. I sound like really a pretty
straight-laced person or a role model for learners! I
think I came across [to students] pretty well. I think
it's good for [students] to realize that a college student
or a student teacher doesn't have to be someone who
graduated from high school, went straight through college,
and is now doing student teaching. I'm older. When we
talked about the roles during the family living class,
[students] made a point of talking about me and about the
different roles that I had to play while I was doing my student teaching" (Tracy, Exit Interview, Item 32, May, 1989).

Tracy quickly delineated how she expected to be treated and how she was treated by her cooperating teachers. Tracy was treated differently by two cooperating teachers. Tracy perceived that her first cooperating teacher treated her in a positive manner whereas Tracy's second cooperating teacher treated her in a negative manner.

"[I expected to be treated] one way during student teaching and was treated in two different ways. In both [student teaching experiences], I expected to have almost complete control of the classroom. I would expect [a student teacher] to function as the teacher of a particular class but I would expect the cooperating teacher to have final control over what goes on in a class. She guides you. She helps you plan the lessons and use the resources but still she's able to say "no, I don't think that would work or yes, I think it would work" or to allow you to try something and see if it works for yourself. During my first student teaching experience, that's the way that I was treated. I was able to have complete control over the classroom. During my second student teaching experience, I never completely had control of what was going on in the classes. I mean that the teacher kept a lot tighter rein on what was going on. Everything was really regimented and there was not alot of flexibility" (Tracy, Exit Interview, Item 33, May, 1989).

Tracy talked at great length about her preferred teaching methodology. Tracy believed that her first cooperating teacher allowed her to develop her individual style of teaching and that her second cooperating teacher stifled her
growth and development as a person learning how to facilitate learning.

"One [of the teaching methods] I do is ask questions. I like to find out what the students are thinking and get them to talk about things. I was able to do that pretty successfully during my first student teaching experience. During my second student teaching experience, whenever I would try that, I was told without fail that "You can't do that; you can't let [the students] have the freedom to answer the questions that way or you will lose control of the classes. You just tell them what they need to know." I still don't agree with that. I think the students get alot more out of [class] when they have a chance to respond instead of just regurgitating the information they have been told onto a test or a worksheet" (Tracy, Exit Interview, Item 34, May, 1989).

Student Teacher Biography

This section addresses several aspects of the student teachers as people who were entering the student teaching experience with a unique set of family backgrounds, teaching experiences, educational experiences, and cultural values. How did student teachers describe the attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge of the teacher they "aspire" to become? From where did the student teachers' attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge come? How would student teachers' values affect pupils in the classroom? Why did student teachers choose to become teachers? Do student teachers still want to be teachers after their student
teaching experience? How do student teachers perceive the "ideal" classroom?

Heather. Heather did not actually address the attitudes, values, interests, skills, and knowledge of the teacher she "aspired to become." Rather, she evaluated herself in terms of her personal attitudes, skills, and knowledge.

"When I think about the teacher I aspire to become, I have a long ways to go on skills. I need better organization skills and I'll always be working on that. Knowledge. I'm always accumulating knowledge everyday of my life. Attitudes. Once in a while I need to work on my attitude. I start to feel sorry for myself I have low points that I let show. I need to get my attitude in gear. [My fiance] has told me that alot" (Heather, Exit Interview, Item 38, December, 1988).

Heather gave Iowa State University credit for teaching her the mechanical aspects of the teaching/learning process or for teaching her how to prepare lesson and unit plans. Heather was also quick to give her mother credit for teaching her caring and communication skills. Heather believes that she has a positive outlook on life which, in turn, will have a positive influence on pupils. She believes that her caring skills are a part of her positive attitudes.

"I learned how to do lesson and unit plans from college. The communications skills or the caring part, recognizing when someone's upset or in trouble - I got that from my mom. She has excellent communication skills and she's the number one idol in my life and I've picked up so much from her because I watch her every move. I wanna be the exact same mother she was and those motherly roles come off in teaching" (Heather, Exit Interview, Item 40, December, 1988).
"I have a good attitude toward life and hopefully that will have a positive influence on my learners. I believe in caring and being honest and encouraging. I love to encourage kids; they really need it and their faces light up when I've told them they've done a good job. Those are all attitudes that help me have a very positive effect on my learners" (Heather, Exit Interview, Item 42, December, 1988).

Heather indicated that she was very interested in receiving negative criticism from her cooperating teachers. Her narrative suggests that Heather did not interpret negative criticism as something "bad" but, rather, interpreted it as information that would help her grow as a teacher.

"I loved [negative criticism]! Any bit of advice I could get I wanted. I was eager for it. When I was younger, I didn't take criticism well at all. I took it as a direct insult and figured that I was a bad person. But I loved it here. I wanted it. In fact I didn't feel like I got enough from my second experience. The more criticism the better because I needed to learn. I needed to have their advice. I reacted well. In fact I asked them for criticism. I had to actually ask [my cooperating teachers] to criticize me" (Heather, Exit Interview, Item 48, December, 1988).

Heather chose to become a teacher because she "loves kids." Heather's philosophy of education came through clearly as she discussed reasons for her decision to become a teacher.

"I chose to become a teacher because I love kids. Those first few years of life are very important [for kids] but once they get into school, who are they with the most? It's the teachers. It's where they are socialized. It's where they develop their self-concept. I'm not saying those first four years aren't crucial, but once they are in school, we have them alot of hours a day and I feel teaching is the most important job on earth besides being a mother or a parent. I still want to be a teacher because a teacher can make a hell of a difference and I know I'm not gunna reach every kid out there but even if I
reach one, which I believe I already have just as a student teacher, it's worth it. It's the best feeling in the world. I love it" (Heather, Exit Interview, Item 49, December, 1988).

Nancy. Nancy pointed to specific people in her life who have influenced her attitudes, values, and beliefs about teaching. However, Nancy did not explain specific ways that she had been influenced by the people she mentioned nor did she explain how she had been influenced. Nancy chose to become a teacher because she "loves students" and because she wants to be a part of the teaching/learning process.

"I think [my attitudes, values, and beliefs about teaching] come from my family background, from within myself, and also from high school teachers, especially my home economics teacher. Some of their beliefs and values rubbed off on me" (Nancy, Exit Interview, Item 39, December, 1988).

"[I chose to become a teacher] because I love students and because I feel it is very important for youth to learn and to become the best they can possibly be and I want to be part of that process" (Nancy, Exit Interview, Item 49, December, 1988).

Mary. When Mary described the teacher she "aspires" to become, she indicates that she does not ever want to stop caring about pupils. Part of caring about pupils involves motivating pupils to learn and being available for pupils in the event that they need help. Another aspect of Mary's perception of the teacher she "aspires" to become is consistency. Mary wants to continually believe in pupils.

"When I describe the attitudes, values, interests, skills, and knowledge of the teacher I aspire to become, I don't
wanna ever stop caring. I want [students] to be the best that they can possibly be at any job. I want them to know that I believe in them. Those are ways I've raised my own children. I expect the best and most of the time I get the best back and that's how I taught [during student teaching]. Sometimes I was kind of astonished when [I didn't get the best back] and I wondered "why" but, with repeated belief in students, they began to not want to disappoint me" (Mary, Exit Interview, Item 38, May, 1989).

Mary believes that her attitudes, values, and beliefs about teaching came from years of experience teaching in non-formal settings. There is a possibility that her values came from people whom Mary admires and respects.

"My attitudes, values, and beliefs about me as a teacher came through years of experience of working in the community. It would be nice if I could attribute these things to my parents but I don't really think I can. They don't share alot of my attitudes, values, and beliefs. Maybe they came from friends and people I admire and respect. I've incorporated many different people's philosophies into my own" (Mary, Exit Interview, Item 39, May, 1989).

Mary perceived that she learned her teaching methodology from her professors at Iowa State University. However, Mary believes that her attitudes, values, and beliefs about teaching are "natural" and that she is a "natural teacher."

"[I learned my teaching techniques from] my methods classes and my advisor and different influential professors at Iowa State. At the time, I thought they were really tough on me and now I understand a little better that they really cared about me. Sometimes I think [my attitudes, values, and beliefs about teaching is] just natural. I've always been teaching. I'm a natural teacher. I believe that" (Mary, Exit Interview, Item 40, May, 1989).
Mary provided information about the importance of the values she holds as a teacher and the importance of the character traits that she brings to a classroom setting in the following two narratives. Mary believes that she is a problem-solver and that every situation has a solution. She is a positive person and she wants to create a positive classroom atmosphere. Mary also believes that she is very sensitive to the needs of pupils even in the event that she allows pupils' personal problems affect her family life.

"The most important [personal value I hold] is that I believe that almost every problem has a solution. It may not be the perfect solution but we can be creative and innovative. I think that each student has to decide for themselves what will work for them and what won't and there is no right or wrong [answers]. I want positive attitudes and ideas to flow in the classroom. I want students to know that they can count on me and that I will find a way and a time to be with them if they need me" (Mary, Exit Interview, Item 41, May, 1989).

"I think [one personal character trait] I have that benefits learners is that I enjoy being sensitive to other people's feelings and needs. Some people criticize me for that. I also believe that I really care; I want people I work with to feel like I care. Yes, sometimes I bring [my caring and sensitivity for students] home with me. I wish I could let go of some of this sensitivity and the feelings I have for people but I'm not always able to do that. But, usually after I come home with it, I try to figure out what can I do; what would make a difference in that person's life" (Mary, Exit Interview, Item 47, May, 1989).

Mary indicated that she reacts well to negative criticism even though actually hearing the negative criticism might be scary for her. Mary indicated that she chose to become a
teacher because "it felt good" to help somebody learn.

However, Mary shared that because of her financial situation, she may need to seek a position in a corporation.

"I react really well [to negative criticism]. I couldn't wait to find out [from my cooperating teachers] what I could do differently. Sometimes I was a little scared. I am a person who likes to figure out how to solve problems and if I'm having a problem, it's ok to criticize cause I'm probably aware that [what I'm doing] probably isn't working anyway. I really receive negative criticism pretty well" (Mary, Exit Interview, Item 48, May, 1989).

"[I chose to become a teacher] because it felt good to help somebody learn something. That's my reward. Do I still want to be a teacher? Yes, I think so. But, home economics teachers aren't being sought after. I think training and development is a form of teaching and I may be in training and development with a company [in my future]. If I work with a company, I can start probably at $5000 more than I can in the teaching profession. With kids in college, I have to be real about what my financial needs are. I guess I want to teach but I don't know if it will be in the actual classroom" (Mary, Exit Interview, Item 49, May, 1989).

**Tracy.** Tracy did not address the attributes of the teacher she "aspires" to become. Rather, she reiterated her position on the value of creating a positive versus a negative atmosphere for pupils. Tracy shares more information about her personal philosophy of education throughout this response.

"[When I think about the teacher I aspire to become], I really don't expect that [my present attitudes, values, and beliefs] have changed. I always try to keep a positive attitude. I think when you dwell on the negative aspects of a student or a lesson, the negative has a tendency to take control. When you look for the positive, you realize that kids are good kids; they aren't troublemakers; they try their best; they have hard lives just like other people do. Maybe [positive thinking] will be catching the same way the negative takes control. The
positive will grow and [the students] will say, "Hey I did it in that class; maybe I can do it in this class; maybe I can do it in a job outside of school." I expect my skills and my knowledge level to continue to increase" (Tracy, Exit Interview, Item 38, May, 1989).

After student teaching, Tracy maintains that her attitudes, values, and beliefs about herself as a teacher developed as she grew up in an educational atmosphere in a home with parents who were educators. Because of her childhood environment, Tracy learned to like education and the teaching/learning atmosphere.

"My attitudes, values, and beliefs about myself as a teacher developed from the time I was very small. I have always thought of myself as a teacher from the time I would line my dolls up and conduct a class there. Anytime my cousins and I would get together, we would play school. Having two parents who were both teachers influenced my attitudes, values, and beliefs about teaching. It's the environment that I grew up in. I grew up around [a teaching] atmosphere. I liked it. I enjoyed the academic atmosphere. I liked the school year. I believe that I can be a good teacher given the opportunity and I hope that someday I get the chance" (Tracy, Exit Interview, Item 39, May, 1989).

Tracy perceives that her teaching skills have been a part of her life for a long time and that attending college courses forced her to refine the teaching skills that she already possessed. Tracy perceives that specific home economics content knowledge comes from coursework taken at Iowa State University. In summary, Tracy reported that her mother has served as her role model all her life and had an impact on her attitudes, values, and beliefs about teaching.
"My teaching skills have been evolving within me for a long time. Being at Iowa State has forced me to bring those skills to the surface, to refine them, to put them into practice, to use them, and to get them ready to be used on a regular basis as a teacher. The knowledge [I possess] has grown little by little from my interest in 4H when I was younger through college, through business, through my family, and through college again. I would say most of the specific knowledge [I have] towards home economics has come from Iowa State. Other than from there, I would have to say 4H and from my mother. She really guided me through 4H and helped me with alot of things. [My mother has] been a real role model for me" (Tracy, Exit Interview, Item 40, May, 1989).

Tracy reported one specific attitude that she perceives will have a direct influence on pupils. She believes in developing a positive attitude toward life and, to emphasize her philosophy, she believes that even though circumstances appear "awful," one only needs to look around in order to see something worse.

"The attitudes I have [that will have a direct influence on learners] is that I have a basic philosophy of life. Things are never so bad that they can't get worse. When you first hear it, it sounds pessimistic but I don't look at it that way. If you think you are really down and out, just take two steps back from you situation and look around you. You can always find someone who is in a worse situation than you are in. I think that being able to say "hey, I'm not so bad after all" is an important thing to be able to do, especially dealing with the kind of kids we've got. My attitude is to get students to say, "the situation I'm in really isn't so bad; I can make a go of it; I can do it" (Tracy, Exit Interview, Item 42, May, 1989).

Tracy reported that university classes that she found most useful during student teaching were her methods classes and home economics content classes.
"The classes that were most useful during student teaching were the methods courses that we had. I found myself digging out some information from those courses to help me with some of the lesson plans [for student teaching]. But [methods classes information] was specific to writing lesson plans and doing administrative things that teachers need to do in planning lessons. There were any number of courses that I took that really provided the knowledge base to draw from. I found myself thinking, "that class really did come in handy" and sometimes you don't think you will [use the information you learned in college] and it surprises you when you do use it" (Tracy, Exit Interview, Item 45, May, 1989).

Tracy compared both of her student teaching experiences when she addressed how she reacted to negative criticism from her cooperating teachers. Tracy posed a profound philosophic question with regard to the purpose of education when she considered being told what she "could not" do while she facilitated learning.

"During my first student teaching experience, any criticism that I got was a positive reference to what we were doing. In my second student teaching experience, I was always told things that I couldn't do. I felt very much like I wanted to try [the things I was told I couldn't do]. I did them anyway and I was told afterwards, "now see what happens when you do that; you can't do that; you can't ask them that many questions; they get too involved in what's going on". Isn't that the point of why we're [teaching]; to get [students] involved in what's going on; to get them thinking and relating this knowledge to their own experience? The negative criticism that I got during my second student teaching experience, I took it for what it was and left it at that" (Tracy, Exit Interview, Item 48, May, 1989).

After student teaching, Tracy maintains that she chose to become a teacher because her parents were her role models and
because she "likes the kids." Tracy explains some of the feelings she has when she observes pupils in classrooms.

"I chose to become a teacher because of the role models presented to me from my parents and the atmosphere that I grew up in. [The teaching atmosphere] was familiar to me. I always liked school. I always liked alot of the teachers I had during school. I chose to become a teacher because I like the kids. I think that's one of the strongest things that I have going for me. Those kids are fantastic. They are fun to be with. I like to watch them work through an idea and a light bulb turns on and "Wow, I didn't know that we could do this." You can see the learning process actually going on. I like to share things with kids" (Tracy, Exit Interview, Item 49, May, 1989).

Communication Skills
Items in this section address the student teachers' perceptions of the communication skills they possess and the importance of communication skills in teaching. Specific items addressed two-way communication in student/teacher interaction and between the cooperating teacher and the student teacher. Student teachers responded to the importance of using active listening skills in the teaching/learning process.

Heather. Heather believes that her "best" communication skills are non-verbal ones. She believes in giving positive and negative reinforcement to pupils through facial expressions. Heather cites an instance with her second cooperating teacher where communication between the
Heather reacted to that perceived lack of communication and reiterated a strong belief about being "up front" with pupils in the classroom.

"My best communication skills are encouragement and letting someone know when I'm upset or very happy with what they have done. [Students] know [how I feel] through my looks and through my voice. They know when to not mess with me; they know when they can mess around. With [my second cooperating teacher], I feel [communication between her and the students] was hard to interpret. [Students] couldn't tell when they could joke around or whether she liked what they said. I believe in letting a person know. A kid needs to be reinforced whether it is positive or negative. They need to be reinforced right then and there and not guess what the teacher's thinking" (Heather, Exit Interview. Item 52, December, 1988).

Nancy. Nancy simply states that two-way communication is very important in the classroom because through such communication comes understanding between a teacher and pupils. Nancy then discusses how she felt when she student taught in a situation where perceived one-way communication existed.

"[Communication skills are] very important because there's gotta be communication when you teach. The students gotta be able to understand you. You've gotta be able to understand the students. There's gotta be two-way communication" (Nancy, Exit Interview, Item 52, December, 1988).

"In my first [student teaching] experience I did not have two-way communication. I had one-way communication. It was very hard. It was impossible to talk with the [cooperating teacher]. It was terrible. Communication in my second experience was great. We had two-way communication! I talked, she listened. She talked, I
listened. We related well to each other. It was very good" (Nancy, Exit Interview, Item 54, December, 1988).

**Mary.** Mary perceives that she did not have any difficulty with good communication skills throughout her student teaching experiences. Mary believes that "good" communication skills are "imperative" for teachers as they interact with pupils. She believes that, without good communication skills, the teacher cannot understand the pupils and consequently, the teacher may then place higher expectations on pupils than pupils can understand.

"I don't feel I ever had a problem with [communication skills] during my entire student teaching experience. A couple of times words came out that weren't supposed to because I got rushed or I was trying to complete too much. But students almost always understood what I wanted them to learn or to start learning. I communicated ideas and feelings very well" (Mary, Exit Interview, Item 51, May, 1989).

"[Good communication skills] are imperative! The teacher has such a responsibility to accept that student where they are and from their life experiences. We can't know them for what we want them to be; we can't expect them to learn all the same way, which is something I saw happening. We want to give the lesson. We want everyone to come through the experience the exact same way. However, [not all students have] the same background or the same [family] support. Good communication skills not only means giving information but it also means receiving information and understanding where that student comes from and why they are responding the way they are" (Mary, Exit Interview, Item 52, May, 1989).

Mary discusses the concept of communication as she perceived that she related to her cooperating teachers. Mary refers to "two-way" communication yet describes "one-way"
communication or her decision to communicate in a positive manner with her cooperating teachers. Mary indicated that she was not afraid to discuss her lack of understanding with her cooperating teacher because she did not want anxiety to build between her and her cooperating teachers.

"[The two-way communication] that I had with my cooperating teacher was that I always tried to be a very good listener. I refuse to be defensive or to defend my position. [That] doesn't mean [my position] was accurate or correct; it just means that I thought [the methodology I chose] was the way to [teach] at the time. I was able to receive criticism [from my cooperating teachers] knowing that if I had known what [my cooperating teachers] were telling me, maybe I would have done some things differently. I was never afraid to tell [my cooperating teachers] when I was frustrated or I didn't understand. Sometimes I was embarrassed, but I always [told them my concerns] anyway. I thought it was better to confront the situation rather than running away from it and letting [anxiety between us] build" (Mary, Exit Interview, Item 54, May, 1989).

Tracy. Tracy described the difference in communication between her and both of her cooperating teachers. Tracy perceived a dramatic difference between the way she communicated and related with her first cooperating teacher as compared to the way she communicated with her second cooperating teacher. Evidently, Tracy tried to communicate her ideas to her cooperating teacher without success.

"With my first cooperating teacher, we had a very good two-way communication as far as relating ideas back and forth to each other. We communicated things that needed to be taught in class. It was very easy to talk to her and I feel that we had a very good relationship. With my second cooperating teacher, I can't say as nice of things. I always felt like she was at least one or two levels
above where I was or at least that was what she wanted to convey to me. I was reminded several times of the amount of experience that she had and the number of years that she had taught. I was reminded of the number of students that she had taught and was reminded that, after you teach this that many times to that many students, you just know what works and what doesn't work. I wanted to try some new things and I did try some new things. When she didn't like it, she let me know it but I tried them anyway" (Tracy, Exit Interview, Item 54, May, 1989).

Acquiring Teacher Behavior

Items in this section address the perceived importance of participating in continuing education activities and participating in professional organizations during student teaching. Items also addressed student teachers' perceptions of how teachers learn to teach learners, what student teachers learned about themselves during their student teaching experiences, the influence that student teachers perceived that they had on learners, and how they related to learners during student teaching. There were two items in this section that addressed student teachers' thoughts about student teaching in two placement sites and the value of student teaching under two cooperating teachers. Student teachers were given the opportunity to share other thoughts about their student teaching experiences in this section.

Heather. Heather perceives that participating in continuing education activities is important because teachers
need support from one another. Heather indicates that teaching is a demanding profession and building a rapport with other home economics teachers is necessary for success.

"[Participating in continuing education activities is] very important. You gotta keep in touch with what's going on in your field. When you're with kids eight hours a day, you need to be with other professionals just to know that you're not the only nut out there in the world. You need to know that there are other people out there actually going into teaching. You build a rapport with other teachers. You remember that you are a professional and that you are a team. It's not you against the world" (Heather, Exit Interview, Item 56, December, 1988).

Heather reports several different ways that teachers learn to teach learners (i.e., experience, watching others teach, from parents, and from former teachers). Heather suggests that she learned to teach learners through watching her high school home economics teacher teach learners.

"[Teachers learn to teach learners] through experience, watching others, their own parents, their own teachers that they have had [in high school]. Teachers learn to teach learners from teaching others like I watched [my high school home economics teacher]" (Heather, Exit Interview, Item 58, December, 1988).

Heather strongly supports the two-site student teaching experience. However, she does not delineate why she believes in the two-site experience in the first narrative. In the second narrative, Heather presents insight as to why she supports the two-site student teaching experience as she addressed student teaching under two cooperating teachers.

"I'm so glad I [student taught in] two different systems! The best thing ever that Iowa State ever went to was two
different sites. It's the greatest; I believe in it. It made a difference in my life and I'm so glad I had both of my teaching experiences" (Heather, Exit Interview, Item 62, December, 1988).

"You just need different [cooperating teachers working] with you. I would have relied too much on [my first cooperating teacher] if I would have had her the whole 16 weeks. I had two different teachers. It taught me that people are different. I got alot of encouragement from [my first cooperating teacher] and I didn't get so much from [my second cooperating teacher] and it made me realize that you're not always gunna have someone there [to encourage you]" (Heather, Exit Interview, Item 63, December, 1988).

Heather responded to "other" comments about her student teaching experience by offering suggestions about how she would respond differently if she were to student teach again. As she explains ways that she would have been different with another student teaching experience, Heather presents information about how she perceives that she has matured through her student teaching experiences.

"As far as "other" comments about student teaching are concerned one thing I would really change [personally] is to not take so much to heart. Kids might tell me they hate me or my class and I know they really don't. I've learned to take [their comments] as not being personal. If someone flunked my test, I wouldn't take it personal that they hated my class. You just can't [take it personally]. I don't take things so much to heart anymore and I'm really proud of myself. I used to be so sensitive. I still am but I've learned not to take it so personal. It's the A-#1 thing that's happened to me. I've really grown" (Heather, Exit Interview, Item 64, December, 1988).

Nancy. Nancy learned, through student teaching, that her teaching philosophy could be described as "strict." Nancy
did not perceive herself as a custodial teacher prior to student teaching. Nancy also learned that she was not a "quitter" during her student teaching experiences.

"[From student teaching] I learned that I am a more strict teacher that I thought I was before. However, I like to be very "in" with the kids and find out what they are up on and I enjoy their company. I learned that I don't give up easily. I'm very strong and I'm not going to let anyone take me over. I think that my student teaching experience has been very good. I hope that when I get out in the real world, I will be able to be as good a teacher as I would like to be" (Nancy, Exit Interview, Item 59, December, 1988).

Mary. In the first narrative, Mary indicated that she learned to teach learners from being intuitive and working countless hours with her handicapped son. She learned to be totally committed to his educative process through trial and error. In the second narrative, Mary suggests that she did not learn anything that she "didn't already know" during her student teaching experiences. Rather, during her student teaching, she became aware of school-based expectations for teachers such as being on time and being prepared for the next class.

"[I think teachers learn to teach from] the practice we had in our methods classes. But mostly I think some of us are intuitive. What we're bringing into our classrooms from our own life experiences is a part of our teaching; what's worked for us before, and especially in my case, what's helped me with my own children. [I learned how to teach learners from] my youngest son because we had to try hard to see what would and would not work for him. I have complete commitment to finding a way for him to learn, not by accident or coincidence, but by complete commitment to his needs" (Mary, Exit Interview, Item 58, May, 1989).
"I don't think [I learned] really anything I didn't already know before [from my student teaching experiences]. [Information] was just presented to me in a different way. I had to be on time and to be ready for when the next class came in. I always was [ready for the next class]. There were things I didn't like, but I also knew that I would do them because I wanted this degree" (Mary, Exit Interview, Item 59, May, 1989).

Mary became aware of two different teaching methodologies by student teaching in two sites. As she discusses what she gained from student teaching in two sites, Mary suggests that she will commit the strategies that she perceives "will" work for her to memory and that she has discarded those strategies that she perceives "will not" work for her. She reported that she was "glad" that she student taught in two sites but suggests that 16 weeks may be too long for an entire student teaching experience.

"[Teaching in two different sites helped me] to know that there are two different teaching styles. I took from each of [the experiences] what will work for me. I've already forgotten those things I know won't work for me. I mean I've put them on the back shelves and I may want to draw on them at some time, but right now I don't think certain things will work for me. I'm glad to have had two experiences but I do think that 16 weeks of student teaching got too long. I think 12 weeks would have been adequate - 6 weeks and 6 weeks. But perhaps that's just because of my age and my experiences. I just felt like it got long and I was ready to try my wings and couldn't try them so it became almost an endurance test" (Mary, Exit Interview, Item 62, May, 1989).

Mary offered "other" comments about her student teaching experiences. Her comments related to her concern that 16
weeks is too long for a student teaching experience. Mary presented clear reasons for her concern.

"[Student teaching] became a very long endurance test for me. I'm ready to be paid for all this hard work. Once I caught onto the skill [of teaching], I was tired of putting in a 50 or 60 hour week and not getting a dime except for a report card. I'm looking forward to having a job and also going to graduate school. Right now I'm a little burned out and I need a little space and rest. I need to want to [teach or go to graduate school] so badly that I'll set aside some other things. That's how I felt about coming back to school. I wanted [my certification] so badly and I was willing to give up work and money. And now I'm back to not wanting to sacrifice like I have been. However, I'm anxious to see what I can do with some of the skills I have" (Mary, Exit Interview, Item 64, May, 1989).

Tracy. Tracy states that a person can be a very good teacher without being involved in professional activities. However, she continued with the narrative by presenting information about the importance of professional involvement.

"I don't think it's absolutely essential to participate in [professional activities]. I think it is possible to be a very good teacher and not participate [in professional organizations]. However, I found [professional meetings] to be very enlightening. Even if it was one tiny piece of information, you always found out something new. It establishes a sort of camaraderie between you and other members of the organization. I think it is important to belong to professional organizations not just to have something that looks nice on a resume' but to be a participating member" (Tracy, Exit Interview, Item 57, May, 1989).

Tracy believes that teachers learn to teach learners through trial and error. She defends her philosophy by suggesting that teachers can know the "mechanics" of teaching and still "have trouble teaching." Tracy believes that
teaching is an endeavor that is personal to each individual teacher.

"I think that teachers learn how to teach through trial and error. You can have all of the preparation, all of the classes, you can know the material, you can know how to write lesson plans, you can do everything book-perfect and still have trouble teaching. I think [teaching is] something that has to develop from within yourself. In all of the classes that I took, the basic knowledge is presented and the methods are presented. You're told different techniques to use during the classes and with different students and it still doesn't all come together until you actually try it. [Learning to teach is] something that you have to try and see what works and what doesn't work for you" (Tracy, Exit Interview, Item 58, May, 1989).

Tracy discussed the different types of learners when she commented on student teaching in two different sites. She reports that, after teaching junior/middle and senior high pupils, she would not be "afraid" to teach in either setting. However, Tracy questions whether or not she would ever teach in a small school setting.

"[On teaching at two different placement sites], I thought it was interesting to contrast the two types of students [high school with middle school learners]. The junior high kids are so excited, full of energy, and wrapped up in themselves. The high school students aren't on quite that high of [an emotional] level. They have matured enough to where they've calmed down a little bit. I wouldn't be afraid to teach either the junior high or the high school levels. I don't know what [teaching in a small school] would be like. My home is in a large community and my family is established here; we are not likely to move out of town. For those reasons, I'm glad I was in a large school" (Tracy, Exit Interview, Item 62, May, 1989).
When responding to student teaching under the direction of two cooperating teachers, Tracy suggested that her first experience would have been sufficient. She felt ready to be employed as a teacher. She also indicated that she was thankful for the "order" of her student teaching experiences. She drew upon what she had learned in her first experience during her second experience.

"[Student teaching under the direction of two cooperating teachers was] where I saw the difference in my student teaching experiences. I am very grateful that I had an excellent experience the first time to draw upon for the second experience. I felt, after the first session, that I was ready to find a school and teach. I had that much self-confidence. I didn't feel a need for the second student teaching experience. The kids were great at junior high level. The school was ok but I didn't feel as though I got the guidance, support, and direction from my second cooperating teacher that I did from the first cooperating teacher. I realize, now, that all teachers are different and all student teachers are different and any two of them can have a completely different atmosphere. I was disappointed [with the second experience] because I didn't get the support that I needed. It was frustrating to either feel as though you were in the school and all on your own or to be in a school and feel as though you are in the way" (Tracy, Exit Interview, Item 63, May, 1989).

Tracy cites having supporting cooperating teachers as her first comment in the "other" category. Tracy suggested specific ways that cooperating teachers could be supportive of a student teacher. She continues her narrative with the importance of resources. As she progresses in her narrative,
Tracy compares her two student teaching experiences from positive and negative perspectives.

"[As far as having other things to say about my student teaching experiences], it was important to have a supportive [cooperating] teacher; one who will take your ideas and help you plan your lessons with guidance and support. It's extremely important to have resources available and for the [cooperating] teachers to make the student teacher feel welcome. [In my first site] I had a desk of my own, complete with copies of the textbooks. The [cooperating] teacher had taken the time to get those things for me and to say, "Here are the textbooks and curriculum guides; these are rules that you need to follow; these are the classes that we teach and perhaps you will want to start with this one." In my second school, I didn't have a copy of the text or curriculum guides; I had no desk. I sat at an open sewing machine and called it my desk. During some classes, I had to move because [students] were using that space. [Having my own space] made all the difference in the world [between the two experiences]. I put that responsibility [to make student teachers feel welcome] on the individual [cooperating] teachers. I know how I would like to do things if I ever have the opportunity to have a student teacher of my own" (Tracy, Exit Interview, Item 64, May, 1989).

Summary

The student teachers presented post-student teaching perceptions for each of the 11 socialization variables. The purpose of this summary is to describe student teacher similarities and differences on their post-student teaching perceptions for each variable. Heather and Nancy are traditional student teachers; Mary and Tracy are non-traditional student teachers.
Key Individuals. All four student teachers indicated that they were positively influenced by their family and friends during their student teaching experiences. Heather presented specific ways in which she was influenced by her high school home economics teacher. Tracy presented specific ways in which she was influenced by a category of teachers she had as a pupil who believed in the "teachable moment."

Cooperating teacher/university supervisor. All four student teachers separated their student teaching experiences when responding to this socialization variable. Heather's first cooperating teacher served as a role model and a person who guided her teaching experiences. Heather's second cooperating teacher served as a person who answered her questions and picked her up "after she fell." Heather perceived that she was influenced by her second cooperating teacher's creativity and deep concern for the pupils. Heather was not sure about the role of her university supervisor.

Nancy perceived that her first cooperating teacher created an atmosphere in which Nancy would "fail as a student teacher." Nancy perceived that her second cooperating teacher's role was to be positive, caring, and supportive. Nancy was not sure of the role of her university supervisor.

Mary indicated that both of her cooperating teachers had unique teaching styles and that Mary was interested in
observing them. However, Mary was not influenced by their teaching strategies because Mary believed that she had already developed her own unique teaching style. Mary indicated that her university supervisor was generally supportive and encouraging.

Tracy's first cooperating teacher believed in the "teachable moment" and being a mentor for her student teacher. Her second cooperating teacher created an atmosphere wherein Tracy felt like an intruder. Tracy's university supervisor was generally supportive and encouraging.

Ecological characteristics of classrooms. Heather reported that an "ideal" classroom would be filled with pupils who wanted to learn and with pupils who were college-bound. Heather perceived that the availability of teaching resources made facilitating learning easier. Nancy indicated that modern facilities and equipment was not as important to her as a good rapport with the cooperating teacher. Nancy also reported that pupil, faculty, and parental attitudes, values, and beliefs were different in a large school setting than they were in a small school setting. Both Mary and Tracy were influenced by the physical arrangements and by the absence of or lack of access to windows in the classroom.

Cooperating teacher/student teacher similarities and differences. Heather reported that she was similar to her
second cooperating teacher in that both of them were concerned for pupils. However, Heather also reported that she learned the "caring aspects of teaching" from her high school home economics teacher and her mother. Nancy perceived that she was different from her second cooperating teacher on enthusiasm. Nancy's second cooperating teacher was more enthusiastic than Nancy perceived herself to be.

Mary perceived that she was different from both of her cooperating teachers in that Mary wanted to try new ideas and take educational "risks" with pupils whereas her cooperating teachers did not want to try new ideas or perceived that Mary's teaching strategies "would not work." Mary perceived that she was similar to both of her cooperating teachers on being flexible with pupils. Tracy reported that she was similar to her first cooperating teacher in teacher beliefs and attitudes and that she was different from her second cooperating teacher in teacher beliefs and attitudes. Tracy's first cooperating teacher believed in the "teachable moment" and believed in helping Tracy learn how to facilitate learning. Tracy's second cooperating teacher believed in strict disciplinary control of pupils, a belief that Tracy could not internalize.

Bureaucratic characteristics of schools. Three of the four student teachers presented strong beliefs related to
following school rules and regulations. They indicated that it is the responsibility of a teacher not only to respect and enforce school rules but also to set before the pupils a good example by following the rules themselves. Three of the four student teachers supported being involved in extracurricular activities. Heather was very strong in her opinion about the value of extracurricular activities when she indicated that such involvement showed pupils that teachers were interested in them and their outside activities. Nancy suggested that she did not "mind" sponsoring extracurricular activities but she did not want to be "abused" by being overloaded with too many extra responsibilities. Tracy did not respond to this section.

Changes in student teacher attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge. Heather perceived that she was more confident in herself as a teacher and a better classroom manager after student teaching. Heather reported that her teaching skills increased during student teaching, particularly in her second experience. Heather was totally responsible for the classes with little supervision from her second cooperating teacher.

Nancy reported that her attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge changed negatively during her first student teaching experience. She believed that keeping
abreast of the negative atmosphere between her and her cooperating teacher took precedence over developing positive attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge. However, Nancy indicated that she "grew as a person" because she chose to continue with student teaching rather than quitting. Nancy reported that her attitudes, values, and beliefs changed positively during her second student teaching experience. During both experiences, Nancy reported that she grew in classroom management skill development.

Mary reported that her attitudes, values, and beliefs about teaching and learning did not change during student teaching. Mary's classroom management skills increased. Tracy reported that her basic attitudes, values, and beliefs about teaching and learning did not change during student teaching. However, she indicated that she became less judgmental about pupils. Tracy had experience teaching minority pupils during both student teaching experiences.

**Philosophy of education.** Heather reported in her entrance interview that education is "preparation for life." Her philosophy of education did not change during her student teaching experiences. Heather perceives herself as student-oriented and flexible in the classroom. Nancy's philosophy of education did not change during her student teaching. She believes that the purpose of education is to produce
productive citizens. Nancy believes in being flexible in the classroom but not to the point of showing pupil favoritism.

Mary reported that part of her philosophy of education changed when she encountered more pupils in a class than she perceived that the classroom could hold. Mary learned that she could not always facilitate learning in ways consistent with her beliefs about the teaching/learning process with so many pupils in the classroom. Mary indicated that she was "enthused about teaching" and wondered why some teachers were experiencing "teacher burnout." Mary reported that she was not comfortable with the administrative teacher evaluation process that she witnessed during student teaching because she does not believe that watching a teacher teach for a short length of time provides enough evidence upon which to make a value judgment about that teacher's performance.

Tracy added to her philosophy of education when she discovered that a middle school teacher could not "assume" that a knowledge base existed in the minds of the pupils. She learned that she had to teach each concept from "absolutely the bottom up." Tracy's basic belief about the importance of utilizing the "teachable moment" was not altered during student teaching.

Role expectations. Heather perceived that she was a counselor, teacher, and role model for pupils. Nancy
perceived that her role as a teacher was to keep parents and faculty informed about what was "going on" in her classes. She also perceived that she would be a teacher and a role model for pupils. Mary indicated that her roles were to be a teacher, parent, disciplinarian, college student, and role model for pupils. Mary indicated that she expected to assume the role of "adult" during her student teaching experiences but that she was not always perceived as an adult by her cooperating teachers. Mary also indicated that she wanted to assume the role of "risk-taker" with pupils and try new ideas (teaching strategies) but was not always permitted to assume that role by her cooperating teachers. Mary believed that she added a new dimension to her philosophy of education by learning workable disciplinary techniques.

Tracy assumed the role of teacher, mother, wife, college student, counselor, role model, and resource person during her student teaching. Tracy wanted to assume the role of almost an "equal" with her cooperating teachers but was only successful in assuming that role in her first student teaching experience.

**Student teacher biography.** Heather presented a self-analysis on how she perceived herself as a teacher after student teaching. She perceived that she still needed to improve her teaching skills and that she had accumulated
knowledge during her student teaching experiences. Heather reported that she learned the "mechanics" of teaching from her coursework at Iowa State University, especially her ability to conceptualize lessons using the scientific method. Heather believes that she has a positive outlook on life which directly affects pupils in the classroom.

Nancy believes that she is the same person after student teaching that she was before student teaching. Her attitudes, values, and beliefs were developed prior to student teaching and whom she was as a teacher was only reinforced during her student teaching experiences.

Mary foresees that she will "never stop caring" about pupils. She indicated that she is a "motivator" and a "consistent" teacher. Mary's attitudes, values, and beliefs are a natural part of her personality. Mary is a problem-solver and a person who works well with other people. Mary indicated that her skills and knowledge evolved over time through her many life experiences.

Tracy believes that she is a teacher who creates a positive atmosphere for pupils. Tracy's personal attitudes, values, and beliefs did not change during her student teaching. Tracy's teaching skills began to develop through the coursework she encountered at Iowa State University but the "real" development came from practice during student
teaching. Tracy indicated that her knowledge evolved over time through her life experiences.

**Communication skills.** All four student teachers strongly supported the need for good communication skills in the classroom. Two-way communication was cited as being absolutely essential to the teaching/learning process. Heather believes one of her strongest attributes is her nonverbal communication skills. Nancy compared her student teaching experiences in terms of the presence or absence of two-way communication between her and her cooperating teachers. Nancy believes that she was influenced positively by the two-way communication skills presented to her by her second cooperating teacher.

**Acquiring teacher behavior.** Heather believes in continuing education because of the relationships that she can build with other teachers in the profession through attending continuing education activities. Heather learned how to teach pupils from her high school home economics teacher. Nancy added to her original perception of her "teacher behavior" by suggesting that she is a "strict" teacher. Nancy indicated that she was unaware that she was a "strict" teacher prior to student teaching.

Mary learned to facilitate learning through her life experiences. Mary indicated that student teaching did not
teach her "anything that she didn't already know" about the teaching/learning process. Rather, Mary indicated that the settings and expectations were different in her student teaching experiences as compared to her non-formal teaching experiences. Mary reported that student teaching for 16 weeks became an "endurance test" and that 16 weeks was too long for a student teaching experience.

Tracy believes that a teacher can be a good teacher without belonging to professional organizations. However, Tracy cited examples of how teachers can acquire new teaching behaviors and new skills by attending professional meetings. Tracy believes that she learned to teach through trial and error and from watching her parents while she was growing up. Tracy learned that she has the skills and abilities necessary to teach pupils of all age-levels.
CHAPTER X.
FINDINGS, SUMMARY, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this chapter is to present: (a) socializing experiences and perceptions of four student teachers; (b) findings which relate to teacher socialization literature; (c) summary of findings; (d) recommendations for teacher socialization research; and (e) recommendations for teacher education programs.

Four Student Teachers

Teacher role identities. Findings from this study document that four student teachers entered student teaching with clear, detailed, and individualistic attitudes, values, and beliefs about themselves as teachers and about teacher roles. These preconceived attitudes, values, and beliefs support Crow's (1987a, b) teacher role identity (TRI) theory.

Crow argues that student teachers construct and develop teacher role identities (TRIs) over time and that TRIs are influenced in three ways: (a) beliefs that have been formulated about teaching and self as teacher as well as beliefs about life in classrooms; (b) former teachers
perceived by student teachers as role models, previous teaching experiences, and childhood experiences; and (c) influences from within the context of the teacher education program.

TRIs were operationalized throughout the total student teaching experiences for four student teachers. Data gathered from this study support five general findings related to TRIs that describe all four student teachers.

First, four student teachers entered student teaching convinced that they possessed appropriate and adequate attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge necessary to teach secondary home economics classes. They were especially confident in their perceived attitudes, values, and beliefs about themselves as teachers. They were committed to the teaching profession and to providing quality education for pupils. Student teachers were confident, even prior to student teaching, that they could facilitate learning and that they would be good teachers.

Student teachers were confident in their teaching skills and knowledge bases. They perceived that they learned teaching "mechanics" (i.e., lesson and unit planning skills) in their teacher education programs. They perceived that they possessed strong home economics content backgrounds. Student teachers believed that their content knowledge evolved either
through participation in content courses at Iowa State University or through past experiences related to home economics content (i.e., through practical experience with quantity food cookery, clothing construction techniques, parenting responsibilities).

Although student teachers were confident in their teaching skills and knowledge bases, they also perceived that they would develop and refine classroom management skills with 'trial and error' practice during student teaching. Developing classroom management skills was perceived as the most important and most necessary learning experience that student teachers would encounter during student teaching.

Student teachers perceived that they would "learn" how to transfer content knowledge to pupils. They would learn how to determine which information was important for pupils to know and how to transfer or impart that information to them. Data from this study support the notion that student teachers perceived a difference between knowing home economics content and transferring that content to pupils.

Second, four student teachers developed attitudes, values, and beliefs about teaching and about teacher roles over a long period of time. Entrance interview data document that student teachers were strongly influenced to become teachers by close family members who were teachers, former high school teachers,
a university professor, and a variety of past non-formal teaching experiences. Entrance interview data also document that student teachers were influenced on how to facilitate learning through the influence of former teachers, parents, and past teaching experiences.

Third, TRIs were operationalized repeatedly throughout the student teachers' student teaching experiences. Data gathered in this study document that student teachers determined how they "would" and/or "should" perform daily teaching tasks and how they "would" and/or "should" interact with pupils based on experiences pre-dating student teaching.

For example, TRIs were operationalized as student teachers took advantage of opportunities to express themselves as teachers through curricular, methodological, and classroom management choices. TRIs served as lenses through which to interpret pupil responses. Positive pupil responses confirmed teacher role identities and negative pupil responses challenged the student teachers' beliefs about themselves as teachers.

TRIs were also used as lenses through which to interpret the meaning of the educative process and to continually evaluate cooperating teachers' teacher roles and choices in relation to how they ought to facilitate learning. In
general, TRIs were utilized by student teachers to determine standards for acceptable teaching.

Fourth, four student teachers entered student teaching with four different teacher role identities. Heather operationalized a humanistic approach to her role as a teacher. Nancy combined a humanistic approach with a strict, on-task approach in her role as a teacher. Mary combined a strong academic approach with a humanistic approach in her role as a teacher. Tracy operationalized a strong desire to take advantage of "teachable moments" as those moments presented themselves coupled with a humanistic emphasis.

Fifth, student teacher attitudes, values, and beliefs about themselves as teachers and about their teacher roles sometimes conflicted with their cooperating teachers' and university supervisors' expectations. For example, Heather believed that teachers should continually provide pupils with immediate positive and/or negative feedback as she facilitated learning. In her second student teaching experience, Heather perceived that her cooperating teacher was "distant and removed" as she interacted with pupils and did not provide pupils with immediate feedback.

Nancy believed that her involvement with athletic coaching (in a site separate from her placement site) during student teaching did not conflict with her responsibilities as a home
economics student teacher. However, Nancy perceived that both her first cooperating teacher and her university supervisor viewed her involvement with athletics as an encroachment upon the time that she needed to devote to home economics student teaching responsibilities.

Mary wanted to implement a variety of teaching strategies in both student teaching experiences. Mary perceived that her cooperating teachers would not permit her to implement her "new ideas" and, consequently, she perceived that her cooperating teachers determined that Mary's ideas "would not work anyhow."

Tracy experienced a philosophical conflict during her second student teaching experience. Tracy wanted to implement a variety of teaching strategies that she believed were appropriate to use with middle school pupils (e.g., spontaneous questions and answers, open discussions, small group projects) but perceived that her cooperating teacher would not permit her to utilize them. Tracy also reported that when she implemented teaching strategies "her way," her cooperating teacher was quick to discuss the positive and negative aspects of her teaching choices. Tracy perceived that her second cooperating teacher was "too strict" with pupils and that such pupil interaction was inconsistent with her philosophy of education.
Four student teachers utilized their teacher role identities as interpretive lenses through which to evaluate nearly every aspect of their student teaching experiences (e.g., teacher roles; teaching methodology; cooperating teachers' attitudes, values, and beliefs about teaching; interactions with pupils). This finding is consistent with Crow's (1987a, b) findings.

Socialization processes. How can the socialization processes of four student teachers be described? Data from this study document that descriptions of four student teachers' socialization processes encompass a dialectic, an exhaustive, and a rewarding and/or depressing perspective.

First, socialization processes for each student teacher were clearly dialectic. Data from this study support the contention that student teaching experiences involved positive and/or negative interaction among student teachers, cooperating teachers, pupils in classrooms, and university supervisors. Student teachers also experienced tensions between personal attitudes, values, and beliefs held as a priority and ecological limitations they encountered in classrooms (e.g., high teacher-pupil ratio, limited resources, space limitations, physical classroom facilities).

For example, there were times when student teachers assumed the role of being key individuals in their own
socialization processes, sometimes to the point that student teachers perceived their cooperating teachers were displeased with their choices. In general, student teachers did not merely imitate cooperating teachers' teaching and classroom management methodology. There were times when student teachers, particularly non-traditional student teachers, presented the appearance of heeding advice and suggestions from cooperating teachers when they had no intentions of changing their minds about the value and legitimacy of their choices.

However, there were also times when institutional demands were predominant in the student teacher socialization process and caused a conflict for student teachers. Sometimes student teachers chose to or were encouraged to make status quo choices in order to facilitate the teaching/learning process.

For example, Mary did not want to facilitate learning with pupils sitting in seats in rows during her first student teaching experience and reported that such arrangements caused her to "feel rigid and boxed in." Because Mary perceived an "it has always been done this way" attitude on the part of her cooperating teacher and because of time constraints, she felt forced to facilitate learning in a setting that did not fit her philosophy or perspectives on how to facilitate learning.

Data from this study support the finding that tension existed
between student teachers and cooperating teachers and between student teachers and institutional demands throughout both student teaching experiences for four student teachers.

Second, student teachers stated that, in some instances, their student teaching experiences were "demanding," "exhausting," and "an endurance test" because of full-load or close to full-load teaching responsibilities. Student teachers reported three specific perceptions related to exhausting student teaching experiences: (a) their teacher role identities were challenged; (b) methodological choices were not consistent with what student teachers purported to believe about how best to facilitate learning; and (c) opportunities for critically reflecting on practice were limited.

The researcher documented that sometimes teacher role identities were challenged as student teachers made methodological and classroom management choices based on expediency rather than on personal convictions about how best to facilitate learning. For example, Heather disciplined a pupil by assigning him a "detention" during a time when she was teaching a laboratory class rather than keeping the pupil after school because she did not have the time to deal with the problem after school.
In her first student teaching experience, Nancy perceived that assigning pupils to read sentences from the textbook as a way to facilitate learning was one way for her to cope with many pupils in the classroom. However, entrance and exit interview data and researcher observations recorded from her second student teaching experience suggest that Nancy did not believe that reading from the textbook was a "good" instructional strategy nor did she employ that strategy in her second student teaching experience, an experience with many fewer pupils per class.

Mary utilized the open discussion teaching methodology coupled with overhead transparencies to a great extent during her second student teaching experience. Mary perceived that students learned "best" through relating to life experiences and she did not have time to prepare lessons utilizing a variety of strategies because of her family responsibilities.

The researcher documented that student teachers made methodological choices that were not consistent with what they purported to believe about how best to facilitate learning. Throughout both student teaching experiences for four student teachers, the researcher documented five insights that illuminate the conflict with methodological choices: (a) student teachers were unaware of a variety of instructional strategies to use to facilitate learning; (b) student teachers
could not determine appropriate strategies to utilize with diverse audiences; (c) in some instances, student teachers could not connect the intended purpose of the learning strategy to the intended learning outcome; (d) student teachers struggled with lesson plan development; and (e) student teachers were overwhelmed with full-load or close to full-load teaching responsibilities without the time or the professional assistance needed for critically reflecting on their practice. This finding is consistent with Crow's (1987a, b) findings.

Third, there were times when student teaching experiences for four student teachers were perceived as rewarding and times when student teaching experiences were perceived as depressing. Pupils in classrooms served as key individuals in the socialization processes for three student teachers (Heather, Mary, and Tracy). Positive pupil responses provided rewarding and motivating experiences for student teachers. At the same time, incongruity between expected pupil responses and actual pupil responses challenged student teacher beliefs about themselves as teachers and about teacher roles. This finding holds true especially for Heather throughout both student teaching experiences.

Student teachers' methodological and organizational choices were influenced by cooperating teachers' advice and
suggestions. In some cases, heeding advice and suggestions provided student teachers with rewarding socializing experiences; in other cases, heeding advice and suggestions from cooperating teachers resulted in conflict between TRIs and cooperating teacher expectations.

In a best case scenario, Heather was encouraged by her cooperating teacher to utilize a wide variety of community resources throughout her second student teaching experience. In each case, guest speakers contributed to providing pupils with current and valuable information.

In a worst case scenario, Tracy adopted a "why should I even try" attitude and consequently "went through the motions" to complete her second student teaching experience. Tracy perceived a conflict between her personal attitudes, values, and beliefs about how to facilitate learning and her cooperating teacher's attitudes, values, and beliefs about how to facilitate learning.

Whether student teaching experiences were perceived as rewarding or depressing, data from this study suggest that cooperating teacher influences did not alter TRIs. In most cases, when student teachers were encouraged to teach differently, they resolved that "things would be different in their own classrooms." Idealizing classrooms is a finding
that is consistent with other researchers (e.g., Crow, 1987a, b; Knowles, 1988).

In some cases, ecological classroom limitations influenced student teacher choices which, in turn, lead to depressing feelings. Student teachers delineated examples of classroom limitations as too many pupils per class, poor seating arrangements, diversity in learning abilities, and the absence or lack of access to windows. Data from this study suggest that student teachers resolved that when they were teachers in their own classrooms, they would have opportunities to overcome classroom limitations by creating atmospheres more conducive to learning.

Data from this study suggest that student teachers relied on previous recollections of themselves as pupils in classrooms and/or on previous teaching experiences as a means for understanding the context of the classroom. Heather's entire socialization process strongly supports this finding. Such recollections provided for student teachers a socialized logic about how teachers worked and provided some solutions to problems related to teaching. This finding is consistent with Crow's (1987a, b) findings.

**Traditional/non-traditional enrollment status.** Utilizing traditional/non-traditional enrollment status as a primary variable of interest for this study illuminated key
information about the differences in socialization processes for both groups of student teachers. More differences emerged from this study than did similarities between traditional and non-traditional student teachers. Five specific comparisons are presented in this section.

The first comparison of traditional and non-traditional student teachers centers on socializing experiences pre-dating student teaching. Traditional student teachers' teacher role identities and teaching methodologies were influenced by former high school teachers whereas non-traditional student teachers were not particularly influenced by former high school teachers.

Heather's interaction with a former high school teacher illustrates the strength of the socializing influence from one former teacher. Heather progressed through high school taking home economics classes from the same home economics teacher. Heather was deeply committed to "becoming" like her high school home economics teacher prior to student teaching. Data from this study documents that Heather modeled several methodological and teacher-pupil interaction strategies after her high school home economics teacher. Subconsciously, Heather also modeled a specific teaching methodology after a university professor.
Nancy reported that she was influenced about how to interact with pupils from two former high school teachers. Data from this study suggest that Nancy's disciplinary methodology was consistent with her description of her former high school teachers' methodology and consequently she implemented a "tough" teacher-pupil interaction approach.

Non-traditional student teachers were predominantly influenced by prior teaching experiences in non-formal settings and by close family members, particularly those who were teachers. Prior teaching experiences for Mary included 4H workshops, community seminars, Future Farmers of America projects, Sunday school, and Bible school. Although the researcher did not observe Mary teaching in non-formal settings, researcher observations confirm Mary's preconceived ideas about how she would facilitate learning.

Tracy perceived that her TRI was strongly influenced by her parents and her childhood environment. Both of her parents were teachers.

The second comparison of traditional and non-traditional student teachers centers around a similarity on classroom management and knowledge transferral skills. Both traditional and non-traditional student teachers perceived that they possessed a relatively low level of classroom management and
knowledge transferral skills prior to student teaching, a finding that is consistent with Lanier's (1984b) finding.

In entrance interviews, both traditional and non-traditional student teachers reported that they would learn about classroom management and would increase their abilities to transfer knowledge for two reasons: (a) they were going to have opportunities to practice both classroom management and knowledge transferral skills in student teaching and, (b) they were going to observe two different cooperating teachers' classroom management and knowledge transferral skills. The responses from both traditional and non-traditional student teachers in entrance interviews indicated that they were enthused about increasing their skills and they positively anticipated the challenge of student teaching.

Data from this study document that both traditional and non-traditional student teachers developed classroom management and knowledge transferral skills during student teaching. Data suggests that comfort with classroom environments and cooperating teachers and familiarity with topics contributed to increases in both skills. There were no observable or reported differences between traditional and non-traditional student teachers in the development of classroom management and knowledge transferral skills.
The third comparison of traditional and non-traditional student teachers centers around differences on how each group responded to cooperating teachers. Traditional student teachers seemingly were more open to observing and evaluating their cooperating teachers' teaching and classroom management methodology and, in some cases, were open to actually imitating their cooperating teachers. Non-traditional student teachers seemed to evaluate their cooperating teachers' teaching and classroom management methodology in terms of what "would or would not work" for them.

Data from this study does not indicate that non-traditional student teachers actually attempted to implement cooperating teachers' teaching strategies unless the cooperating teachers strongly encouraged them to do so. Near the end of her first experience, Mary disciplined disruptive pupils in a way that resembled her cooperating teacher's style but reported many times that she did not believe in that particular strategy and would not utilize that strategy in her own classroom.

The fourth comparison between traditional and non-traditional student teachers centers around differences in terms of how student teachers coped with conflicts between themselves and their cooperating teachers. Heather and Nancy, traditional student teachers, were quick to heed advice and
suggestions from their cooperating teachers. There is evidence that heeding some advice and suggestions resulted in rewarding experiences and that heeding other suggestions resulted in conflicting, and sometimes traumatic, experiences. However, traditional student teachers were open to advice and suggestions from cooperating teachers.

Non-traditional student teachers were more hesitant in terms of heeding advice and suggestions from cooperating teachers. When Mary was approached by her cooperating teachers with advice and suggestions, she embarked on a mental journey to "understand" the advice. In most cases, she interpreted the advice and/or suggestions as negative criticism and as words that she would need to internalize in order to "decide" whether or not the information was appropriate for her.

Tracy perceived advice and suggestions from her first cooperating teacher as professional interactions between the two of them and that the advice was useful for interacting with pupils to create the best possible learning environment. In her second experience, Tracy listened to the advice and suggestions and then made cognizant choices with regard to whether or not she would heed the advice. In some cases, Tracy tried to teach the way her second cooperating teacher expected her to teach. In other cases, Tracy consciously
chose to teach "her way" knowing that she would be criticized by her cooperating teacher. In any case, non-traditional student teachers were not as quick to heed advice and suggestions from cooperating teachers as were traditional student teachers.

The fifth comparison between traditional and non-traditional student teachers centers around perceptions of university supervisory roles. Traditional student teachers were either not influenced or negatively influenced by their university supervisors.

Heather reported in her exit interview that she did not know why the university supervisor visited her classroom because the conversations between her and her university supervisor seemed unrelated to her student teaching experiences. Nancy reported that visits from her university supervisor did not contribute to helping her become a better teacher and, in some cases, served to contradict Nancy's understanding of what was expected from her as a student teacher. Both traditional student teachers reported that university supervisors did not provide them with "appropriate feedback" with regard to their teaching nor did university supervisors discuss topics that were important to student teachers. This finding is consistent with Crow's (1987a) finding.
Data from this study suggest that traditional student teachers did not perceive input from university supervisors throughout their student teaching experiences as helpful. Traditional student teachers felt that university supervisors did not seize opportunities to instruct them on how to connect theory with practice or on ways through which they could become better teachers.

Non-traditional student teachers indicated that they "enjoyed" visits from the university supervisors and that the supervisors offered helpful suggestions. However, the suggestions that were offered were perceived by student teachers as helpful for a particular lesson or lessons observed during one visit rather than suggestions that might have a socializing effect on teacher role development.

Changes during student teaching. Data from this study document that four student teachers changed in a variety of ways during student teaching. The purpose of this subsection is not to delineate specific perceived or observed changes for four student teachers. Instead, the purpose of this subsection is to report socializing variables that impacted changes in student teacher attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge (e.g., key individuals, ecological characteristics of classrooms) and to report the socializing
impact that teacher role identities had on changes perceived by the student teacher or observed by the researcher.

The researcher formulated general questions that served as guides for this analysis: Did student teachers change their basic attitudes, values, and beliefs about themselves as teachers and about teacher roles during student teaching? If student teachers changed their basic attitudes, values, and beliefs during student teaching, did intervening socializing variables impact the change or did student teachers grow and develop as teachers through broadening their original teacher role identities? Concurrently, did student teachers change in terms of classroom management and knowledge transferral skill development? If so, did socializing variables impact the change or did classroom management and knowledge transferral skills change through a process of trial and error?

Data from this study indicate that affective components of four student teachers' teacher role identities (basic attitudes, values, and beliefs about themselves as teachers and about teacher roles) remained stable during student teaching. Their preconceived and well-developed notions about how they "should" facilitate learning did not change.

For example, Heather, a traditional student teacher, was consciously aware of the fact that she would imitate her high school home economics teacher. Nancy, a traditional student
teacher, was aware of her belief that "teachers needed to be tough but not hard-core all the time." Mary and Tracy, non-traditional student teachers, entered student teaching with "tried and true" past teaching experiences and/or engrained notions about how to facilitate learning. Data from this study support Lortie's (1975) assertion that student teacher biography is a powerful socializing determinant and Crow's (1987a) assertion that teacher role identities serve as lenses through which student teachers interpret teacher roles.

Data from this study document the notion that classroom management and knowledge transferral skills changed during student teaching. The key questions are: "Did specific socializing variables impact the changes? Did student teachers broaden their teacher role identities through a process of trial and error or did student teachers combine the impacts from socializing variables with TRIs?"

Four student teachers reported that their teaching skill levels changed during student teaching. Student teachers used specific descriptive words such as "increased," "increased greatly," "developed," and "changed alot" to express perceived change. Observations provided evidence that change was associated with levels of comfort. In other words, observations support the relationship that as student teachers became more comfortable with cooperating teachers, pupils, and
classroom environments, their teaching skills increased or changed. However, through researcher observations, the researcher documented over time that four student teachers did not significantly alter the teaching strategies that they developed prior to student teaching.

For example, Heather entered student teaching with not only a clear image of how she would "be" as a teacher but also a well-developed scientifically-oriented teaching methodology. Throughout her student teaching experience, she adapted, modified, and expanded that particular methodology. Heather's university professor taught her that particular methodology so well that Heather was not aware that she was using it. Data from this study suggest that Heather utilized one methodology and increased her skills in terms of using that methodology. She did not encounter or adopt new skills during student teaching even though she utilized a variety of strategies with the same scientifically-oriented methodology.

Mary entered student teaching with a well-developed artistic skill. In the beginning, she was artistically creative with posters as teaching devices. Over time, Mary determined that she was "more comfortable" with using the transparency/open discussion strategy for teaching and the transparency strategy was less time-consuming. For the most part, Mary combined the transparency/open discussion strategy
with any other strategies she may have used to facilitate learning. By the end of student teaching, Mary appeared comfortable with the transparency approach. Mary's entrance and exit interviews indicate that she did not learn the open discussion teaching strategy during student teaching; rather, she perfected it.

Four student teachers reported that they grew in knowledge transferral during student teaching. The researcher observed that access to a variety of resources was a key contributor in terms of helping student teachers determine important concepts to teach, reliable information to present, and, in some cases, ways in which to present the information. The researcher also observed that student teachers became familiar with the information that they were teaching over time. Familiarity with home economics content for four student teachers was equated with "growth in knowledge." Familiarity with content coupled with being comfortable in classrooms were two criteria used by student teachers to determine growth, and growth was equated with change.

Data from this study suggest that student teaching experiences, both positive and negative, contributed to the expansion of original teacher role identities. Student teachers observed two ways to facilitate learning through observing two cooperating teachers. However, observations
were interpreted and evaluated by student teachers as strategies that "would or would not" work for them as they thought about how they should facilitate learning. This finding is particularly true for non-traditional student teachers.

Data from this study suggest that four student teachers changed during the latter weeks of each student teaching experience. There is evidence to support the notion that student teachers accepted some aspects of the status quo. Mary utilized her first cooperating teacher's disciplining strategies even though she believed "things would be different [in terms of dealing with disruptive pupil behavior]" when she had her own classroom and could provide different seating arrangements.

The researcher observed that "favorite" teaching strategies (e.g., transparencies, open discussion) were utilized predominantly during weeks six, seven, and eight by three student teachers throughout both student teaching experiences. The researcher believes that this finding is related to the demands placed on student teachers as they assumed full-load or close to full-load teaching responsibilities in a relatively short period of time.

Conflicts during student teaching. Four student teachers experienced conflicts during their student teaching
experiences. In general, conflict was perceived by student teachers as internal (e.g., philosophical, methodological, and/or organizational differences between the student teacher and cooperating teacher) and external (e.g., frustration with variables beyond their control). Five categories of conflict are discussed in this section.

First, student teachers experienced internal conflict over the incongruence between ways that they facilitated learning and ways they perceived that they "wanted" to facilitate learning. Three student teachers reported that when they were teachers in their own classroom, "things would be different." Tracy would be able to interact with pupils "her way" without being told that she could not facilitate learning using strategies of her choice. Mary would create a classroom atmosphere with chairs and tables situated according to her philosophy and beliefs about how best to facilitate learning. Nancy would teach in a way that was consistent with her value system without negative input from a cooperating teacher when she taught in her own classroom.

Second, student teachers perceived that they experienced external conflicts with ecological classroom limitations. This finding is supported through data collected on student teachers who student taught in middle school settings where there were approximately 30 pupils per class. For example,
Mary was frustrated when she addressed what appeared to be a continual problem with disruptive pupil behavior in her first student teaching experience. Mary was also frustrated with physical classroom arrangements and either the absence of, or lack of access to, windows in the classroom. Tracy experienced frustration teaching not only in a middle school setting with a high teacher-pupil ratio per class but also in a classroom that was overly crowded with equipment. Heather was frustrated with the lack of teaching resources in her second student teaching experience.

Third, student teachers perceived both internal and external conflicts with teaching strategies. Internally, student teachers perceived that they knew how to facilitate learning and that they would utilize strategies they envisioned in their minds (e.g., strategies they learned in methods classes or strategies developed through past teaching experiences in non-formal settings). However, three student teachers (Nancy, Mary, and Tracy) recognized that they did not have quick recall of a variety of teaching strategies, especially strategies to utilize with middle school pupils.

Fourth, three student teachers perceived external conflicts with connecting learning theory (e.g., information they learned in education and methods courses) to practice. Data from this study suggest that one traditional student
teacher utilized a specific teaching methodology (as opposed to isolated strategies) that was different from the strategies utilized by the other three student teachers. Heather utilized a teaching methodology based on the scientific method. Beyond Heather's methodology, student teachers did not have a clear, overall understanding about a variety of ways to facilitate learning, ways to facilitate learning for diverse learning audiences, and ways to connect teaching strategies with appropriate content. Three student teachers (Nancy, Mary, and Tracy) utilized primarily the lecture/transparency/open discussion strategy for instruction. The researcher observed that student teachers used games as a strategy either to introduce a lesson or to review for a test. At least for two student teachers, this strategy was utilized predominantly because it consumed time and sparked a competitive interest for pupils.

Fifth, two student teachers perceived internal and external conflict related to the university's role in helping them connect theory to practice. Two student teachers perceived that they did not have ample opportunities during student teaching to learn practical, relevant ways to connect theory to practice. Heather and Mary reported in conversations with the researcher that they needed help with understanding a wider variety of teaching strategies,
especially strategies useful for teaching classes with diverse learning audiences.

Teacher Socialization Literature

*Socialization theory.* Socialization theories formulated in the past suggest that student teachers are passive recipients of the norms of the institution and that the teacher socialization process is unidirectional (Goodman, 1985; Popkewitz, 1979; Tabachnick, 1981; Zeichner, 1980a). Findings from this study suggest that socialization for four student teachers was not unidirectional. Teacher roles were not unconditionally accepted by student teachers nor were student teachers overpowered by institutional norms (Berger & Luchmann, 1967; Crow, 1987a; Popkewitz, 1976; Tabachnick et al., 1982; Wentworth, 1979; Zeichner, 1980a).

Findings from this study suggest that the socialization processes for four student teachers was dialectic. There was a continual tension between teacher role identities and program features, settings, and people which supports Popkewitz's (1979) claim that "while social structures are compelling in the construction of identity, the concept of socialization should define people as recipients and creators of values" (p. 4). Specific documentation on student teacher
experiences and the tensions that they encountered, were presented in Chapters VII through IX.

Findings from this study do not support the notion that four student teachers modeled their teaching methodology or beliefs after their cooperating teachers (e.g., Iannacone, 1963; Edgar & Warren, 1969) beyond utilizing a few isolated teaching strategies to practice teaching through the process of trial and error. This study documents that one student teacher learned a specific and adaptable teaching methodology from one university professor prior to student teaching.

Student teachers in this study were recipients of teaching values and strategies prior to student teaching and, in most instances, prior to their teacher education programs. There is evidence that student teachers observed and interpreted additional attitudes, values, and beliefs about teaching through interacting with two cooperating teachers.

Beyond recognizing that there was a tension between student teachers and program contexts, data also support Wentworth's (1979) assertion that "society cannot replicate itself precisely with the novice because . . . the novice's frame of reference plays upon the meaning of interaction" (p. 84). Student teachers entered student teaching believing that they had been adequately prepared to facilitate learning before they entered student teaching and before they entered
their teacher education programs. They believed that they would build upon their currently held attitudes, values, and beliefs about teaching as well as upon their currently held classroom management and knowledge transferral skills.

During student teaching, teacher role identities served as lenses through which student teachers interpreted their methodological choices and professional behavior (i.e., interactions with pupils, cooperating teachers). Student teachers utilized teacher role identities throughout student teaching rather than imitating cooperating teachers, hence, they did not leave student teaching as replicas of their cooperating teachers.

Findings from this study concur that student teachers engaged in a continual process of interpretation and construction of events (Crow, 1987a; Cicourel, 1973; Olesen & Whittaker, 1968). Student teachers were active participants in their own socialization processes as documented by the choices that they made about the teaching/learning process, their willingness or lack of willingness to heed advice and suggestions from cooperating teachers, and, in two instances, student teachers resolved to "play the game" in order to finish student teaching.

All four student teachers interpreted home economics curricula very differently. For example, three student
teachers student taught in metropolitan middle school settings. Home economics content in all three middle schools was guided by a district-wide middle school home economics curriculum. In other words, home economics curricula in this particular scenario should have been consistently interpreted by all three student teachers.

Student teachers in this study continually reshaped their own socialization processes. Data from this study indicate that there were times when student teachers resisted and/or contradicted the norms of the institution. This finding is consistent with Crow's (1987a) finding. For example, Tracy utilized teaching strategies that she was told not to utilize by her cooperating teacher. Heather resisted utilizing what she perceived was a poorly organized grading system in her second student teaching experience (e.g., purchased her own grade book, developed her own system of managing pupil papers). Consequently, she developed and utilized her own system throughout her student teaching experience. This finding is also consistent with Zeichner's (1980a) assertion that "while people are necessarily constrained by structural limitations, they play an active part in shaping their identities, often acting in ways which contradict the dominant norms and values that pervade a social setting" (p. 2).
Socialization research methodology. Findings from this study support the need for qualitative approaches to the study of teacher socialization (Crow, 1987a; Fuller & Bown, 1975; Wells, 1984; Zeichner, 1980b). This particular study contributes a rich and detailed description of the socialization processes for four student teachers. Data from this study then can be compared to other qualitative studies on teacher socialization processes for student teachers. Zeichner (1980b) asserts that "ethnographic approaches to the study of field-based experiences should help . . . build a firmer knowledge base of what is learned . . . to better understand 'what is out there'" (p. 53).

According to Crow (1987a), descriptions of student teachers gathered through ethnographic approaches, such as the four student teachers in this study, provide comprehensive descriptions essential to understanding the complexity of the interactive relationships basic to socialization between program participants (e.g., student teachers, cooperating teachers, university supervisors, peers, pupils) and program features and settings. Crow (1987a) and Zeichner (1980b) contend that conducting more qualitative research on student teachers does not negate the necessity for quantitative research because the two types of research work together to
create a more comprehensive knowledge base on the socialization of student teachers into the profession.

Findings from this study question focusing research on the socializing influence of the cooperating teacher or other isolated socializing variables and are consistent with other researchers (Zeichner, 1980a; Wells, 1984). Findings from this study support Karmos and Jacko's (1977) and Funk et al.'s (1982) assertions that cooperating teachers represent one factor in the socialization processes for student teachers and perhaps not a particularly significant one.

Findings from this study do not support Yee's (1969) and Seperson and Joyce's (1973) assertion that there is a conservative shift in student teacher values during student teaching resulting from the influence of cooperating teachers. Student teachers in this study were influenced by a variety of socializing factors, not the least of which was their own teacher role identities. Findings from this study also support the contention that the socializing factors that influenced student teachers were interrelated and could not be isolated.

**Socializing influence of student teacher biography.** Findings from this study on four student teachers support Lortie's (1975) claim that student teacher biography is a
powerful influence in the teacher socialization process.

Lortie concluded that the Five Town teachers:

"... placed events which preceded their formal preparation for teaching within a continuous rather than a discontinuous framework. Thus, when they describe their former teachers, they do not contrast their "student" perceptions with a later, more sophisticated viewpoint [one that might have been learned in a teacher education program]. They talk about assessments they made as youngsters as currently viable, as stable judgments of quality. What constituted good teaching then constitutes good teaching now" (p. 65).

Student teachers in this study relied on recollections of former teachers and past teaching experiences and integrated those recollections into their teacher role identities. According to Crow (1987a), this integration is one definable characteristic of a teacher role identity.

Traditional/non-traditional enrollment status emerged in this study as one way to distinguish between the socializing influence from former high school teachers and the influence from past teaching experiences. Traditional student teachers were strongly influenced by former high school teachers. Non-traditional student teachers were strongly influenced by either former teaching experiences and/or close family members, particularly those who were teachers.

In any event, prior socializing experiences accounted for most of the student teachers' socialization into the teaching profession for four student teachers. Findings from this
study support Crow's (1987a) tentative finding that the teacher education program had a low impact on influencing the socialization processes for student teachers.

Findings from this study support recent research on the interactive roles of student teachers in their socialization processes (e.g., Goodman, 1985; Lacey, 1977; Popkewitz, 1976). According to Popkewitz (1976), "The active role relationship between people and institutions becomes evident as people choose to become committed, detached, or to revolt from the constraints existing within teacher education" (p. 16). There are examples in this study where student teachers were committed to the constraints existing within a teacher education program (e.g., four student teachers progressed through a teacher education program in such a way that they would meet graduation requirements; four student teachers were cautious during student teaching so that they would not only learn about teaching but also earn the credits they needed to graduate). Tracy's detachment from her second student teaching experience provides strong evidence that she was very interactive in her own socialization process. She adopted the "why try" attitude and chose to "play the game" in order to finish student teaching. Nancy's traumatic first student teaching experience is a clear example of student teacher
revolt, to a point. She revolted more internally than she did externally.

Findings from this study support Lortie's (1975) claim that teacher educators need to reconsider the assumptions upon which they offer teacher education courses, especially those assumptions that appear naive and unjustified. Four student teachers in this study entered the same teacher education program with four different personal histories, four different beliefs about how to facilitate learning, and four different philosophies of education. Yet, they were "educated" as a whole and without much consideration for who they were as people, what they believed about themselves as teachers, and about their roles as teachers prior to student teaching. This finding is consistent with Crow's (1987a) findings.

Data from this study suggest that student teachers were, in most cases, somewhat unaware of the origins of their teacher-related histories until they interacted with the entrance interview schedule designed for this study. Four student teachers entered student teaching believing that they would add to their teacher role identities through opportunities to "practice" their beliefs through a process of trial and error rather than implementing learning theory that they learned in their teacher education programs.
Socializing influence of placement sites. Findings from this study support, in part, Goodman's (1985) theory on student teacher coping strategies. Goodman asserts that student teachers cope with the influence of the institution by utilizing one of four coping strategies: (a) passive acceptance; (b) active acceptance; (c) passive resistance; and (d) active resistance. Student teachers in this study demonstrated use of all four coping strategies, in most cases. This finding is consistent with Crow's (1987a) analysis of how student teachers coped with adjusting to the status quo.

Findings from this study suggest that two student teaching experiences were beneficial for four student teachers. Two explanations emerged to support the finding: (a) student teachers were placed in each site for eight weeks and eight weeks appeared to be a sufficient amount of time for student teachers to interact with one cooperating teacher and one age level of pupils, and (b) eight weeks appeared short enough so that student teachers were not negatively influenced by individual school bureaucracies or by negative aspects of cooperating teachers' teaching and disciplining methodology.

One negative aspect of the two-site student teaching experience emerged from this study. Student teachers perceived that there was insufficient time for them to critically reflect on their teaching practices and to evaluate
their teacher role identities. Student teachers assumed either full-load or close to full-load teaching responsibilities in a relatively short period of time in both student teaching experiences.

Findings from this study do not support the contention that student teaching for longer lengths of time contributes positively to socializing student teachers into the teaching profession. There seems to be a trend among teacher educators, legislators, and state department of education officials to require more time for student teaching. Tabachnick et al. (1982) asserts that sometimes this additional time is recommended without considering changes that should follow in terms of supervising student teachers and without considering the time that is necessary for student teachers to critically reflect on their teaching practices. According to Tabachnick et al. (1982):

"There is no justification for the naive notion that practical school experience must be useful in introducing students to a wide range of teaching abilities. Nor can it be taken for granted that the time spent in classrooms will illuminate relationships for students between what teachers do and the purposes and consequences of teaching. . . . . Proposals which "solve" problems of teacher education by scheduling more student time in classrooms rest upon the apparently untenable assumption that more time spent in that way will automatically make better teachers" (p. 39).

Findings from this study do not support student teaching for longer lengths of time because more time "might" produce
better teachers. Rather, this study supports the value of student teaching for eight weeks each in two separate sites in order for student teachers to interact with two different sites, two different cooperating teachers, and two different pupil age- and grade-levels.

**Socializing influence of a teacher education program.** Data from this study was insufficient to support or not support recent research findings on the socializing impact of an entire teacher education program (Crow, 1987a, b; Knowles, 1988). This study lacks an in-depth perspective relative to the holistic socializing impact of one teacher education program or a clear understanding of the impact of the hidden curriculum on four student teachers. Rather, this study describes the socializing impact during the 16-week student teaching experience. Data from this study support socialization researchers pleas to continue to study socialization in its entirety (e.g., Feiman-Nemser, 1983; Lanier, 1984b; Popkewitz, 1979; Wells, 1984; Zeichner, 1984).

Data from this study document that student teacher TRIs developed prior to student teaching and that TRIs were not significantly challenged throughout their teacher education programs and/or student teaching experiences for several reasons. Four student teachers perceived that university supervisors did not delve into a critical analysis of student
teachers' teaching practices and beliefs in terms of helping student teachers understand themselves as teachers and helping them understand their teacher roles. Four student teachers perceived that they did not have opportunities to link learning theory to practice or to critically analyze their teaching practices. Four student teachers perceived that there were few opportunities for supervised and planned skill development made available to them during student teaching because university supervisors' visits were geared toward evaluation rather than instruction.

**Other socializing influences.** Findings from this study suggest that other factors were also socializing agents for four student teachers. Full-load teaching responsibilities seemed to detract from opportunities to critically reflect on student teachers' teaching strategies and their teacher role identities. Student teachers in this study recognized that teaching was exhausting and that a high level of stress was associated with student teaching responsibilities. However, this study did not provide enough data to separate tensions among teaching responsibilities, cooperating teachers, hidden curriculum, and pupils. Recent socialization researchers do not acknowledge that workload is a significant socializing variable in the student teachers' socialization process (Zeichner, 1980a; Wells, 1984).
Findings from this study support the notion that pupils in classrooms were powerful socializing variables in the socialization processes for three student teachers (Heather, Mary, and Tracy). This finding supports Friebus's (1977) assertion that positive feedback from pupils legitimizes the student teachers' teacher role identities. Student teachers interpreted the congruence between their expectations for pupil responses received and actual pupil responses as a confirmation of the rightness of their attitudes, values, and beliefs about teaching. This finding supports Crow's (1987a) finding that student teachers used pupil feedback to evaluate their teaching practices and beliefs about teacher roles.

Four student teachers perceived that university supervisors had a minimal impact on influencing their socialization into the teaching profession. This finding supports Crow's (1987a) and Zeichner's (1980b) findings. Exit interview data from four student teachers provided three possible explanations for their perceptions: (a) supervisors made few visits to placement sites; (b) university supervisors remained at the placement sites for short periods of time; and (c) university supervisors assumed evaluative rather than instructive roles as they supervised student teachers. Findings from this study also suggest that some supervisory visits were managed by the student teachers in order to create
a favorable impression for the university supervisor. This finding is consistent with Crow's (1987a) finding.

Summary

This study provides comprehensive and detailed data that thoroughly describes how four student teachers selectively acquired the attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge currently held in the teaching profession. Five findings emerged and are presented in this summary.

First, four student teachers entered student teaching with different teacher role identities. They each encountered different socializing influences pre-dating their teacher education programs. They each held different attitudes, values, and beliefs about themselves as teachers and about teacher roles.

Second, four student teachers in this study entered student teaching with clear and well-defined attitudes, values, and beliefs about themselves as teachers and about teacher roles. These attitudes, values, and beliefs contributed to unique teacher role identities (TRIs). Student teaching experiences for four student teachers seemed to have little impact on altering TRIs.

Third, student teachers were active agents, as opposed to passive recipients, in their teacher socialization processes.
Data from this study provide evidence that student teachers were not passive recipients of advice and suggestions presented to them by cooperating teachers and/or university supervisors, institutional values and norms, or cooperating teacher methodology. Student teachers entered student teaching anticipating that they would "learn" how to manage classrooms and transfer knowledge through the process of trial and error rather than through imitating or being "taught" by their cooperating teachers. One traditional student teacher perceived that she did imitate the teaching methodology that she encountered as a pupil in a high school classroom and as a pupil in a university methods class. Both traditional and nontraditional student teachers continued to develop teaching strategies and classroom management skills that they had learned through a variety of teaching experiences prior to student teaching.

Fourth, four student teachers were influenced by the demands of full-load or close to full-load teaching responsibilities. Because student teachers student taught in two sites during 16 weeks they assumed full-load or close to full-load teaching responsibilities earlier than they would have assumed had they student taught in one site for 10 weeks. Although student teachers were exposed to a variety of teacher-related experiences during the course of 16 weeks,
student teachers perceived that by assuming full-load teaching responsibilities within the first four to six weeks of each experience, they did not have time, opportunities, or sufficient professional assistance to critically reflect on their teaching practice or on their teacher role identities.

Fifth, three student teachers were directly influenced by pupil responses to them as teachers. Positive pupil responses provided evaluative feedback for student teachers in terms of validating the worth of the strategy as well as their worth as teachers.

Recommendations for Teacher Socialization Research

Based on findings from this study, the researcher offers the following recommendations for future teacher socialization research:

1. Student teacher socialization research should continue to focus specific attention on the role that individuals play in the teacher socialization process. Socialization researchers should study the influence of student teacher biography in order to understand more about the role of the student teacher in the socialization process (Crow, 1987a; Feiman-Nemser, 1983; Lortie, 1975; Zeichner, 1980a).

2. Researchers should consider socialization as a dialectic process within specific institutional and school-
based contexts. Research should continue to describe what happens in the socialization process rather than to focus on specific socializing variables (e.g., cooperating teachers, university supervisors, placement sites). This research supports Crow's (1987a) findings that socialization should be considered a contextual enterprise involving not only an internalization of cultural norms but also an ongoing negotiation of the past (biography) with present activities and future goals.

3. Student teacher socialization research should continue to utilize qualitative approaches to the study of socialization. Socialization should be reconceptualized as a process that evolves over time through interaction with teacher role models, teaching experiences, and settings (e.g., Fuller & Bown, 1975; Wells, 1984; Zeichner, 1980b). The ethnographic approach to this study enabled the penetration of the complex and interrelated world of student teaching as perceived by four student teachers. However, conducting more qualitative research on student teachers does not negate the necessity for quantitative research because the two types of research work together to create a more comprehensive knowledge base on the socialization of student teachers into the profession (Crow, 1987a; Zeichner, 1980b).
4. Teacher socialization researchers should investigate teacher education programs from a holistic perspective. This recommendation is consistent with other researchers (e.g., Crow, 1987a, b; Wells, 1984; Zeichner, 1980b). Socialization as a process that evolves over time, teacher role identities (Crow, 1987a), and specific socializing variables (e.g., full-load teaching responsibilities, pupils in classrooms) should be considered in the study of the impact of teacher education programs on socializing student teachers into the teaching profession.

In this study, describing the student teaching component of one teacher education program was valuable because the researcher collected detailed and consistent data for 16 weeks on each student teacher in order to thoroughly describe the socialization processes for four student teachers. However, this study is limited in determining the impact of the teacher education program variables on the teacher socialization process.

The original conceptualization of this study was not adequate for describing the total impact from the teacher education program on the socialization processes for four student teachers. The researcher determined that a review of program-related materials would be adequate to ascertain the
impact of the teacher education program on the socialization processes for four student teachers.

However, as the study progressed, the researcher determined that merely reviewing program-related materials was not sufficient for describing the impact from the teacher education program on the socialization processes for four student teachers. To capture the impact on teacher socialization from teacher education programs, research investigations should focus on university course documents, teacher education program philosophy, program requirements, the socializing influence of university professors, and on the student teaching experience (Crow, 1987a, b; Feiman-Nemser, 1983; Lanier, 1984a; Popkewitz, 1979; Wells, 1984; Zeichner, 1984).

5. Research should further investigate Crow's (1987a) teacher role identity theory. Findings from this research strongly support the definable characteristics of a teacher role identity and suggest that student teachers entered a teacher education program with clearly defined attitudes, values, and beliefs about themselves as teachers and about teacher roles.

6. Future socialization research should include pupils in classrooms as a powerful socializing influence in student
teacher socialization processes, particularly for the socialization process for traditional student teachers.

7. Future socialization research should address the role of the university supervisor in the student teaching experiences and ways in which university supervisors assume supervisory roles (e.g., evaluative rather than instructive).

Recommendations for Teacher Education Programs

1. Teacher educators should be keenly aware that past and present key individuals directly influence student teachers' attitudes, values, and beliefs about themselves as teachers. Findings from this study suggest that former high school teachers served as powerful socializing influences in the lives of traditional student teachers. Non-traditional student teachers appear more susceptible to the influence of life experiences over a longer period of time, especially other teaching experiences, as key socializing factors. Cooperating teachers served as key individuals in the student teaching experience but the influence of cooperating teachers appears to be in the areas of knowledge transferral and classroom management skill development rather than influencing student teachers' attitudes, values, and beliefs about themselves as teachers and about teacher roles.
2. Teacher educators should be aware of the roles student teachers expect to assume during their student teaching experiences. Not only do these roles need to be delineated but they also need to be clearly defined. There was a distinct difference between traditional and non-traditional student teachers on how they defined their teacher roles. There was also a difference between traditional and non-traditional student teachers on how they perceived that they would implement their teacher roles.

Traditional student teachers in this study perceived that they would assume roles of being a teacher, role model, learner, and counselor. Non-traditional student teachers perceived that they would assume roles of being a teacher, role model, learner, counselor, resource person, surrogate parent, and adult. Non-traditional student teachers perceived, in some cases, that they were not viewed as "adults" by their cooperating teachers and that their life experiences, including the fact that they had children of their own, were not considered by cooperating teachers during student teaching experiences. Mary indicated that sometimes she was confused by conflicting role expectations. Sometimes she was expected to "know" more than she did because she was "older;" sometimes she was treated like a traditional student teacher or someone who needed to be "spoonfed." Both
traditional and non-traditional student teachers indicated that they would assume the role of "learner" as they related to learning classroom management and knowledge transferral skills.

3. Teacher educators should be aware of the powerful impact that student teacher biography has on the socialization of teachers into the profession. The aspects of student teacher biography that impact the teacher socialization process include clearly defined attitudes, values, and beliefs about themselves as teachers prior to student teaching. Student teachers appeared to be pre-socialized with regard to the basic foundations of teaching skills. However, student teachers did not appear to be socialized about classroom management and knowledge transferral skills prior to student teaching.

4. Teacher educators should be aware of the socializing influence generated by classroom ecological characteristics. Such situations as high teacher-pupil ratio, space availability, resource availability, and diversity in pupil learning abilities emerged as classroom variables that had a direct influence on each student teacher.

The ecological characteristics impacted non-traditional student teachers differently than traditional student teachers. For example, both non-traditional student teachers
reported that they were stifled in terms of reaching their personal teaching goals because of the high teacher-pupil ratio during their middle school student teaching experiences.

5. Teacher educators should be aware that pupils in classrooms and full-load or close to full-load teaching responsibilities emerged in this study as having strong socializing impacts for three student teachers. Data suggest that pupils in classrooms serve to legitimize student teacher role identities, a finding that is consistent with Karmos and Jacko's (1977) study. Data also support the notion that assuming full-load teaching responsibilities in a short period of time does not provide sufficient time for student teachers to critically reflect on their teaching practice or on their attitudes, values, and beliefs about themselves as teachers.

6. Teacher educators should consider the value of presenting specific teaching methodologies, as opposed to isolated strategies, to student teachers coupled with incorporating a practical understanding of learning theory.

7. Teacher educators should be aware that student teachers would benefit from opportunities to connect theory to practice and opportunities to critically reflect on teaching practices during student teaching.
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Dedication
I had known Dr. Mary Ruth Swope, then the Dean of the School of Home Economics at Eastern Illinois University, for only a few months when she sent me a note:

"... Kathy, somewhere beneath your "smile-faced t-shirt and sawed off shorts," I know there lies deep within you the "seeds of greatness!" Someday you will contribute to our [home economics] profession in ways untold ... " (April, 1971).

I did not believe Dr. Swope. I was a new masters degree student who recently completed a bachelor's degree in home economics education and could not find a job. I did not believe that I had anything within my being worthy of "greatness" and, beyond that, I could not comprehend the faith she had in me as a person.

But, through the years, Dr. Swope never, ever gave up on me. She, and her husband Donald, have been my friends and my strong supporters. They have helped me in every imaginable way to achieve my dream ... a dream beyond my imagination ... a PhD in home economics education, a subject matter area that means almost more to me than life itself. With this degree, in my mind, comes real and imaginary possibilities ...
not the least of which is an opportunity to "teach future home economics teachers" to value the richness of home economics philosophy, including a strong commitment to families and individuals, and to pass on our legacy to the children.

Through the years, I honestly valued every word I heard from Dr. Swope as she taught me about home economics. I listened closely as she shared her life with me. I learned many things about who I was and who I wanted to be from her successes and from her hardships. One of her dreams was to earn her doctoral degree by the time she was 40 years old. I heard those words in the first class that I took at EIU. Dr. Swope was my teacher. I decided then, at age 22, that I would have my doctorate by the time I was 40 years old. I turned 40 on October 4th of this year. Conceptualizing a research study based on the powerful impact of being socialized through the positive influence of former teachers was easy for me. I have experienced limitless rewards from that kind of impact directly through the life of another human being . . . my teacher and my friend.

This dissertation, and to a great extent my doctoral degree, is dedicated to Dr. Mary Ruth Swope. She believed in the absolute value of education and home economics. She believed that home economics, if taught the way the founders
conceptualized the profession, was more important to our young people in the public schools and to our society, as a whole, than any other subject matter taught in the schools. She used to say, "I don't know a soul who doesn't eat . . . wear clothing . . . live somewhere . . . love someone . . . . They need us!" More than anything in this world, I want to be an "us!" Beyond that, I want to express my thanks to you, Dr. Swope, for all the love, emotional and financial support, and incredible never-ending caring that you extended to me during the past 18 years. My next dream is that you will be as proud of me as I am of you and that I will have the opportunity to contribute to our home economics just like you did!

Appreciation

With a dissertation as time-intensive as this one was, there are innumerable "thank you's" that must be extended to those who contributed to this research. Four student teachers who participated in this study gave of themselves in ways that only I can understand. Thank you, to each of you, for the countless hours you spent recording data, talking to me on the telephone, and allowing me to enter your student teaching placement sites unannounced. I am especially thankful for each of you because had you not been willing, I would not have been able to conduct this study with the design that I chose
and without you, I clearly would not be who I am today. Each of you contributed four new dimensions to my life. I know, beyond a doubt, that I am a better person, in part, because you allowed me to enter your lives for awhile.

Eight middle and high school building principals and cooperating teachers deserve much commendation for allowing me to enter their school buildings and classrooms. Thank you, especially to the cooperating teachers, for allowing me to not only observe your student teachers but also to observe you, as you facilitated the teaching/learning process.

There are several people at Iowa State University who need to know how grateful I am for their help and guidance on this dissertation. I would like to thank Dr. Jerelyn B. Schultz, my co-major professor, for convincing me that in order to understand what it takes to be a good teacher, one might begin by understanding student teaching experiences. Also, a thank you for helping me conceptualize this ethnographic research and for reading my many "mini-papers" prior to deciding upon what 'ought' to be done to study student teachers. Also, thank you very, very much for returning to Iowa State University for my oral defense!

Thank you to Dr. Sedahlia Jasper Crase, a committee member, for . . . God only knows how many reasons! I think I'm most grateful to you for being so sensitive to me. When I
was "lost" in one of the darkest corners of my professional development, you helped me find a way . . . an understandable way . . . to learn about liberal arts education. I still cannot believe that I made an appointment with a liberal arts college president just to "chit chat" about liberal versus technical education! What an incredibly enriching experience! For that and much, much more . . . I extend my appreciation.

Thank you to Drs. Anton Netusil and Richard Manatt for serving on my doctoral committee. I appreciated your comments and suggestions on my research. Also, thank you for challenging me to seek more information on liberal arts education. Soon after my preliminary examination, I started to think about and research the topic of liberal arts education. Today I understand more than I did a year ago about the topic and hope that I can continue to grow in that area.

And now, to my other co-major professor, Dr. Cheryl Hausafus. From the day I met you, I have been enamored by your amazing mind. I know if I could ever be "taught" greater ways to think, better ways to reason, or more unique ways to expressed myself in writing, I wanted to be "taught" by you. I cannot say I have always appreciated your "post-it notes." In fact, I think I have been challenged more often through my entire degree program over your incessant suggestions for
change on everything I submitted to you for evaluation than ever before in my professional life. But, I must admit that with each and every "post-it" came growth for me. I never once blindly accepted a "post-it" from you. I researched your thoughts until sometimes I thought I would go insane just trying to disprove the . . . "post-it!" I am thankful for each and every hour you spent with me, helping me to learn better ways to think and better ways to write.

Another gigantic "thank you" is extended to you, Dr. Hausafus, for teaching me about the computer. There is absolutely no way in this world that I could have managed this dissertation and/or made it through statistics without you first teaching me how to value and operate the computers. For that skill, I am deeply indebted. Professionally, I thank you for being my teacher . . . my mentor . . . my employer . . . and my supporter. You are some incredible teacher! Personally, I thank you for being my friend and for not allowing me to quit when I was sure I was not going to survive.
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PERMISSION FORMS
[Introductory letter sent to student teachers asking them to participate in the study]

Dear:

About a year ago I decided to conduct my doctoral research on student teachers. The purpose of my study is to describe the process through which a student teacher is socialized into the teaching profession. I want to study the cultural contexts which influence a student teacher in terms of acquiring the values, attitudes, interests, skills, and knowledge current in the teaching profession. The Family and Consumer Sciences Education faculty are interested in this research. Dr. Jerelyn Schultz and Dr. Cheryl Hausafus have contributed to the research design and have suggested ideas that will help to make my dissertation meaningful. Dr. Schultz is particularly interested in understanding whether or not a student teacher can learn more about teaching from student teaching in two sites as opposed to one site and how two placements influence the socialization process.

I am writing to ask you to participate in my study. I have consulted with your cooperating teachers and local school administrators in both of your school system assignments. They have agreed to let me observe you while you student teach and they have agreed to being interviewed and to help me collect data from them through audio and video tape recordings.

The specific procedures to be followed for this study are open-ended. The research design I have chosen is ethnographic meaning that I want to observe you over a long period of time to collect data through direct observations. I want to interview you prior to your student teaching experience as well as periodically during your student teaching experiences. While you are student teaching, I will spend time in your classrooms observing your teaching styles, your choices, and your interactions with students, your cooperating teacher, and other people in the environment. I will be video taping your lessons from time to time, writing fieldnotes about what I am observing, and tape recording conversations for analysis.
The data I collect will in no way influence your student teaching grade. Questions you may have about what I am observing and recording will be answered. The data collected will be open to you as the participant but the data will be strictly confidential. Your university supervisor will not have access to my research under any circumstances. I will use an assumed name for you when I write my results as a part of my dissertation.

You are free to withdraw your consent and to discontinue participation in the research without prejudice anytime during your student teaching experience. As the researcher, I will not interact with or interfere with your student teaching experience beyond being cordial. My focus will be on observing changes in your values, attitudes, interests, skills, and knowledge throughout your student teaching experiences. I will focus on recording events as accurately as I possibly can while you learn to teach students.

Please consider my request for you to be a part of my research study. In the event that you choose to participate in the study, I will need to interview you prior to the beginning of Fall semester. Below there is a form for you to complete and return to me in the envelope provided. If you have questions, feel free to phone me at 515-292-8836 (home) or 515-294-5307 (office).

Sincerely,

Kathy Petersen
Graduate Assistant

Dr. Jerelyn Schultz
Professor and Department Chair

Dr. Cheryl Hausafus
Assistant Professor

Dr. Sally Williams
Family and Consumer Sciences Education
Student Teaching Coordinator
Consent Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer Address</td>
<td>Summer Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Zip Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_____ I would prefer not to participate in your research study.

_____ I would like to participate in your research study. A convenient date, time, and place for our introductory interview would be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
July 12, 1988

[Sample letter to cooperating teachers after they had agreed, by telephone, to participate in the study]

Dear :  

Thank you very much for consenting to allow me to conduct part of my research in your classroom. Enclosed please find a copy of the letter I sent to your principal, . I tried to reach him by phone but the secretary told me that he was very difficult to reach due to his summer schedule.

If your administrator has no objections, I will contact [your student teacher] within the next few days. If [she] agrees to allow me to study her student teaching experiences, I will contact you near the beginning of the school year. Also, I will contact you if [your student teacher] does not agree to participate in this study.

Sincerely,

Kathy Petersen
July 12, 1988

[Preliminary letter to building principals]

Dear :  

I am writing to ask for permission to conduct part of my doctoral research in [name of home economics teacher’s] home economics classroom during the second eight weeks of Fall semester, 1988. My plans are to frequently visit her classroom to study her student teacher and the whole process of student teaching.

I spoke with [home economics] on the phone on July 11. She agreed to allow me to enter her classroom on the condition that her administrator agreed. If you have no objections to my entering the home economics classroom to study the student teacher and the student teaching process, I will contact the student teacher assigned to [name of home economics teacher] and ask her if she would be willing to participate. If you would like to read my proposal for my doctoral dissertation, I would be happy to send a copy to you. I have assured [name of home economics teacher] that I will in no way interfere with any classroom activities nor will I interact with the student teacher while I am observing.

I would like to meet you formally when I come for my first visit to you school. If you would like to contact me, you can reach me at 515-294-5307 or 515-292-8836.

Sincerely,

Kathy Petersen

cc:
Home Economics Teacher
July 12, 1988

[Sample letter sent to building principals after they agreed to allow the researcher to collect data in their buildings]

Dear :

Thank you very much for agreeing to allow me to conduct part of my doctoral research in the [name of the school system] with [name of the home economics teacher]. I am looking forward to meeting you, meeting the students, and becoming familiar with your school system.

In mid-June I spoke with [the home economics teacher] and explained to her the kind of research that I wish to pursue. I plan to conduct an ethnographic research study on the student teacher assigned to the home economics student teacher. I intend to record events, conversations, and interactions encountered by the student teacher. If you would like to read my proposal, I would be happy to send a copy to you.

I would like to meet you formally when I come for my first visit to you school. If you would like to contact me, you can reach me at 515-294-5307 or 515-292-8836.

Sincerely,

Kathy Petersen

cc: Home Economics Teacher
APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW SCHEDULES
ENTRANCE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Student teacher and teacher socialization literature cites specific variables that directly influence student teachers relative to how student teachers are socialized into the teaching profession. The 11 variables are presented on this schedule with several items addressing each variable.

Please respond to 2 to 3 items in each category. You may enter your responses in the tape recorder. Please make sure that you tell me which number you are addressing. I will use this information in its narrative form. In the event that you would like to conduct this interview with me present, please telephone me collect at 292-8836. I will be happy to conduct the interview at your convenience.

Key Individuals

1. Describe your favorite teacher or a teacher you believe had the greatest impact on you as a learner in a classroom.

2. How do you perceive that your favorite teacher influenced your decision to become a teacher?

3. How do you perceive that your teaching techniques will be similar to and/or different from those of your favorite teacher?

4. What influence do you perceive that your friends will have on your student teaching experience?

5. What influence do you perceive that your family will have on your student teaching experience?

Cooperating Teacher/University Supervisor

6. What do you perceive to be the role of your cooperating teacher in your student teaching experience?

7. What do you perceive to be the role of your university supervisor in your student teaching experience?
8. What do you expect to learn about how to facilitate learning from your cooperating teacher?

9. What do you believe about taking advice and suggestions from your cooperating teacher and university supervisor?

Ecological Characteristics of the Classroom

10. Describe a typical school setting.

11. How will the classroom environment (i.e. space, resources, teacher-pupil ratio, varying learning abilities, etc.) influence your thinking about teaching as a profession?

12. What influence will the location of your student teaching experience have on your attitudes, values, and beliefs about teaching?

13. How do you perceive that you will relate to your cooperating teacher?

14. How do you perceive that you will be similar to your cooperating teacher in attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge?

15. How do you perceive that you will be different from your cooperating teacher in attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge.

Bureaucratic Characteristics of Schools

16. Describe general school rules and regulations which must be followed in a local school system.

17. How do you perceive your role in following the school rules and regulations in the local school system?

18. What is your attitude toward extracurricular responsibilities and other responsibilities assigned to teachers?

Changes in Attitudes, Values, Beliefs, Skills, and Knowledge

19. How do you expect that your present attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge will change during student teaching?
20. Given that changes in attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge do occur, what changes would you consider positive changes?

21. Given that changes in attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge do occur, what changes would you consider negative changes?

22. How do you perceive that your cooperating teacher will influence your attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge during your student teaching experience?

**Philosophy of Education**

23. What do you believe about the value of public education?

24. What is your philosophy of education?

25. What do you believe about how school systems are structured in terms of administrative hierarchy?

26. What do you believe about conceptual learning?

27. What do you believe about lesson and unit plans?

28. What do you believe about being flexible with learners?

29. What do you believe about using community people as resources in the classroom?

**Role Expectations**

30. Describe the roles that a teacher assumes as a part of being employed in a local school system.

31. What roles do you expect to assume as a part of your student teaching experience?

32. Describe yourself as a role model for learners.

33. How do you expect to be treated by your cooperating teacher?

34. Describe the methods and techniques you will use to facilitate learning.

35. Describe the methods and techniques you will use to discipline learners.
36. Describe the methods and techniques you will use in preparing for lessons to be taught to learners.

37. Describe the relationships you hope to develop during student teaching with learners, cooperating teachers, and others in the learning environment.

**Student Teacher Environment**

38. Describe the attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge of the teacher you "aspire" to become when you are certified to teach learners.

39. From where do your attitudes, values, and beliefs about yourself as a teacher come?

40. Where did you learn the teaching skills you possess?

41. List the personal values you hold that will have a direct influence on learners in the classroom.

42. List the attitudes you hold that will have a direct influence on learners in the classroom.

43. Identify the knowledge base you hold that will have a direct influence on learners in the classroom.

44. Identify the skills you have that will have a direct influence on learners in the classroom.

45. What classes have you taken at the university that you believe will be most useful during student teaching?

46. Why do you believe those classes will be useful?

47. What personal character traits do you possess that you believe will be beneficial to learners in the classroom and to others in the learning environment?

48. How do you perceive that you will react to negative criticism from your cooperating teacher and/or university supervisor?

49. Why did you choose to become a teacher?

50. Describe the ideal classroom in terms of the ideal learning environment.
Communication Skills

51. Describe the communication skills you possess.

52. Describe the importance of communication skills in teaching.

53. How valuable is two-way communication in the classroom?

54. How valuable is two-way communication in relating with your cooperating teacher?

55. How important are active listening skills to a teacher in the classroom?

Acquiring Teacher Behavior

56. How important do you believe that participation in continuing education activities is in relation to teaching learners?

57. What do you believe about the importance of belonging to professional organizations and attending professional meetings?

58. How do teachers learn to teacher learners?

59. What do you expect to learn from your student teaching experience?

60. What influence do you perceive that you will have on learners in the classroom?

61. How will you relate to learners in the classroom?

62. How do you perceive that student teaching in two school systems will affect you in terms of becoming an educator?

63. How do you perceive that student teaching under the guidance and direction of two cooperating teachers will affect you in terms of becoming an educator?
EXIT INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

The purpose of my research is to describe, in detail, ways in which student teachers acquire the attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge necessary for the teaching profession. How do student teachers change during the student teaching experience? As a culminating experience, would you please answer the following items on the exit interview schedule? This schedule is similar to your entrance interview schedule and it is written in past tense.

You can use the tape recorder to record your responses. Or, if you would prefer, I will make arrangements to be present during your interview. Please make sure that you indicate the number of the item that you are addressing.

Thank you very much for helping me collect as much information as possible about your student teaching experience.

Key Individuals

1. What influence did your friends and/or family have on you during your student teaching experiences?

2. Did you follow through on suggestions that were given to you about how you should facilitate learning or what you should teach pupils that were given to you by friends and/or family members?

3. How are your teaching techniques similar to and/or different from the teaching techniques of your favorite teacher's teaching techniques?

Cooperating Teacher/University Supervisor

4. What was the role of your cooperating teacher in your student teaching experience?

5. What was the role of your university supervisor in your student teaching experience?
6. What did you learn about how to facilitate learning from your cooperating teacher?

7. What are some specific examples of ways that you chose to teach learners that you continued to use during your student teaching experiences which you already knew prior to student teaching?

**Ecological Characteristics of Classrooms**

8. Describe an ideal classroom setting.

9. How did the classroom environment (i.e. space, resources, equipment, teacher-pupil ratio, varying ability levels, etc.) influence your thinking about teaching as a profession?

10. What influence did the geographic location of your student teaching experiences have on your attitudes, values, and beliefs about teaching?

**Cooperating Teacher/Student Teacher Similarities and Differences**

11. How did you relate to both of your cooperating teachers?

12. In what ways are you similar to your cooperating teachers in attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge?

13. In what ways are you different from your cooperating teachers in attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge.

**Bureaucratic Characteristics of Schools**

14. Describe school rules and regulations in both of the local school systems in which you student taught.

15. Was it necessary to follow school rules and regulations in both of the school systems in which you taught?

16. What is your attitude toward extracurricular responsibilities and other responsibilities assigned to teachers?
Changes in Attitudes, Values, Beliefs, Skills, and Knowledge

17. How did your attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge change during your student teaching experiences?

18. Given that change occurred, what changes were positive changes for you during your student teaching experiences?

19. Given that change occurred, what changes were negative changes for you during your student teaching experiences?

20. How did your cooperating teachers influence your attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge during your student teaching experiences?

Philosophy of Education

21. What do you believe about the value of public education now that you have finished student teaching?

22. What is your philosophy of education now that you have finished student teaching?

23. What do you believe about how school systems are structured in terms of administrative hierarchy?

24. What do you believe about conceptual learning now that you have finished student teaching?

25. Were lesson and unit plans easier to conceptualize and write during your second student teaching experience? In what ways?

26. What do you believe about being flexible with learners and about meeting the needs of individual learners?

27. What do you believe about using community people as resources in the classroom?

Role Expectations

28. What roles did you assume as a part of being employed as a student teacher in a local school system?

29. What roles did you expect to assume as a part of your student teaching experiences that you did not assume?
30. Describe yourself as a role model for learners now that you have finished student teaching.

31. Were you treated the way you expected to be treated by your cooperating teachers?

32. Describe the teaching methods and techniques that you used to facilitate learning.

33. Describe the disciplining methods and techniques that you used with pupils.

34. Describe the methods and techniques you used in preparing lessons to be taught to pupils.

35. Describe the relationships you developed during student teaching with pupils, cooperating teachers, and others in the learning environment.

**Student Teacher Biography**

36. Describe the attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge of the teacher you now "aspire" to become now that you have finished student teaching.

37. From where did your attitudes, values, and beliefs about yourself as a teacher come now that you have finished student teaching?

38. From where do you believe that you learned the teaching skills and the knowledge base you perceive you have now that you have finished student teaching?

39. Describe the personal values that you hold now (after student teaching) that you believe will have a direct positive influence on learners.

40. Describe the personal attitudes that you hold now (after student teaching) that you believe will have a direct positive influence on learners.

41. Identify the knowledge base you now hold that will have a direct influence on learners.

42. Identify the skills you now have that will have a direct positive influence on learners.
43. What classes have you taken at the university that you believe were most useful during student teaching?

44. Why do you believe those classes were useful?

45. What personal character traits do you now possess that you believe will be beneficial to learners.

46. How did you react to negative criticism from your cooperating teacher and/or university supervisor?

47. Why did you choose to become a teacher and do you still want to be a teacher?

48. Describe the ideal learning environment.

**Communication Skills**

49. Describe the communication skills that you now possess as related to those communication skills that were necessary to be an effective student teacher.

50. Describe the importance of communication skills in teaching.

51. Describe some situations in which two-way communication was an asset to you as a teacher.

52. Describe the two-way communication you had in relating with your cooperating teacher?

53. How important are active listening skills to be a teacher.

**Acquiring Teacher Behavior**

54. How important was participating in continuing education activities (i.e. attending professional meetings) in relations to facilitating learning and keeping abreast of new knowledge in the field?

55. What do you believe about the importance of belonging to professional organizations and attending professional meetings now that you have finished student teaching?

56. How do teachers learn to facilitate learning?

57. What did you learn from your student teaching experiences about yourself?
58. What influence will you have on learners when you become a teacher?

59. How did you relate to learners in the classroom?

60. How did student teaching in two school systems affect you in terms of becoming a teacher?

61. How did student teaching under the guidance and direction of two cooperating teachers affect you in terms of becoming a teacher?

62. What other information could you provide to further describe your student teaching experiences? How do you perceive that you have changed during the past 16 weeks in terms of attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledge?