DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 240 112   —   SP C23 819

AUTHOR   Tabachnick, B. Robert; And Others
TITLE   The Development of Teacher Perspectives.
INSTITUTION   Wisconsin Center for Education Research, Madison.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE   Apr 83
GRANT   NIE-G-81-0009
NOTE   87p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
              American Educational Research Association (Montreal,
              Canada, April 11-15, 1983). For related document, see
              SP 023 820.
PUB TYPE   Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports -
              Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   *Attitude Change; *Beginning Teac'-ers; Elementary
              Secondary Education; Institutional Characteristics;
              Job Satisfaction; Peer Acceptance; rProfessional
              Development; *Role Perception; *Soci,'ization;
              Student Teacher Relationship; *Studen Teachers;
              *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Role; *Teaching
              Experience; Teaching Styles

ABSTRACT
              Two-year longitudinal case studes were conducted of
four teachers, beginning with the student teaching experience through
the first year of teaching. The study explored ways in which teaching
perspectives, evidenced at the end of student teaching, are
strengthened or modified during the first year of teaching. It also
sought to determine who and what influences the development of
teacher perspectives during the first year. Information was gathered
through observations and interviews with each subject, colleagues,
students, and principal. The study focused on teacher actions and
ideas in four specific domains: (1) nature of knowledge, curriculum,
and the learning processes; (2) teacher's role; (3) teacher-pupil
relationships; and (4) student diversity. A narrative account is
presented of each teacher's experiences and the ways in which the
teacher adjusted to and complied with accepted practices of the
school, or, conversely, adhered to individual perspectives and
teaching styles. Appended are definitions for 17 issues or dilemmas
of teaching that were used to define teacher perspectives in the
study. (JD)

ED240112

THE DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHER PERSPECTIVES

B. Robert Tabachnick, Kenneth M. Zeichner,
Kathleen Densmore, and Glenn Hudak

University of Wisconsin-Madison

Presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational

Research Association, Montreal, Canada, April, 1983

P6023819

The significant people for a school teacher are other
teachers, and by comparison with good standing in that
fraternity, the good opinion of students is a small
thing and of little price. A landmark in one's assimi-
lation into the profession is that moment when he
decides that only teachers are important.
(Waller, 1932, p. 398)

Colleagues per se and the co�extual effects of the
workplace are less important to organizational
neophytes than are the attitudes of significant
evaluators--those having powe� over the new teacher
in terms of their ability to apply organizational
sanctions. (Edger & Warren, 1969. p. 389)

The study of classroom effects on teachers raises
questions about the extent to which the thing�
teachers do in classrooms and how they think about
their work are associated with specific classroom
demands rather than with the personal competence
and desires of teachers or the quality of their
preparation. (Doyle, 1969, p. 51)

Teachers teach as they were taught during their many
years as students. Their professional preparation
comes late in their own schooling and is too little
and too thin to separate them from what their
experience has taught them that teaching is. This
professional preparation and subsequent practice
merely reinforce their own perceptions. Teachers
fail to transcend the conventional wisdom of their
own profession and continue to teach as they were
taught. (Goodlad, 1982, pp. 19-20)

THE DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHER PERSPECTIVES

This paper reports selected findings from a two-year longitudinal study of the development of teacher perspectives. We studied four elementary and middle school teachers during their student teaching experience and first year of teaching. The construct of perspectives which has its theoretical roots in the work of G. H. Mead and his concept of the "act" (Mead, 1938) refers to

> 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 in such a situation. These thoughts and actions are coordinated in the sense that the actions flow reasonably, from the actor's point of view, from the ideas contained in the perspective . . . and are seen by the actor as providing justification for acting as he does. (Becker et al., 1961, p. 34)

According to this definition, perspectives differ from attitudes since they involve actions and not merely dispositions to act. Also, perspectives are defined in relation to specific problematic situations and do not necessarily represent generalized beliefs or ideologies. In an earlier study (Tabachnick et al., 1979-80), we applied the construct of perspectives to student teaching and defined teacher perspectives as the ways in which teachers think about their work (e.g., purposes, goals, conceptions of children, curriculum) and the ways in which they give meaning to these beliefs by their actions in classrooms. Our use of teacher perspectives was similar to that employed by several other researchers (e.g., Janesick, 1978; Sharp & Green, 1975) as we focused on describing the action-idea systems that reflected the experience of student teachers in specific classroom contexts.

In the present study we again utilize the construct of teacher
perspectives to describe student teacher and teacher actions and ideas
in relation to four specific domains: (1) knowledge and curriculum, (2)
the teacher's role, (3) teacher-pupil relationships, and (4) student
diversity. Each of these four orienting categories was further defined
in terms of several specific "dilemmas" of teaching which had emerged
from an analysis of the data from an earlier phase of this study.
Appendix A identifies and defines the 17 dilemmas of teaching that were
associated with the four orienting categories. These 17 dilemmas gave
direction to our data collection efforts during this second phase of our
study.[1]

In research reported earlier (Tabachnick, Zeichler et al., 1982),
we studied the perspectives toward teaching of 13 student teachers who
were enrolled in an elementary teacher education program at a large mid-
western university and noted any changes which took place in the
perspectives of these students during their 15-week student teaching
experience. We generally concluded that student teaching did not result
in substantial changes in the teaching perspectives that the 13 students
brought to the experience at the beginning of the semester. With the
exception of three of the 13 students who chose to comply strategically[2]
to the demands made upon them in their work settings, teaching per-
spectives developed in directions consistent with the latent per-
spectives brought to the experience but did not fundamentally change
over the course of the semester. For the most part students became more
articulate in expressing and more skillful in implementing the perspec-
tives which they possessed in less developed forms at the beginning
of the semester.[3]

As a result of the placement procedures that were in use in the program under study, students for the most part were able to select themselves into student teaching situations where there was a strong initial agreement between their own latent perspectives, the teaching perspectives of their cooperating teachers, and the norms existent in their classrooms. Two of the three students who failed to develop in directions consistent with their initial predispositions selected their placements for pragmatic reasons, ignoring any lack of congruency in teaching perspectives; they chose to comply strategically to the demands made upon them without possessing an underlying commitment to the values embedded in their classroom situations. The third student who chose to comply strategically was immobilized by the conflicts that existed between her cooperating teacher and university supervisor and was unable to fulfill her initial expectations for student teaching.

The results of this earlier study generally support the position of Lortie (1975) and others who argue that student teaching plays little part in altering the cumulative effects of anticipatory socialization. On the other hand these results appear to challenge the findings of Hoy and Rees (1977) and others who contend that student teaching exerts a powerful and homogenizing influence on student teachers' perspectives since it is the students' first significant confrontation with the institutional realities of schools. The results of this earlier study support a view of student teacher socialization as a negotiated and interactive process which entails a continual interplay between the intentions of individuals and institutional constraints. The actions of student teachers were not totally determined by the perspectives brought to the experience; nor were they totally determined by institutional

imperatives. Individual intent and institutional constraint both played
significant roles in affecting the development of the 13 student teach-
ers although the specific nature of this interaction was different in
each case. Despite the fact that only three students strategically
complied with the demands posed by their situations and although none of
the students significantly redefined the range of acceptable behaviors
in their classrooms, the majority of student teachers purposefully
selected themselves into situations in which they would be able to act
in certain ways, gave some direction to the specific nature of their
development, and reacted somewhat uniquely to their situations even in
the face of common institutional constraints. There was little evidence
in our data that would support the kind of passive response to institu-
tional forces and unthinking acquiescence to institutional demands which
has been described frequently in the literature of student teaching
(e.g., Gibson, 1976).

We concluded this earlier study with the statement that one is
unable to assess the role of student teaching in teacher development by
examining the student teaching experience alone. For even if our
conclusions regarding the impact of student teaching on the 13 students
are correct, there is a great deal of sentiment in the literature
regarding the vulnerability of first-year teachers to the press of
institutional forces. As will be discussed shortly, there are many who
argue that beginning teachers undergo a number of significant changes
during their first year of teaching which in many cases are seen to
negate the impact of socialization during preservice teacher education.
As two of us have argued elsewhere (Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981), we
take exception to this position and feel that the nature of the

relationship between student teacher perspectives and those held as
first-year teachers is not well understood. For although student
teaching and the first year of teaching have been the focus of many
studies separately (see Zeichner, 1980; Johnston & Ryan, 1983), there
have been very few longitudinal studies that have traced the development
of student teachers into their first year of employment. In our view it
is only through such longitudinal studies that the role of student
teaching in teacher development will be understood.

The present study follows four of the original group of 13 student
teachers into their first year of teaching and addresses two questions
related to the general theme of teacher development. The first question
is concerned with exploring <u>the ways in which teaching perspectives</u>
<u>evidenced at the end of student teaching are strengthened or modified</u>
<u>during the first year of teaching</u>. Despite the existence of m. ny
empirical studies which indicate the vulnerability of first-year teach-
ers to the press of institutional forces, studies also exist which
demonstrate a great deal of stability between student teaching and the
end of the first year. On the one hand it has been shown in studies of
both elementary and secondary teachers in several countries that begin-
ning teachers appear to experience statistically significant shifts in
several kinds of attitudes during their first year of teaching. For
example, beginning teachers have been shown to shift in an authoritarian
direction in their attitudes toward pupils as measured by the M.T.A.I.
(Day, 1959; Ligana, 1970); to become more custodial in their attitudes
toward pupil control (Hoy, 1968; McArthur, 1978); to feel that they
possess less knowledge about teaching at the end than at the beginning
of their first year (Gaede, 1978); to shift from progressive to more

conventional teaching perspectives (Hanson & Herrington, 1976); to shift

in their attitudes toward autonomy in the teacher role toward attitudes

held by sanctioning colleagues (Edgar & Warren, 1969); and to rate

themselves as less happy and inspiring at the end of the first year than

at the beginning (Wright & Tuska, 1968). Lacey (1977, p. 48) summarizes

the impression given by much of this research as follows:

> The major finding of this research underlines the importance
> of discontinuity between training and the reality of teaching.
> The attitudes of beginning teachers undergo dramatic change as
> they establish themselves in the profession away from the
> liberal ideas of their student days toward the traditional
> patterns in many schools.

Despite the fact that much empirical research exists which would

support the view that many attitudes evidenced at the end of student

teaching are abandoned by the end of the first year, several studies

also exist which indicate a great deal of stability between student

teaching and the end of the first year. For example, studies conducted

by Power (1981) and Petty and Hogben (1980) in Australia and by Mardle

and Walker (1980) in England demonstrate that certain attitudes of

beginning teachers appear to be resistant to changes (e.g., perceptions

of self in the teaching role). Power (1981 p. 213) summarizes the

impressions given by these studies when he concludes that his findings

call into question the pessimistic statements about "reality shock" for

beginning teachers that have been associated with many of the studies

cited above.

> The present evidence calls into question the pessimistic
> statements about reality shock for beginning teachers. If the
> conditions described by Dreeben . . . existed in this study
> and had the impact they suggested, it is difficult to believe
> that the influence would not be reflected in teachers'
> perceptions of themselves in the teaching role, in their
> evaluation of teaching as an occupational activity, or in
> their vocational interests and aspirations, even at the group
> level. But no such evidence appeared in the present data.

It should be noted that in <u>both</u> groups of studies, those that demonstrate changes and those which do not, some teachers experienced significant shifts in attitudes while others did not. Furthermore, among those who changed, the changes were often in different directions. The conclusions of all of these researchers regarding continuity or discontinuity between student teaching and the end of the first year of teaching have been based in each instance on central tendencies or mean shifts in attitudes in the groups of teachers studied. One of the clearest examples of the differential impact of the first year of teaching is provided by a study conducted by Kuhlman and Hoy (1974) in which individual variation is not totally masked by reference to beginning teachers as a homogeneous group. In this study, along with individual variation within the groups of elementary and secondary teachers (e.g., some elementary teachers changed while some did not), there was no change in the bureaucratic orientation of elementary teachers, while secondary teachers as a group became significantly more bureaucratic during their first year. Also, despite his challenge to the notion of "reality shock" for beginning teachers, Power (1981, p. 290) concludes:

> The results show the transition from student teacher to teacher to be characterized by remarkable stability . . . . It can be seen that, as a group, the sample revealed no significant change in perception of self in the teaching role, aspirational self-perception, professional judgment, evaluation of teaching or vocational aspirations. At the same time . . . while there is group stability, there is considerable systematic individual change . . . . There was little or no change for the majority of subjects, but there were some subjects whose scores changed moderately to substantially in one or the other direction.

In the final analysis when attention is focused on the socialization of individual beginning teachers in specific situations, it

seems that both groups of studies cited above support a view of
beginning teacher socialization similar to that articulated by Ryan
(1970) and Tisher (1982) where the quality and effects of the
socialization of beginning teachers are seen as largely context specific
and dependent in each instance on the unique interactions of individual
and institutional factors. All of the research conducted to date
indicates the impossibility of making generalizations regarding
stability or change during the first year without an understanding of
the characteristics and qualities possessed by specific first-year
teachers and knowledge of the specific characteristics existent in the
school contexts within which they work. Given the ambiguity and
contradiction evident in much of the research cited above and the almost
total lack of description of the teachers studied and of the contexts in
which they worked, the present study seeks to identify with reference to
four teachers the specific conditions (individual and institutional)
under which student teacher perspectives are strenghtened or modified
during the first year of teaching.

The second question is concerned with determining who and what
influences the development of teacher perspectives during the first
year. While the previous question was concerned with the substance of
teacher perspectives as they evolved over time, this aspect of our study
explores the nature of the interplay between individual intent and
institutional constraint in the development of first-year teachers.
Here we are concerned with documenting the ways in which the perspec-
tives of the four teachers were influenced by particular interactions of
various psychological and sociological variables that together formed
the context of the induction year.

There is clearly a lack of consensus in the literature with regard to the potency and influence of various socializing agents and mechanisms that affect the development of first-year teachers. Studies exist which emphasize the socializing role of more experienced colleagues (Eddy, 1969); Newberry, 1977); pupils (Haller, 1967; Spradbery, 1976); sanctioning colleagues such as principals (Edgar & Warren, 1969); the ecological characteristics of classrooms (Doyle, 1979); and the structural characteristics of schools and the teacher's work (Dreeben, 1970; Dale, 1977; Gitlin, 1983). Evidence also exists that beginning teachers learn how to teach during their first year largely through trial and error in the isolation of their own classrooms (Lortie, 1966) and that they frequently draw upon models of teaching which were internalized during pupilhood (Lortie, 1975) and on their own human tendencies to teach others (Stephens, 1967).

Significantly, for every study that demonstrates the effects of a particular role group or institutional factor in the socialization of beginning teachers, evidence also exists which modifies general conclusions under certain conditions. For example, Edgar and Warren (1969) stress the importance of considering a beginning teacher's internal resources and the degree of affect present in supervisory relationships when attempting to assess the impact of sanctioning colleagues on teacher development. Also, Newberry (1978) suggests several specific conditions that seem to affect the role of more experienced teachers in helping beginning teachers. Finally, Isaacson's (1981) study questions the significance of either principals or experienced teachers in the development of beginning teachers even when structures exist to facilitate such influence.

10

Lortie (1973, p. 488) states that the socialization of teachers is "undoubtedly a complex process not readily captured by a single one-factor frame of reference." He calls for studies which assess the relative contribution of several agencies or mechanisms under particular conditions. The present study seeks to discover, with reference to the four teachers studied, how particular individual and institutional factors interacted to affect the development of teacher perspectives during the first year and to identify some of the factors (e.g., grade level taught, architecture of the school, and structure of the curriculum) which mediate the relationships between the intentions of individual beginning teachers and various socializing agents and mechanisms. Our intent is to generate a series of "generalizations" related to beginning teacher development which take into account the existence of particular individual factors and institutional conditions.

Methodology

The subjects for this two-year longitudinal study are four teachers (all women) who were enrolled in an elementary student teaching program at a large midwestern university during the spring semester of 1981. In the fall of 1981 all four were employed as first-year teachers, each in a different school district.

Between January and May, 1981, each student teacher was interviewed at least five times and observed while teaching at least three times to enable us to trace the development of teaching perspectives during the student teaching experience. Their cooperating teachers and university supervisors were also interviewed once at the end of the semester to

13

enable us to identify sources of influence related to the development of

teaching perspectives. More detailed information about data collection

procedures employed during this period can be found in Tabachnick,

Zeichner et al. (1982).

Between August, 1981, and May, 1982, we spent three one-week

periods observing and interviewing each of the four teachers during

their first year of employment.

Hannah taught an eighth-grade self-contained classroom in a K-8

rural public school which was very diverse with respect to income level.

The parents of the children who attended this school ranged from those

who were wealthy professionals and farm owners to those who labored on

farms. The school had nine classrooms, and Hannah taught all subjects

to her eighth graders with the exception of social studies. When her

class went to the seventh-grade teacher for instruction in social

studies, Hannah taught science to the seventh-grade class.

The second teacher, Rachel, taught a self-contained seventh-grade

class in a nine-classroom K-8 Catholic parochial school located in an

urban industrial area. This school was fairly homogeneous with regard

to the income level of its population and served families in a community

with one of the highest unemployment rates in the United States during

1981-82. Rachel was responsible for teaching all subjects in the

curriculum except science; she taught social studies both to her own

class and to the eighth-grade class across the corridor.

The third teacher, Beth, taught eighth grade as part of a three-

member teaching team in an architecturally open-plan public middle

school (Grades 6, 7, 8) located in a suburban community. Together the

three teachers were responsible for planning instruction and teaching

the approximately 80 eighth graders, one of three eighth-grade teams in
the school.

The fourth teacher, Sarah, taught a self-contained fourth-grade
class in a K-5 public elementary school located in a well-to-do suburban
community. She was responsible for teaching all subjects in the school
curriculum.

Both suburban schools were located within ten miles of a midwestern
city with a population of 500,000 and served fairly homogeneous
populations which ranged from moderately to very affluent. Each of the
four classrooms had pupils within it who represented a wide range of
intellectual abilities.

A specific research plan was followed during each of the three
weeks of data collection in 1981-82. During four days of each week an
observer[4] constructed narrative descriptions of events in each classroom
using the six categories of teacher perspectives as an orienting frame-
work. All of the teachers were interviewed several times each day
regarding their plans for instruction (i.e., purposes and rationales for
particular activities) and their reactions to what had occurred. One
day each week an observer constructed a narrative description of class-
room events with a focus on six pupils in each classroom who had been
selected to represent the range of student diversity that existed for
that classroom.

In addition to the daily interviews with each teacher that focused
on particular events that had been observed, a mimum of two in-depth
interviews were conducted with each teacher during each of the data
collection periods. These interviews sought, in part, to explore
teachers' views regarding their own professional development through

semi-structured questions that were constructed in relation to the six orienting categories of perspectives or which addressed additional dimensions of perspectives, unique to each teacher, that had emerged during the first year.

Finally, the six "target pupils" in each classroom were interviewed individually once during each data collection period to enable us to determine how classroom life was experienced by individual pupils. These pupil interviews enabled us to confirm or disconfirm our own observations of how students reacted to classroom events and to check the accuracy of teacher statements regarding how time was spent in the classroom during the weeks that we were not present.

Through the classroom observations and teacher and pupil interviews we attempted to monitor the continuing development of teacher perspectives and to construct in-depth portraits of life in each of the four classrooms. Additionally, we sought to investigate the influence of several social context variables on the development of teacher perspectives: (1) school ethos and tradition, (2) teacher culture, (3) student culture, (4) parental expectations, (5) school demographic characteristics, and (6) material constraints on teachers' work such as curricular guidelines. During the two in-depth interviews that were held during each of the data collection periods we asked each of the four teachers about their perceptions of the constraints and encouragements in their schools and about how they learned what was and was not acceptable behavior for teachers in their particular situations. We were particularly interested in the degree to which each teacher felt that she was free to employ initiative and independent judgment in her work and the extent to which each teacher felt she had to conform to the expectations

14

of others with respect to what to teach, how to teach, and how to

organize and manage her classroom.

We also interviewed each principal at least once and interviewed

two teachers in each school concerning their views of the six institu-

tional dimensions identified above.[5] Finally, we collected many kinds

of formal documents in each school such as curriculum guides and teacher

handbooks.

Tape recorded interviews with teachers, pupils, and principals and

classroom observations were transcribed to facilitate content analysis

of the data. Several analyses of these data led to the construction of

four case studies which describe the development of each teacher and the

individual and social influences on their development from the beginning

of student teaching to the end of their first year of teaching. The

individual case studies were then compared and contrasted to enable us

to formulate generalizations related to our more general questions

concerning teacher development. Outlines of the four case studies will

now be presented, together with our conclusions regarding the two

research questions which have been selected for discussion in this

paper.

Beth

Beth was a student teacher in a self-contained fifth-grade class-

room. Hers was one of four fifth grades in a K-5 school enrolling about

500 children. The community includes a mix of parents who are young

professionals, or work at skilled trades and commerce. There are few

very affluent families and few qualify for welfare. The school's

tradition is of a lively approach to a fairly traditional curriculum
with a few individualistic teachers trying out forms of "open classroom"
teaching or creating and teaching content that goes beyond the standard
curriculum. Beth commented on the warm, friendly interactions among
staff members and their ready acceptance of her as a student teacher.

Beth and her cooperating teacher chose to work together. In
separate interviews each comments approvingly about the flexibility and
"easygoing" nature of the other and of the classroom. Beth states her
preferred teaching style to be one in which by artful questions and
stimulating comments the teacher gets pupils to talk and build idea upon
idea while the learning "just keeps flowing." In practice, Beth's
teaching was more controlled and routine than that. Beth followed the
prescribed curriculum and used the textbooks in a routine way, rarely
adding to or extending the content in them. She recognized certain
students of high ability as able to take part in a "flowing" discussion
but rejected this as inappropriate for most students, who needed a more
carefully prescribed curriculum. She did interrupt the textbook
sequence in math in order to re-teach material she believed her students
did not understand. She also planned and taught several short (2-3 day)
units in science in which, for example, pupils observed chicks hatching
out of eggs or collected and examined snowflakes, but these were
exceptions to letting the textbook determine her curriculum.

Relations with pupils were informal though controlled. Beth joked
with them playfully ("raise your hand if you're not here"), did not
object when pupils call her by her first name (though this made her feel
uneasy), commented, "I'd like them to remember me as not their math
teacher but that 1 was a fun kind of teacher." A typical comment to get

pupils quiet was, "We need more silence so everyone can finish,"
justifying her request in terms of its helpfulness to pupils.

The cooperating teacher played the dominant authority role in the
classroom. Beth saw her role to be transmitting the curriculum as
determined by those in authority, helping her cooperating teacher carry
out his plans to ensure the "basics" were taught, and adding some
"trivial" extras (her term).

In the 10-week practicum preceding her student teaching semester,
Beth had taught in a class with a high proportion of children from
low-income homes. She believed they didn't need to learn the same kinds
of things as students in her present school. The former need "something
that you have to know to get by with." She believed her present stu-
dents could benefit more from intellectually complex and abstract ideas.
Beth expected pupils who are "behavior problems" to be less intelligent
and to achieve at lower levels than conforming pupils. She hoped not to
have to teach many "problem" children.

Beth's first year in a regular teaching position was as an eighth-
grade teacher in a middle school in a suburban community about ten miles
from a city of about 500,000 people. The community has some light
industry but most residents worked in or on the edge of the large nearby
city. They were much like the parents of the pupils she had known as a
student teacher--professionals, well paid skilled trades workers, and
self-employed people who were moderately well-to-do.

The school was built to an architecturally open plan and enrolled
sixth-, seventh-, and eighth-grade pupils. Groups of three or four
teachers were organized into teaching teams to plan for and teach groups
of from 80-120 pupils. There were three eighth-grade teams and five

teams of sixth and seventh graders (combined in each team). Forty-four

teachers worked with about 700 pupils. On the staff were specialist

teachers of arts, reading, a general instructional consultant, teachers

of children with "exceptional educational needs," and two guidance

counselors. The tradition of the school was one of precisely detailed

plans for teaching in a closely controlled environment, monitored by the

principal and by tests of the levels of achievement by pupils of

Performance Based Objectives (PBO's). The principal is a very strong

personality, deeply committed to the curriculum and organizational

pattern of the school, and constantly walking through the school to see

if standards of quiet, busyness, and neatness are being met.

Two other teachers, both men and both teachers of more than ten

years experience, join Beth in making up their eighth-grade team. The

three work easily together. They meet for short planning sessions

nearly every day, though "planning" consists mainly of decisions about

timing and scheduling. Rarely do her colleagues suggest (or does Beth

propose) that she give large-group presentations (i.e., to all 80 pupils

in her team), even though, by the end of the year, her colleagues hope

she would do some of these. Beth's major responsibilities are to teach

four ability groups in math and three in reading/language arts and to

support the teaching of social studies by working with a group of about

25 pupils. Textbooks and their teacher's manuals generate most if not

all the PBO's. Instruction is direct, with teachers deciding the amount

of information and the pace of learning for individuals and groups. All

groups try to learn the same information or skills and all will be

measured against the same PBO's.

20

Knowledge is taught as though, by public agreement, it is known to be certain. From time to time, Beth acknowledges the private or personal ideas of a pupil but invariably presents a preferred and correct version, legitimate because "it will be on the test." During one observation, Beth says to her group, "The film [we are about to see] covers chapter 4 fairly well . . . You'll need to take notes. I'll stop the tape, tell you what's important, maybe repeat it for you."

It is clear that Beth perceives a number of institutional constraints that shape the choices she makes or that restrict the range of permissible choices. Time is one such constraint. This element is intensified in its effect by two other institutional constraints: the commitment of the staff to Performanced Based Education with precise quantities of information to be learned and tested; the organization of the school into teaching teams, where each teacher is responsible in an immediate way to the expectations of two or three colleagues, undertaking specific tasks and the achievement of specific goals, usually expressed as covering specified amounts of information related to a topic. The time constraint becomes an oppressive master and encourages teachers to overlook or ignore subtle differences in student understanding, settling instead for gross responses to individual differences (separate ability grouping permits more or less material to be assigned and more or less time to be allowed for completion of tasks). Time constraints also encourage teachers to accept minimum competencies as the only competencies. There is little incentive to having students dig deeper once they understand the minimum, since it is only the accomplishment of the minimum (PBO's) by which pupil (and teacher) achievement will be judged. Time constraints intensify the

effects of another institutional characteristic, the use of easily available materials and their use in a routine way, i.e., as information-givers rather than in less routine ways, e.g., as data to be examined, challenged, interpreted. (When asked why Annette is the only one who does something different than the teacher-suggested ways of reporting on a book, Beth replies, "It's enough if they do what's there.")

These approaches to knowledge/curriculum are legitimated by the existing teacher culture. Accommodating the other members of the team is an important and high priority. One of Beth's colleagues gets "too interested" in social studies. He is described as "cat.;'ing on" (going over the scheduled time), and criticized because taking the pupils off on "tangents" (going into material not tested by the PBO's) prevents his section from being ready to take the teamwide test on the date scheduled.

Personal constraints and personal preferences also help to form Beth's perspective. She feels she knows math and enjoys teaching it. She feels she has little background in social studies and believes that that constrains her from going any deeper or adding much to the information in the textbook or on the worksheets. At the same time she is uncomfortable with the uncertainty inherent in a problem-oriented lesson. Her eyes shone with excitement when some of her brightest math students, almost spontaneously, started inventing alternative solutions to a math problem. But her stated preference, confirmed by her teaching, is for the comfort of knowing in advance of teaching what particular pupil responses you will get during a lesson.

Beth's view of teacher role has changed somewhat from her student teaching perspective. As a student teacher she expected a teacher to invent and develop curriculum even if only as additions to a prescribed curriculum. Her viewpoint now is that "expert others" (administrators, textbook writers, a committee of teachers) will decide what is to be taught; teachers are to manage that curriculum as skillfully as they can. This complements nicely her view of knowledge/curriculum and is supported by her school's curriculum pattern which is designed to make management easy.

Clearly, the teacher's role is sharply separated from the pupil's role. Teachers decide what tasks pupils will undertake, when they are to begin, when they are to stop working or turn to another task What pupils need is what teachers decide they need, usually the result of a teacher analysis of what pupils lack, e.g., the math skills they fail on a test or information they don't know on a pretest.

Beth talks about nonacademic aspects of teacher role as having importance. Her role as counselor or guide to children is not salient, and almost no time is spent in informal or counseling discussions with pupils on matters not relevant to their academic performance, with the exception of a formal class group that discusses value questions, use of leisure time, and related topics. Interpreting school to parents is mentioned by Beth, but parent contacts seem to be almost entirely confined to reporting progress and such school sponsored events as the class camping experience in which a few parents participated.

The most troublesome part of teacher role for Beth is her membership in a professional group. Early in the year she was distressed to discover that the "big happy family" guided by a benign principal was in

reality a collection of factions who disagreed about most things but tended to agree that the principal was "management" and not one of them. By the end of the year Beth identifies with the teachers as a group but still wants to be guided by the principal and to meet his expectations for her. She feels deprived by the absence of the guidelines provided by continuous feedback to her when she was a student. She doesn't get much feedback from her colleagues and is ambivalent in wanting and yet afraid to get too much from the principal.

In most instances Beth's actions with respect to teacher role conform to and key on the attitudes and actions of her fellow teachers. She maintains a slight distance, e.g., she doesn't interact in a particularly warm or social way with the other teachers, but still seems to want to meet with their acceptance and approval. Beth is very "other-directed" and looks to her colleagues for cues on how to act the teacher role well. What she does as teacher is consistent with her personality and her personal preferences, her vision of herself as teacher. She is slightly ambivalent about routines of teaching. Sometimes she talks as though she should be doing more inventive things, but usually she seems to find the routines comforting. She knows what to do, what to expect if she does or doesn't do some things, how to negotiate for more options or more time with her team members and how to establish student routines that make her bureaucratic responsibilities easier to meet, e.g.,keeping order, having busy-looking students, meeting PBO's.

Beth finds it necessary for her own psychological comfort to control pupil behavior. First, she enjoys the sensation of being powerful, of making the pupils mind. Second, she prefers a more formal,

22

somewhat distant relationship with her pupils. These are both illus-
trated in an instance she describes. She was annoyed by boys calling
her by her first name, joking around, possibly with a mildly sexual
connotation. ("Eighth-grade boys had . . . crushes, you could tell.")
Beth reports dealing with this directly. ("1 sat them down and said
that I thought what they were doing was very annoying and I want it to
end. And it did.") She comments early in the year that she would
"rather have things a little more easygoing, maybe a little more joking
around," but the overwhelming preponderance of Beth's comments and
teaching behavior suggests just the opposite, that she is comfortable
with a distance between students and herself, using controlling behavior
to assert her authority and discouraging familiarity and bantering
interchange.

Beth falls in with the existing teacher culture in sometimes being
sarcastic or belittling students, especially those who are poor achiev-
ers, and especially one boy who is a butt of much of the teachers'
sarcasm. (Interestingly enough, there is no evidence that this affects
the boy's relations with other students, i.e., that they also ridicule
him or reject him.) Similarly, she is reinforced by other teacher
actions in demonstrating her ability to control students in her charge.
There are institutional demands enforced by the principal--that the
students be busy, quiet, and, generally, immobile (although the
principal seems to be sensitive--to-the--strain that Beth is under as a
beginning teacher and tries to get her to relax, smile more, enjoy her
work). The distant, formal, controlling, teacher-pupil relationship
seems to express the institutional norm. However, Beth is not merely
constrained to conform to this. She likes controlling the students,

winning the struggle to control, as it were, and doing so in a direct,
public way. This confirms her in her role as teacher and expresses her
own personal preferences for order, predictability, and cool teacher-
pupil relationships that carefully separate the roles of teacher/friend.

Beth's perspective toward teaching has changed in certain important
respects from the end of her student teaching semester to the end of her
first year of teaching. Her approach to curriculum is much the same,
transmitting mainly the information in textbooks or following the
routines set out in teacher's manuals. The one content area, science,
in which she introduced several short but lively lessons as a student
teacher is an area she didn't teach in her team. The greatest change
comes in Beth's relations with pupils. Student teaching was playful;
teaching is serious. The student teacher tried to be a "fun" person; as
teacher, Beth is a powerful, commanding person who controls behavior and
punishes misbehavior. As a student teacher she comments on a teacher's
inability to plan the same curriculum, have the same expectations of all
children since they are so different from one another; as teacher she
refines that belief to mean planning different strategies to get every
pupil to meet the same objectives. This is not a matter of inventing or
discovering an entirely different perspective on teaching from one held
earlier. Rather we see a shift in which elements that were present
earlier become salient, while elements which were previously central
drift down to very low priorities.

Rachel

Rachel was 22 years old when she began her student teaching experience in January, 1981. During this 15-week semester she taught in one of three fourth/fifth-grade classrooms in a K-5 public elementary school enrolling about 400 children. The school community includes few minorities and has a mix of parents who range from moderately to very affluent. Most of the parents of the children who attend this school are either self-employed professionals (e.g., physicians, lawyers), employed by a nearby state university, or in state government. Rachel attended a Catholic elementary school as a child and completed her two pre-student-teaching practicums in what she describes as highly structured and teacher-directed classrooms in two different parochial schools. When given the opportunity, she deliberately chose to student teach in a less structured and more "easygoing" school where children's interests are incorporated into the curriculum and where she would have opportunities to develop her skills in planning and implementing a more varied and stimulating curriculum. "I didn't want to be in a rigid classroom. I've been in a rigid classroom my whole life."

Most of the teachers in Rachel's school, including her cooperating teacher and one of the other fourth/fifth-grade teachers, had worked together for at least ten years under the leadership of the same principal. This school has a very strong tradition which is described by Rachel's cooperating teacher as one of "active teaching." Teachers in this school play a central role in developing the curriculum, are expected to make learning relevant and meaningful for children and to include pupils in the planning of classroom activities. There is the

expectation for everyone who teaches in this school to plan an
integrated curriculum around children's needs and interests and to bring
many resources into the classroom other than textbooks, to make the
curriculum "more alive and interesting for kids." This emphasis on
"active teaching" which encouraged teachers to use independent judgment
and creativity in planning the curriculum was evident throughout the
entire school. The teachers in the three fourth/fifth-grade classrooms
had recently developed their own reading program based on trade books, a
creative writing program which had received national recognition, and
generally planned classroom activities with a great deal of pupil input.
There were very few institutional constraints on teachers' planning of
the curriculum.

There was a very strong initial agreement between Rachel's goals
for herself as a student teacher and the culture that pervaded her
school. She began her student teaching with a desire to develop herself
into an open and flexible teacher who is able to make school interesting
and enjoyable for kids. "The important thing about school curriculum is
that it excites and interests the kids. It's important to have a
stimulating class." Rachel came into her student teaching experience
with a feeling that schools generally promote pupil passivity. One of
her priorities for this semester was to develop her abilities in plan-
ning activities that would help students become better able to make
informed decisions for themselves and to defend a point of view based on
concrete evidence. Many of the activities that Rachel planned during
the semester encouraged pupils to view knowledge as problematic, to
consider conflicting viewpoints on issues, and to support their posi-
tions with reasoned arguments. For example, she structured many lessons

where small groups of children would research topics and make presen-
tations to the class and planned several debates where children were
encouraged to express conflicting opinions on current public issues such
as violence in America and animal extinction. Rachel's university
supervisor commented that Rachel's actions throughout the semester
indicated that she was more interested in getting kids to think
"in-depth" about issues than with the quantity of material covered.

There were very few external constraints placed upon Rachel by her
cooperating teacher in deciding what and how to teach. Rachel's cooper-
ating teacher demanded the same kind of self-direction and inventiveness
of Rachel that was demanded of all teachers in the school.
Consequently, Rachel had numerous opportunities to make decisions about
what and how children would learn and often made decisions about her
teaching based on her assessment of what kids needed and what would
interest them. At times Rachel's cooperating teacher would give her
broad topical guidelines such as "weather" or "nutrition," and Rachel
was free to develop specific objectives and activities as long as they
were planned within the framework of "active teaching."

Rachel felt very strongly that children should be given oppor-
tunities to make decisions regarding both the content and organization
of the curriculum. "Children ought to have input into their learning.
They can make decisions about when they will do certain assigned work
and what they will do within a certain framework." Throughout the
semester, in addition to using her own judgment about what would be
relevant and meaningful for kids, Rachel involved the children in
deciding such things as what public issues would be debated, which
specific topics would be researched and how they would be presented,

27

which specific books would be read, and in deciding when certain tasks would be completed.

The lessons that Rachel planned and taught during the semester incorporated many human and material resources from outside the classroom and often led the children into the neighborhood to investigate various questions and problems (e.g., identifying birds and trees). When inside the classroom the children rarely worked together as one large group and could most often be observed working individually or in small groups in various parts of the room. The variety of activities and active pupil involvement that were characteristic of Rachel's teaching this semester are exemplified by the observer's puzzlement when seeing two boys flying paper airplanes in a corner of the room and her wondering whether they were "fooling around" or completing some assigned task.

Rachel was very concerned about relating the curriculum to the lives of her pupils and with incorporating the personal knowledge of pupils into her lessons. She viewed knowledge as meaningful to students only when it is tied into their prior experiences. Because Rachel not only wanted to respond to her pupils' interests but to expand them as well, she frequently sought ways to make the curriculum "meaningful" for her pupils when they had no prior experience with what was being studied. For example, when reading a story about a blind girl in one of her reading groups Rachel arranged a trip to the Braille Society and a meeting with a blind pupil in another classroom so that her pupils would have some personal experience that could be related to the story.

The central problem for Rachel as a student teacher was to develop skills and ideas for getting pupils actively involved in interacting

30

with the curriculum. Her attempts to implement a varied curriculum which encouraged active pupil involvement were reinforced by her pupils' enthusiastic reactions to her teaching. The children, who had experienced a similar pedagogy throughout their elementary school careers, eagerly took advantage of opportunities to voice their opinions and to select content and materials to be studied. Rachel was encouraged by her pupils' reactions and commented, "They're really ambitious to learn. You get a lot of satisfaction when you see their excitement."

However, despite Rachel's success in implementing a varied curriculum which elicited the involvement and enthusiasm of children, her relationships with the children were relatively distant and formal and almost always focused on matters related to academic content. She was rarely observed interacting with children about personal matters not connected to the curriculum. Rachel expressed an ambivalence at the beginning of the semester regarding her desire and ability to exert her authority as a teacher when working with her class as a large group and generally felt more comfortable giving pupils assignments which would be completed individually or in small groups. She did not want to "set herself above the kids," but realized that she needed to exert some authority and to set some limits in order to accomplish her goals. This ambivalence about her authority as a teacher and her inability to establish warm personal relationships with children did not result in serious problems this semester because of the self-directiveness of her pupils, but they would become matters of central importance the following year.

Because of the strong agreement between the latent perspectives that Rachel brought to student teaching, the culture of her school, the perspectives of both her cooperating teacher and university supervisor

and the reactions of her pupils, Rachel was able to develop over the
semester in a direction consistent with her initial goals. She and her
supervisors felt that she came into the experience with lots of ideas
about what should go on in a classroom but without the practical skills
needed to make her pedagogy a reality. Rachel learned from her
cooperating teacher and supervisor a variety of planning and
organizational skills needed to make her lessons "flow." Rachel and her
supervisors also felt that she became more comfortable by the end of the
semester with exerting her authority as a teacher when leading a large
group. Rachel felt very confident at the end of the semester about her
abilities to implement "active teaching" and felt that her excitement
about her work and her high expectations for pupil involvement would
make the "active teaching" model successful with any group of children
that she would teach in the future.

Rachel's first year in a regular teaching position was spent as the
only seventh-grade teacher in a nine-classroom K-8 Catholic parochial
school located in the downtown area of a heavily industrialized city
with a population of around 120,000. Rachel taught all subjects except
science to her seventh-grade class (including religion) and taught
social studies to the eighth-grade class across the corridor while the
eighth-grade teacher taught science to the seventh graders. This city
was experiencing one of the highest unemployment rates in the United
States during 1981-82 and most of the parents of Rachel's children had
been employed (before being laid off) at a large automobile factory
located a few blocks from the school.

Most of the children in Rachel's class were of Italian heritage.
Some had been born overseas and had recently moved to this city so that

their parents could obtain work at the local manufacturing plant. Not
all of the children, however, lived in the neighborhood surrounding the
school and several parents drove their children to school each day
because they wanted them to attend the same school that they had
attended as children. The majority of the children were bilingual,
fluent in both English and Italian, but several of the parents did not
speak any English, which forced Rachel (who did not speak Italian) to
communicate with them (e.g., during phone calls) through younger
siblings of children in her class who happened to be home at the time.

The culture in this school was very different from that which
existed in the school where Rachel student taught. Instead of an
emphasis on "active teaching" there was a strong emphasis throughout the
school on keeping the pupils quiet and busy. Rachel and all of the
other teachers were given textbooks to use as the primary source in each
subject area and were generally expected to cover what was in the texts.
Teachers were free to supplement the texts as long as they did not stray
too far and as long as the material in the texts was eventually covered.
The principal, who checked teachers' lesson plans each week, said that
she left the teachers pretty much on their own as far as how to teach
but that she expected teachers to check with her first before trying
something "too different." Teachers were also given daily schedules by
the principal which specified when and for how long each subject area
was to be taught.

From the beginning Rachel felt a lot of pressure from the principal
and the other teachers to keep her pupils quiet and busily working in
their seats and worried that she would not be able to assume "the
authoritarian teacher role" that was expected of her. "Discipline is

the biggest thing in a Catholic school. They want discipline and they
want quiet. That's probably the hardest thing for me." Throughout the
semester Rachel interacted with the other teachers regularly on a social
basis, but she did not feel that she got much assistance from the other
teachers or from the principal in implementing her desired pedagogical
approach. "The teachers are very nice, but I get no help. The most
advice is that I've got a bad group and that I'll learn from experi-
ence." Rachel also felt that she did not get support from the majority
of the parents of her pupils whom she felt expected her to do everything
on her own.

At the beginning of the year Rachel was told by the sixth-grade
teacher who had worked with her class the previous year and by most of
the other teachers that her class was "pretty much impossible." "The
teacher last year had the same problem with them and she never resolved
it. She was just glad to get rid of them." Rachel was advised to
structure her class very tightly and to exert a high degree of overt
teacher control if she wanted her pupils to comply. Despite the fact
that Rachel relied very heavily on the texts in planning her lessons,
she largely ignored the advice of her colleagues and principal and from
the very beginning tried to recreate her student teaching experience by
planning special lessons to supplement or replace the more routine
lessons based on the texts. She taught several lessons toward the
beginning of the year that required pupils to work independently or in
small groups using reference materials to investigate specific questions
and problems that had been designed to engage their interest and active
involvement. For example, she began her math class for the year with a
unit on graphing (which was not in the curriculum) where students were

required to graph facts related to their own lives; planned a unit on
poetry where students reacted to such poems as one about a boy who hated
school, and wrote their own poems; and planned small-group research
projects related to different cultures and climatic zones.

Rachel also continued her attempts to present knowledge to students
as problematic even when relying on the texts and asked many open-ended
questions that required independent thought and the application of ideas
to new situations (e.g., why particular plants and animals are suited to
some climatic zones and not others). Despite isolated successes with
inquiry-oriented lessons, Rachel's students did not respond enthusias-
tically to her efforts to make at least some of the curriculum relevant
and meaningful, and for the most part they rejected her efforts to
involve them actively. Rachel placed part of the blame for her failures
on the dominant culture of her school and her pupils' lack of experience
with her methods. In December she comments:

> These seventh and eighth graders are already into their
> routine, and they're not used to doing things on their own.
> I've tried to have them do some kind of reference skills on
> their own, but they're totally lost. They can't handle it. I
> did that for two months and I'd help them but it didn't work
> at all. I figured out that I'm just gonna do it more struc-
> tured and pass out worksheets and to do it as a large group
> together. It's really hard for them to do it if they're not
> used to it. At _____ they were doing it at the fifth grade
> and picking it up fast. They were probably doing it from the
> first grade . . . . Here, if you're having a bad day, the best
> thing to do is to read out of the book . . . . They will just
> line up like little soldiers and get their books out and read.
> That's not the best way to do it, but that's what they are
> conditioned into doing.

For the most part Rachel was unable throughout the year to get her
pupils to respond either to the "active teaching" learned as a student
teacher or to the more routine teaching that was characteristic of her
new school. All of our observations indicated that Rachel was engaged

in a continual struggle to get her pupils to complete work of any kind
or to participate in class discussions. She frequently raised her voice
to attempt to enable class discussions to be held; frequently repeated
directions and information because of the lack of pupil attention; and
frequently threatened, bargained with, and punished children in the hope
of establishing a minimum amount of control.

Despite Rachel's attempts to elicit pupil cooperation, her pupils
always seemed to get the best of the situation and to undermine her
authority overtly and covertly. Rachel frequently became so frustrated
with her pupils' lack of cooperation that she often lashed out at the
class in anger ("Don't ask me what page we're on. I've told you three
times already.") and threatened her class with extra homework, with
staying after school, and with more routine work many times each day.
"If you don't work on this we'll go back to worksheets." The pupils'
resistance to Rachel's efforts was very strong and constant, and their
contempt for her activity was often blatant and cruel. For example,
during a discussion in the eighth-grade social studies class on Andrew
Carnegie, several students openly copy insignias from record album
covers, others throw things around the room, and one boy sits back in
his chair with his feet up on his desk with a note stuck to his foot,
"Do not disturb." At one point toward the end of the year Rachel's
frustration became so great that she openly cried in class and a pupil
told the observer, "She said she couldn't stand it anymore." Students
would pass notes to each other in open defiance of Rachel's directions,
regularly fail to complete assignments on time, blatantly cheat on tests
by walking around the room looking at others' papers, and often leave
the room laughing when they were sent into the hall as punishment for

misbehavior. The majority of her interactions with children were
negative in quality, and pupils frequently responded to her requests
with sarcasm. After Rachel scolded a girl for drawing during a math
discussion, "There is a time and place for everything," the girl
replied, "Seven o'clock tonight at Jack's house."

Despite her isolated successes in engaging her pupils on tasks, the
struggle between Rachel and her students was so constant and dominant
that during one of the rare moments of cooperation the observer comments
in surprise, "The students are actually quiet and writing their poems."
Because of the lack of pupil cooperation, Rachel was often forced to
modify her plans and drop potentially stimulating activities for more
routine tasks. For example, after attempting to begin a discussion in a
social studies class by asking students to think about the difficulties
and necessities needed in coming to the "New World" and after failing to
get any response, Rachel comments, "We'll read now. It's the only thing
you guys understand."

Throughout the year Rachel was understandably preoccupied with
eliciting a minimal amount of pupil cooperation and was thrown so off
balance by the strength of her pupils' resistance that she frequently
failed to take advantage of those opportunities where pupils did cooper-
ate. She was extremely frustrated about her failure to implement
"active teaching" ("They don't care about anything, and I don't know how
to make it exciting for them.") and felt that she wasn't sure that she
had the resources within her to succeed with the more routine approach
to teaching that her pupils were used to.

> I guess that I don't feel I have the right to tell them that
> they have to listen. I feel like they should want to learn
> and that I shouldn't have to cram it down their throats . . .
> I feel that I have a lot to offer them, but I guess it's

> idealistic of me to think that they're gonna sit back and
> become knowledgeable and then go out and fight the world. I
> have to get into a more authoritarian role, but it's very hard
> to come by for me.

Although her successes continued to be rare throughout the year and

her pupils' apathy and resistance continued to the very end, Rachel was

able to find some psychological peace by the end of the year by discon-

necting her "self" from her work. In April she comments, "I think I've

come to the conclusion that this is a job and that is all it's going to

be. The most important thing is not to get too wrapped up in it . . . .

I've come to realize that all places aren't going to be like last year

and that all kids aren't going to be that excited about learning."

However, despite Rachel's eventual detachment from her work and her

hope that the year would end as soon as possible, she continued under

great odds to plan at least some of her lessons within the mode of

"active teaching." For example, in April she spent a lot of time

planning a unit on the labor process where small groups of students went

out into various work places in the community (e.g., hospital, court-

house, local factory) to interview workers about job specialization and

work interdependency. Although there was almost no reinforcement for

this type of activity from her pupils, their parents, other teachers and

the principal, Rachel tenaciously clung to her belief that the willing

cooperation of her pupils could be elicited by relevant and meaningful

lessons that encouraged active pupil involvement.

Despite the great differences between Rachel's actions as a student

teacher and as a teacher, her perspective toward teaching had not really

changed by the end of the year. Despite her frequent comments about the

need to become more authoritarian in her approach, Rachel was to some

extent both unwilling and unable to adopt the more routine pedagogy and

authoritarian teacher role that was characteristic of her school.
Although she was largely blocked from realizing her own goals as a
teacher because of her pupils' rejection of what she tried to offer
them, the most significant aspect of Rachel's first year of teaching was
that she kept on trying (although with less enthusiasm at the end) to
elicit the willing cooperation of her pupils through the curriculum
rather than through the authority of the teacher. Her ambivalence
toward exerting her authority as a teacher was present throughout he
student teaching and came to play a more significant role in her per-
spective toward teaching by the end of the first year. Rachel was
offered a contract in June for the following school year but did not
sign it.

Sarah

As a student teacher, Sarah chose to work in a junior primary
classroom. This not only provided the kindergarten placement she
wanted, but also provided a full-day program with one group of pupils.
Children in the junior primary class had completed the kindergarten year
but were judged not ready for first-grade work. Edgeton School had
about 500 pupils in three classrooms at each grade level from kinder-
garten to sixth grade. It was built to an open architectural plan but
with removable walls. The teachers chose to have the walls up to make
each classroom a separate and more private place. There was only one
junior primary classroom and it enrolled 11 children in the semester
that Sarah was a student teacher.

There was no established curriculum for the junior primary class as there was for all the other grades. The cooperating teacher was expected to find or invent activities that would help the pupils begin to read and do number work, as well as become more practiced in following classroom routines and less dependent on continual teacher direction and assistance.

This particular cooperating teacher appealed to Sarah because of her consideration for her pupils and because of what Sarah perceived to be the sense of community which marked the attitudes of pupils toward one another. Sarah described herself as someone who does not challenge authority or like to argue. (Her supervisor saw her as a very quiet person who would be unlikely to pursue or defend a position contrary to what those in authority wanted.) Sarah thought that the unspecified curriculum and the open and welcoming attitude of the cooperating teacher would provide space for her to "try things out." This proved to be an accurate perception.

Sarah's general belief was that knowledge was largely problematic, with meanings shaped by the personal experience of the pupils. She encouraged the very young children she taught to think carefully about their observations and often asked them why they thought something had happened. She had learned about the language experience approach in her reading methods course but had never seen it in action. Although it was quite different from anything her cooperating teacher did, she was encouraged to try it. She felt free to select topics for study and taught units on the senses (touch, sight, etc.) which relied mainly on active observations by pupils followed by conclusions from what was observed.

There was a great deal of variety among her pupils that Sarah recognized and for which she planned either quite different tasks or as a result of which she expected somewhat different responses to a whole group discussion or a worksheet given to everyone. She said she was trying to know each child and become sensitive to what might hurt someone, what might stimulate someone to like himself better and want to work harder. Hers was a very light touch on the reins of control. The small class size seemed to make little control necessary, and Sarah was crisply sure of herself, her control and structuring of activities visible but unobtrusive. She concentrated closely on what her pupils said and did, and was easily able to shift direction or re-plan on the spot if she was getting signals suggesting the children did not understand or had exhausted their ability to continue.

Sarah believed the teacher role to be to choose goals, but she expected that these goals need not contradict nor conflict with the expectations of a prescribed curriculum. In addition she expected to be imaginative enough to integrate pupil interests into the teacher selected program, to exercise control without being harsh, uncaring or insensitive to the varied abilities and character of her pupils.

The school where Sarah found her first regular teaching job was in a suburban community only about five miles from Beth's school district, but with children coming from more affluent homes. The school was a low, attractive building designed to look from the outside like a large single-family house set back in a very large yard. Inside, its design accommodates 15 self-contained classrooms at each grade level from kindergarten to fifth grade; there are three fourth-grade classrooms. The school staff had the services of a reading coordinator, a school

psychologist, special teachers for art, music, physical education, and for children with learning difficulties.

The prevailing school philosophy was that children should be stimulated to achieve high academic standards that would lead to success at academic levels beyond the elementary and high school. Teachers at each grade level tended to coordinate their work somewhat with one another, moving at almost the same pace and covering the same topics. There was little opportunity for planning or even carrying on discussions with teachers at other grade levels because teacher time was constantly in use. Even the half hour teachers were required to stay at school after the pupils left, seemed to vanish in meeting the requirement that teachers must stay with bus-riding children until they were safely loaded onto the school bus. There were no scheduled recess times, and teachers tended to provide recesses as these fell conveniently into the schedule, supervising the children's play themselves.

There is a general but mild anxiety among the teachers about meeting the expectations of parents that pupils will achieve well. Pupils are generally highly motivated, even competing with one another in achieving academically. Teachers perceive the parents of these children to be insightful enough to notice when their expectations are not met, powerful enough not to be satisfied by bland assurances. Although the school follows a fairly conventional curriculum in the various subjects, some teachers encourage active investigation by pupils, and most teachers appreciate and share their class' artistic work proudly. This fits into their perception that parents expect the school to go beyond a routinized curriculum.

40

When asked what behavior he would approve in a first-year teacher, the principal says,

> I would say the flexibility of the teacher, being able to change plans in midstream . . . when things aren't working out, to be flexible and try a different approach. I would also expect to see that the first-year teacher would take care of the individual differences in the classroom and not be teaching en masse lessons to the youngsters . . . . The teacher would have to have a very positive outlook and be very humane in her treatment with the youngsters . . . not to create a classroom . . . with threats and duress that children would be placed under because the demands of the teacher [were followed] with certain punitive measures.

This flexible, responsive, and humane teaching is to take place within a curriculum framework of topics that are to be the same for all teachers at a grade level. As the principal describes it,

> The important thing is that the youngsters are exposed to the same curriculum as the other fourth-grade children in the other classrooms. It would not be permissible for her to bring in an outside unit that did not pertain to the study of Wisconsin, say, that she decided she was going to study about Africa . . . . Science would be the same thing. There are certain units that must be taught to the fourth-grade children . . . . The strategies that she employs are up to her . . . [also the order in which units are taught] would be her option.

Teachers acknowledge that the formal culture of the school contains these explicit constraints. An informal culture of belief and behavior quietly contravenes many of these rules under such conditions as the following: there is no direct and open challenge to the authority of the formal culture or its spokespeople (particularly the principal); teachers meet most or all of the requirements of the standard curriculum before undertaking any innovations; academic achievement (especially on standardized tests) remains high; parents do not complain; pupils are not unusually noisy or out of the control of the teacher. As part of the informal culture, teachers add content that interests them into the standard curriculum (e.g., a teacher suspends the formal teaching of

reading for three weeks while a class writes and produces a play); they manage activities discouraged by the principal (a teacher has pupils bring hammers from home on the bus for a construction project since, though discouraged, it was not expressly forbidden by the principal); teachers loosen the supposed control of curriculum guides by keeping them in the closet unused while they use the texts and mutual agreement among those teaching at a grade level to preserve a more or less coordinated and coherent curriculum. Thus, while the curriculum topics control what is taught, there is considerable freedom to add topics, to lengthen or compress the time spent on a topic, and to arrange for various approaches to teaching any topic.

The informal culture often supports the formal culture, as in the following incident:

> Sarah was told by one of her colleagues that on Fridays she
> can put the kids on the bus and "just keep walking," as no one
> expects teachers to stay until 4:00 p.m. on Fridays. A
> teacher notices her leaving the school and comments, "We're
> supposed to stay until 4 o'clock." Sarah says confidently,
> "Oh no, on Fridays you don't have to." In the next faculty
> meeting the principal comments that teachers are not to leave
> school before 4 o'clock, including Fridays. A second
> colleague of Sarah's explains that she often leaves early but
> always asks for and gets the principal's permission to do so.
> Sarah uses the bureaucratic structure after this, asks to
> leave early several times and is never refused.

Sarah's perspective toward teaching was extended and strengthened by the experiences of her first year of teaching, but not substantially changed from the perspective that developed by the end of her student teaching.

Sarah views knowledge as being legitimated by public agreement but believes that knowledge can be refined by testing it against one's personal experience and common sense. She continually invites children to relate concepts and information to their own lives. A very typical

44

question for her is the one she asked after a boy read from a newspaper article describing flooding on the Red River, "Could you imagine what it would be like to be flooded out of your house?"

Consistent with such a view is Sarah's belief that knowledge is problematic, not certain. Scattered throughout every teaching day are questions and comments that encourage pupils to challenge ideas or to search for another way to understand something or another way to do something. In an interview, one boy describes a situation in which "you have to prove your facts and Jeff and I take up about the majority of science period shouting at each other trying to prove our facts."

Language/reading is organized to be taught to small groups of approximately 10 students, but much of the work is individualized and quite varied. Creative writing and creative dramatics are encouraged, as is frequent use of the school library. Math is highly individualized and typically presents an image of children working in groups, in pairs, or by themselves--some at the chalkboard, some in the hall, others scattered around the room. Two or three children are designated to correct student work or act as helpers. When that fails to help them understand, pupils ask Sarah for help. New concepts are sometimes introduced to the whole group but are more likely to be presented to groups of five or ten children. Science is taught as a whole group activity with texts being used mainly for their illustrations and ideas for experiments. Unlike one of her colleagues who performs experiments while the pupils watch, Sarah has small groups do the experiments themselves, then justify and challenge one another's conclusions.

The typical pattern throughout her curriculum is one in which she, as teacher, decides the over-all approach and its purposes, presents the

43

topic, but builds in options. In math, pupils choose where, with whom,
how quickly, and in what sequence to perform tasks. In other content
areas the choices are more restricted but independent decisions are
considered by the teacher, often approved and rewarded when they are
productive in terms of teacher goals (as when a boy constructs a
periscope at home after reading directions for making one in their
science text). The more obvious signs of a standardized curriculum
(such as ditto masters) are absent partly as a result of control by the
principal. In one incident:

> Sarah tells pupils who want to put a crossword puzzle on a
> ditto not to use dittos anymore. Later, Sarah comments to the
> observer that once she was running something off like this and
> [the principal] "gave me a funny look." Asked if she thought
> he disapproved, Sarah answers, "Yes, because [one of the other
> teachers] told me once she did and [the principal] told her
> not to."

Yet Sarah's curriculum, if not her teaching, is closely coordinated with
that of the other fourth-grade teachers.

Sarah relates to her pupils in a warm, direct style that is very
empathic.

> Child: Miss _____, can you come see something I did on mine
> [haunted house]?
> Sarah: I sure can. I'd love to, in fact.

On another morning, Sarah is kneeling at the desk of a mentally
retarded child mainstreamed into her class.

> Emily is feeling unhappy. Sarah is kneeling at Emily's desk,
> rubbing Emily's back. Emily is crying. A minute of silence
> [during the sharing of news articles]. Sarah asks, "Anyone
> else . . . news?" Joanne holds up a poster of cars she drew
> for fun. Another minute of silence as Sarah talks to Emily.
> Emily wipes her eyes and gets ready to go to reading.

Sarah is crisply self-assured in directing pupils to address tasks.
Pupils seem to require little motivating to get them on task. The work
interests them and they respond eagerly to Sarah's encouraging them to

take initiatives, look at an idea from a different vantage point, and
make choices. They are easily kept to an acceptable noise level. For
her part, Sarah is relaxed with purposeful pupil movement and the hum of
activity, as well as with the periodic litter resulting from an active
program. Her pupils quickly clean and straighten up the classroom when
asked to do so.

Prominent in Sarah's view of a teacher's role is being responsible
for what happens in the classroom. Textbooks, curriculum guides, school
regulations or the norms of the informal teacher culture must be
respected, but they are all open to criticism and can be modified if
need be to serve the interests of her pupils as she understands them.
Sarah expects to accommodate to institutional constraints but not to be
controlled by them. She decides what "rules" she can follow and makes
her conformity very visible. She expresses her own values and interests
but does this quietly, through subtle insertions into the regular
curriculum and rarely if ever in an overt, direct challenge to
institutional norms. Within her institution's constraints she has found
and created opportunities to be the kind of teacher she wants to be.
She turns to the other fourth-grade teachers and to specialists (read:
coordinator, school psychologist) for advice about what or how to teach.
She picks and chooses from this advice as well as from suggestions from
her closest colleagues about how to use the bureaucratic structure of
the school for her own purposes. The pace of activities, the burden of
varied school responsibilities, and her conscientious efforts to meet
the demands of teaching leave her little time to interact with other
teachers outside of the fourth-grade group. She seems content to
maintain some distance and insure her privacy from the other members of

the staff. While she attends meetings of the school's teacher
association unit, she is put off by the disagreements and hostility she
perceives there and she never speaks during the meetings.

Although the range of income differences within Sarah's classroom
is fairly narrow and represents a fairly affluent group, there is some
ethnic variety and a spread of intellectual abilities. Sarah seems to
respond to each child as an individual. The variety interests her. She
sees it in a positive way as a teaching problem that challenges her
imagination and inventiveness and makes the classroom a more interesting
place. She seems to enjoy some of her pupils more than others but those
reactions seem to be the result of personality compatibilities or
clashes rather than the group membership of any of her pupils. She is
perceived by her pupils to act in an evenhanded way toward members of
the class. She tries to challenge the three or four unusually bright
children in her class and regularly gives extra attention and warmth,
though not a great deal of teaching time, to the mentally retarded child
mainstreamed into her room. Sarah's curriculum is designed to respond
differentially to the individual variations among her pupils.

Summarizing briefly, Sarah has extended and maintained the
perspective toward teaching which had developed by the end of her
student teaching semester. In part, the institutional constraints and
elements of the formal and informal cultures of her school were
supportive of her preferred perspective. In part, her ability to
maintain a low profile while challenging school norms in very subtle
ways and her inventiveness in creating accommodations that satisfied
institutional demands and her own personal demands at the same time,

made it easy for her to develop more practiced expressions of her
perspective toward teaching.

Hannah

Hannah was 24 years old when she began her student teaching experi-
ence in January, 1981. During this 20-week period she taught along with
four certified teachers in one of two fifth/sixth-grade teams in a
suburban middle school (fourth, fifth, and sixth grades only) enrolling
about 500 children. There were four teaching teams in this school, each
one responsible for the instruction of approximately 120 children.
Hannah had her own homeroom class of around 30 pupils and worked with
almost all of the pupils on the team at one time or another, since the
instructional program was totally departmentalized. The school
community includes few minorities and has a mix of parents ranging from
a few who were very poor and on welfare to some who were highly paid
professionals. Some of the parents owned or worked on farms, others
worked in the village in which the school was located, and the majority
commuted to work to a nearby city with a population of around 175,000.
The majority of the parents were moderately well off and lived in the
village.

Teaching was the second career choice for Hannah since enrolling at
the university. She had spent some time studying medical technology,
but did not like "sitting on a bench working with machines all day," so
she switched her major to elementary education. Since high school
Hannah had done a lot of volunteer work with children and she saw
teaching as an opportunity for her to combine her strong interest in

science and health related issues with her love for children. Hannah

began the semester very confident in her abilities as a teacher and saw

the student teaching experience as a chance for her to experiment with a

variety of teaching styles, to bring more ideas into the curriculum, and

to establish warm and close relationships with children so that they

would become excited about learning and feel good about themselves and

school. She chose to work in her school because it offered one of the

few paid positions in the program, because she was impressed by the

modern and attractive physical plant, and because she was given the

impression that she would be able to use her judgment in planning the

curriculum and that she would be able to use materials beyond those

provided to her by the school.

Almost immediately Hannah discovered that her initial impressions

of the school were incorrect. "They do a nice job of sugar coating.

The first impression is nice but then you live in it and it changes.

They do not tell you a lot . . . that got shattered pretty fast."

Hannah soon discovered that she was expected to follow the standardized

curriculum very closely and to maintain a distance from pupils that made

her uncomfortable. She was given lists of specific objectives in each

subject area that she was expected to cover and was provided with all of

the materials and tests that she was expected to use. All of the

children went through the same curriculum at different speeds. Not only

was Hannah expected to cover a specific curriculum using prepackaged

materials and tests, but she was expected to cover this curriculum

within specified periods of time and with a minimal amount of noise and

pupil movement. The children switched within the team to different

rooms at specified time intervals, and Hannah had very little choice

48

about when subjects would be taught and for how long. Because of the
open architectural design of the school where no walls separated class-
rooms, all of Hannah's actions were totally visible to the other members
of her team. She was told that a minimum amount of pupil noise and
movement was necessary with such a design so that classes would not
disturb one another.

From the very beginning Hannah openly questioned the departmental-
ized school structure, the rationalized form of the curriculum, and the
distant and formal relations between teachers and pupils that were a
part of the taken-for-granted reality of her school. Hannah's cooperat-
ing teacher and university supervisor were very aware of her discontent
with the school. "She believes the curriculum is too rigid and is
always asking why are we doing this" (cooperating teacher). "She
thought that her team members were very cold toward the students"
(university supervisor). For the first six weeks Hannah tried to run a
classroom that violated many of the norms in her school. For example,
after her frustration with her pupils' lack of understanding of math
concepts, she "dumped" the required math worksheets for two days each
week and used Cuisinaire rods to teach math concepts and skills. She
also planned a unit using the newspaper in place of the basal reader,
attempted to set up learning centers in language arts, and broke down
preexisting ability groups by combining children who had previously been
classified as high and low achievers. Generally Hannah felt that she
was being asked to fit into a teacher mold that she did not like ("They
really tried to put a lid on things I wanted to do."), and openly
antagonized the teachers on her team by her efforts to go off on her
own. "I find that I'm forced into doing things I don't want to do and I

51

want to break the molds." Despite the pressures on her to maintain a
distance from her pupils, Hannah also tried to relate to pupils in areas
beyond the academic curriculum and in ways not approved by her school.
For example, after catching a few of her pupils smoking pot on the
playground, Hannah did not report the incident to her principal and
spoke with the children alone after school. She felt that dealing with
drugs, sex, and social issues was an important part of her role as a
teacher and tried to gain the confidence of her pupils so that they
would confide in her.

Hannah was generally not very successful in implementing her
"deviant pedagogy" during the first six weeks. The children did not
cooperate with her efforts to relate to them in a more personal way and
frequently complained that they were "falling behind" when Hannah moved
away from the prescribed curriculum. As a result of Hannah's lack of
success with her methods, she was continually told by her supervisor and
colleagues that she was too idealistic and was asked to consider whether
teaching was really for her. "She came in with a lot of fantasy ideas
of what teaching was all about and wasn't ready for the real world of
teaching" (cooperating teacher). The amount of pupil resistance was
not that great but clearly stood out in comparison to the other quiet
and smoothly running classrooms on her team.

Feeling all alone and getting constant pressure from her colleagues
and pupils to conform to the norm, Hannah made a conscious decision by
the end of the sixth week to comply strategically with the accepted way
of life in her school. "I didn't want to be put down anymore. There
was no support there. I conformed to the situation for the sake of not
taking the hassle. I didn't enjoy it, and it wasn't me." From the

seventh week on Hannah stuck more closely to the required curriculum and
kept her discontent about school practices to herself. When asked why
she no longer voiced her opinions to her colleagues and supervisor, she
responded, "Because you want to have your degree and get a recommenda-
tion and finish."

Despite her strategic compliance to the expectations of her teach-
ers, Hannah continued on her own to attempt to implement a more varied
and lively curriculum and to relate to students in a more personal way.
Most often she followed the curriculum and put on the "teacher mask"
when in view of her colleagues, but she continued throughout the
semester to plan supplementary lessons that altered the students'
relations with each other, with the curriculum, and with the teacher.
In May the observer comments, "The contrast is great between Hannah's
area and the rest of her team where the students are always sitting
behind their desks. Hannah rearranges her room, and the kids are
allowed to be all over the place working at different things." At the
end of the semester Hannah's cooperating teacher and the supervisor were
both aware that her compromises after the sixth week represented only
strategic compliance and not a change in her perspectives. "I don't
think she believed half of the things I was telling her" (cooperating
teacher). "I think that although she had to compromise at times she has
not changed deep down in the way she will approach teaching in the
future." Because of the great discrepancy between the latent (but not
fully developed) perspectives that Hannah brought to the experience and
the culture of her school, she was not able to develop as a student
teacher into the kind of teacher she hoped to be. She felt that she was
on her own throughout the semester and felt there was no one in her

school to whom she could turn as a model or who could teach the skills she wanted to learn. "1 learned a lot of things of what not to do." Despite the lack of support, Hannah was not able to separate her "self" from her role as teacher and at the end of the semester she still clung to her view that warm and close relationships between pupils and teachers, getting kids excited about learning and feeling good about themselves were the keys to learning. Hannah strongly believed, despite the lack of confirmation from this semester, that the "academics will come easily" after a teacher is able to open up the communication lines between herself and her pupils and establish a relationship of trust. Hannah also continued to express her views in relatively general terms about the importance of integrating pupils' personal knowledge into the curriculum and of making learning fun. Because Hannah was not able to get the guidance that she desired, she was not able to develop (as did Rachel) the skills and strategies necessary for realizing her goals. She reacted strongly against becoming the kind of teacher she saw around her but did not develop well articulated perspectives consistent with her own vision of teaching. At the end of the semester Hannah was convinced more than ever that she wanted to be a teacher and was eagerly looking forward to teaching in a classroom with four walls and toward working with one group of children. Her primary goal for her first year of teaching was to "be able to know my kids really well."

Hannah's first year in a regular teaching position was spent as the only eighth-grade teacher in a nine-classroom K-8 public school enrolling about 190 pupils. This school is located in a rural farm community a few miles outside of a city with a population of 9,000. Hannah taught all subjects except civics to her eighth-grade class and taught science

to the seventh graders while her class went next door to the seventh-
grade teachers for instruction in civics. The parents of the children
in her class were very diverse socioeconomically, ranging from those who
were farm owners and professionals to those who were farm workers. For
the most part Hannah's class had been together as a group since kinder-
garten and would be attending the junior high school in the nearby small
city the following year. All of the teachers lived in the immediate
area with the exception of Hannah and one other teacher who commuted
from a city 45 minutes away. Hannah was also the youngest teacher in
the school and the only one who had not completed a teacher preparation
program at one of the relatively small state colleges which are now part
of the state university system. Finally, Hannah was the fifth new
teacher that had come to work in this school in the last three years.
Three of these teachers were no longer teaching in this school because
of alleged problems with pupil control and with staff, and the fourth
teacher has requested a transfer to another school.

The culture and tradition of this school is very complex. On the
one hand there is a very strong individualistic tradition in the school
that sanctions a teacher's right to do things in his or her own way and
there is very little cooperation or coordination among the staff. All
of the classrooms except for the seventh and eighth grades are totally
self-contained, and each teacher is responsible for all of the instruc-
tion for a group of around 25 students. Most of the teachers had been
teaching in the school for many years and several had begun their
careers in rural one-room school houses where the teacher had total
control over the management of the classroom and curriculum. The
principal of the school is also a full-time classroom teacher and does

not observe or confer with teachers except for weekly staff meetings
which are held after school and occasional individual conferences with
teachers.

Consistent with the individualistic tradition of this school there
were relatively few overt controls exerted on teachers with respect to
the planning and teaching of the curriculum. Teachers were usu ly
given curriculum guides and textbooks for each subject area and were
expected to cover the content specified in the guides in whatever order,
at whatever pace, and with whatever methods they thought were most
appropriate. "Their approach to teaching would be pretty much up to how
they feel they can teach the particular subjects in the best way . . . .
As long as she's [Hannah] following good ethical procedure I would say
the rest is up to her " (principal). Teachers were also free to supple-
ment the texts with any other materials and to go beyond what is listed
in the curriculum guides as long as the curriculum was covered by the
end of the year. During this particular year the curriculum guides were
being revised in the district's central office, and Hannah did not
receive a copy until April. She was told by the principal to follow the
textbooks to ensure that she was covering the required content, but
little or no effort was made to see that she did follow them. The most
significant controls that were placed on teachers' handling of the
curriculum were in the areas of grading and testing. All teachers were
expected to give each child 30 "marks" during each subject per report
card period and to grade students according to a standard grading scale
(e.g., 92+ = A). There was also a great deal of emphasis placed upon
pupil performance on the national standardized tests given each spring.
The principal, who was willing to tolerate a variety of instructional

approaches from his teachers, told Hannah and the seventh-grade teacher
(whose approaches were clearly different from the rest), "We'll see how
your techniques work when the kids are tested." Despite the relatively
low controls on how the teachers taught the curriculum, all of the
teachers with the exception of Hannah and her colleague in the seventh
grade stuck fairly closely to the texts.

Alongside the tradition of individualism in this school, there was
also a very strong and mostly unspoken agreement among all but the
seventh- and eighth-grade teachers about the way in which teachers
should relate to their pupils. This approach was characterized by one
teacher who had taught in this school for its entire 20-year history as
"the old school method . . . you can't have someone here who is too soft
with the kids." Hannah became aware of this consensus on teacher-pupil
relationships ("In this school it's the teacher's role to be the
disciplinarian") through her observations of how other teachers acted,
through her pupils' comments, and indirectly through the "grape vine" of
her school. Other teachers would rarely confront Hannah directly with
criticisms of her more informal style of relating to pupils beyond
telling her that she was inexperienced and would eventually learn that
"certain methods just won't work." On several occasions, however,
teachers complained to the principal, who in turn passed the word to
Hannah, that she had violated the preferred formality and distance
between pupils and teachers. Hannah was criticized for such things as
trusting kids too much, hugging them too much, and for playing her
stereo too loud and too often. All of the other classrooms with the
exception of the seventh and eighth grades were kept under tight control
by the teachers (e.g., kids sitting in rows and quiet). Despite the

relative autonomy which existed for teachers at school, there was a
strong informal agreement among staff which initially made Hannah feel
isolated and alone.

> You begin to try new things; everything is not out of the
> textbooks or worksheet oriented. They look down on that. But
> they don't constrain you and say you can't do things. They
> would never say you can't do something. They'll do it in a
> roundabout way . . . when it comes back to you, you feel that
> everyone else is against you.

The community was characterized by Hannah and the two teachers
interviewed as extremely conservative and suspicious of new ideas.
According to the seventh-grade teacher, "They want a strong emphasis on
the three R's and see the rest of the curriculum as extra." A teacher
who had taught in this school for its entire 20-year history felt that
most of the parents approved of the "old school" methods and expected
teachers to maintain tight control over pupils. She stated that many of
the parents know what to expect from the teachers because they had
attended this school as children. Hannah initially felt more pressure
from the parents than from her colleagues to conform to the unspoken
tradition regarding the teacher's role and was initially reluctant to
act on her instincts because she felt she was perceived as an outsider.

At the beginning of the year, despite the lack of close super-
vision, Hannah relied heavily on the textbooks in planning the curricu-
lum; however, she also made efforts from the very first day to establish
warm and close relationships with her pupils in violation of the school
tradition. Hannah continued to describe her basic orientation to
teaching as "humanistic" and tried to emphasize the affective and
interpersonal dimensions of her work. She felt strongly that a positive
self-concept is the key to learning and wanted to find ways to make
school enjoyable for both herself and her pupils. Hannah went out of

her way to present herself to her pupils as a "human being" by openly admitting her mistakes and ignorance with regard to curricular content and by freely sharing aspects of her personal life with her pupils. She also made many efforts to get to know each child in her class very closely and to gain her pupils' trust and confidence. For example, early in the year Hannah began the practice of having pupils keep journals which she responded to on a regular basis, took pupils on several weekend field trips, and arranged weekend pajama parties with the girls in her class.

As a result of these and other efforts, Hannah was able to gain access to information regarding many aspects of her pupils' personal lives such as their feelings about their parents and about dating habits. Initially her pupils were very suspicious of Hannah's efforts to break down the conventional barriers between teacher and students and there was a lack of support from her colleagues. Hannah became confused and uncertain in the fall about the direction she should take, and she established several classroom practices and rules which violated her own vision of "humanistic teaching." For example, student grades in math and spelling were read aloud each day, and several arbitrary rules were put in place to monitor pupil behavior (e.g., zeros were given for talking during the reading of grades). Despite these isolated instances where Hannah flirted with more conventional methods of controlling her pupils, for the most part she exerted little direct control over pupil behaviors as pupils gradually began to respond to her efforts, and by November there appeared to be little difference in the pupils' behavior whether Hannah was in or out of the room. The pupils generally stayed

on task with little direction and there were very few instances where Hannah was observed disciplining pupils for misbehavior.

Despite her efforts to establish warm and personal relationships with her pupils which were gradually becoming more and more successful, Hannah was frustrated with her heavy reliance on the textbooks in the curriculum and with her failure to establish a more varied and lively instructional program. While she was very sure of herself in dealing with children in interpersonal matters (e.g., she spoke with children about how to make friends and about dating), she felt that she did not have a clear idea of how to implement her preference for a more integrated curriculum which incorporated children's personal experiences, which gave pupils concrete experiences to relate to ideas, and which elicited their enthusiasm and excitement about solving problems in relation to the world around them. "I just feel like I'm spoon feeding them and opening their heads and pushing the knowledge in."

Knowing that her pupils had been taught "right out of the text-books" in the past and that they would be taught so in the future, and not confident that she was able to explain to others how particular methods were meeting specific academic goals, Hannah worried a lot about handicapping her students and about not giving them what they were "supposed to learn." She stated that not only were her ideals new to the school, but that they were also new to her. By December Hannah had given up any hopes of meeting her curricular goals and was so frustrated that she considered quitting teaching and accepting another job. After she informed her pupils of a job offer she had received in another state, the pupils got together and tried to convince her to stay and presented her with a certificate praising her fine work. Hannah decided

to stay in her present job largely due to the reactions of her pupils and continued to search for ways to realize her curricular goals.

Another reason why Hannah decided to stay in her job was because of the reactions of the parents of her children. From the beginning of the year Hannah made many efforts to win the trust and confidence of the parents and to learn more about the ways and mores of the community. For example, she visited farms and learned how to milk cows, went bowling regularly with parents, and saw them on a social basis. After an initial distrust of this "outsider" who was attempting to relate to pupils in a way very different than the other teachers, Hannah felt that the parents began to support her ("they were 110 percent helpful") when they noticed that their kids were more involved and enthusiastic about school, were asking different types of questions, and were experimenting more in relation to the world around them. Hannah's ability to mobilize parental support was a significant factor in her ability to violate the school culture and to gradually succeed in running a classroom more consistent with her ideals.

As the year progressed, Hannah became more and more satisfied with her approach to the curriculum. She continued to rely mainly on the texts in planning her lessons (particularly in math), but she gradually made more and more independent decisions that resulted in a greater emphasis on providing concrete experiences for children and on incorporating their personal lives into the curriculum. For example, in the spring Hannah took her class to the state capitol (four hours away) in connection with a unit on state government, initiated a drive to collect one million bottle caps to help kids understand the concept of a million, and had her pupils do aerobic exercises in connection with the

study of respiration rate. To some extent Hannah had been doing these kinds of things all along (e.g., setting up a frog hospital for an entire day in December where the kids dissected animals), but the degree to which she moved away from the texts increased over the course of the year. By April Hannah felt confident enough to drop the basal readers and have her pupils read novels, and to let two pupils teach a unit on engines to the class which drew on their experiences in repairing farm vehicles. Throughout the year Hannah continued to expose all kids to the same curricular content and to stay fairly close to the text in some subjects (e.g., math), but her work in language, reading, and science reflected more and more of the active pupil involvement and problematic approach to knowledge that she had hoped to create since the beginning of her student teaching. By the end of the year Hannah felt that she had come close to her ideal where pupils are thinking critically and constantly and where they are always asking questions and trying to apply their in-class learnings to everyday life.

One of the significant reasons why Hannah was able to move from a point in December where she considered quitting, to a feeling of satisfied accomplishment at the end of the year was the support she received from the seventh-grade teacher. Although this teacher did not model the kind of pedagogy that Hannah hoped to create, he was generally sympathetic to her ideals and supported her efforts to relate to and teach pupils in her preferred way. Hannah and the seventh-grade teacher were able essentially to create a school within a school where they teamed for science and civics instruction (the first teaming in the school's 20-year history), started a student council and school paper, and coached volley ball and track together. The seventh- and

eighth-grade classes frequently did things together that did not include
the rest of the school (e.g., play softball games), and the two teachers
together were able to withstand the evident displeasure of their
colleagues. Our interviews with the eighth-grade pupils without
exception confirmed that life in these two classrooms was very different
from that in grades 1 to 6. By the end of the year Hannah's pupils
unanimously expressed their appreciation for the year that Hannah was
able to provide for them. Several of the girls looked to Hannah as a
"big sister" rather than as a teacher.

Because of this support from the pupils, parents, and the seventh-
grade teacher, and because of Hannah's own skills in dealing with people
and her sensitivity to the political nature of schools, she was able to
significantly redefine many aspects of school in relation to her own
class. She openly questioned many school rules and regulations, such as
the rule which required students to sit in assigned seats in the
lunchroom, and openly took "effort" into account in the grading of her
pupils in violation of school district practice. Significantly,
Hannah's class scored the highest of all of the eighth grades in the
district on the standardized tests given in the spring. Hannah felt she
was able to demonstrate that you can relate to pupils in a humane way
and still accomplish academic goals. She was disappointed, however,
that she was unable to influence the practices of the other teachers and
create a more humane environment throughout the school.

At the end of the year Hannah was looking forward to being rehired
the following school year despite receiving a lay-off notice which was
justified in terms of declining enrollments. The parents of her
children were so satisfied and enthused about the job that Hannah had

done this year that they petitioned the school board to rehire her despite the added costs. Despite being rehired for the 1982-83 school year, Hannah saw herself eventually getting certification as a school guidance counselor so she could work exclusively in the interpersonal domain. Although she felt she had succeeded during this year, she felt that in the long run that there were too many obstacles in the way for her to feel satisfied with a career in teaching.

Development of Perspectives

For three of the four teachers--Beth, Rachel, Sarah--perspectives toward teaching seemed to come into focus by the end of the student teaching semester. Each had a perspective in which a teacher was to exercise considerable control over the style and content of instruction in order to offer pupils an experience of active learning, in which they tested and used their own experience to give deeper meanings to concepts. Beth was the most tentative of the three in holding to such a perspective, but she joined the others in expecting a teacher to interact in a warm and humane way with students. Rachel seemed to have the most difficulty in being close to children, though she stated her belief in the value of this kind of teacher-pupil relationship. Beth differed from the others in being less accepting of pupils as individuals, expecting groups of children to exhibit actions characteristic of some group to which they belonged (e.g., coming from low income homes).

Hannah's perspective toward teaching was more problematic at the end of her student teaching semester. She stated beliefs that would

62

suggest similar perspectives toward teaching to those of Rachel and
Sarah. These statements were definite and unequivocal. The powerful
institutional constraints of her school during student teaching and her
response of strategic compliance made it unclear whether she would do
what she said she wanted to once she was "teacher" rather than "student
teacher."

Although there was individual variation, the four teachers were
relatively alike in their apparent perspectives toward teaching when
they took up their first teaching positions. They went into quite
different school settings, but the four schools were alike in certain
general ways. Within each school there was a collection of related
institutional elements that projected a formal school culture. These
included: explicit school regulations (e.g., teachers must stay at
school until 4:00 p.m.; pupils are not to be in classrooms unless
supervised by a teacher); official time tables (e.g., a specific time
when pupils change classes for reading; time when last school bus
leaves); curriculum guides and curriculum materials (Performance Based
Objectives, textbooks, elaborately complete worksheets or a ban on using
worksheets); formal status relations of principal, specialist teachers,
teachers, and pupils.

At the same time, each school was characterized by an informal
school culture, one that was often tacit rather than explicit. Even
when explicit, the informal culture was less visible than the formal
culture, being expressed in private conversations between teachers,
casual remarks not intended for wide distribution, interpretations of
the publicly acknowledged formal culture expressed in teacher,
principal, pupil actions. There was usually one formal school culture,

6ɔ

63

but there were several different and often conflicting versions of the informal school culture within a single school.

Three of the four teachers --Sarah, Rachel, and Hannah--maintained the perspectives toward teaching which they brought with them to their first year of teaching. Sarah and Hannah used the experience of the first year to strengthen and refine their perspectives. Rachel's was maintained even though she had few instances of successful teaching to sustain her.

For Sarah, extending her perspective was not a struggle. Both the formal and informal school cultures encouraged her to continue to express her perspective, although in a restrained and cautious form. The most constraining element of the formal culture in her school was the control exerted by daily time schedules, the rush to "cover" all the material scheduled for the year, the requirement that she stay with her pupils as long as they were in school. The curriculum itself demanded attention to predetermined topics, but left considerable opportunity for Sarah to breeze by some and dig deeply into other topics. The informal school culture acted as a countervailing force to the formal culture in her school. Her colleagues in the other fourth-grade classrooms used the freedom they had to express unique teaching styles, to introduce interesting and varied activities in order to keep pupil interest and effort high. Other teachers in the school casually praised Sarah's evident success (as guessed from student essays and murals displayed in the hall) in eliciting thoughtful and creative products from her pupils. Despite being worn out at the end of the day, Sarah picked up the underlying enjoyment of teaching and of being able to circumvent

unwanted constraints, that was part of the informal culture of her
school.

Rachel and Hannah encountered considerable pressure to change to a
perspective that was impersonal, permitting pupils almost no deviation
from teacher-set requirements and encouraging little pupil initiative or
creativity in building concepts or in analyzing generalizations about
the social or natural world.

Rachel was alone in her school in challenging this perspective.
There was some constraint imposed by the formal school culture as the
principal monitored the noise and movement levels in her classroom (the
standard was to have little on either). Neither the curriculum nor
other formal school regulations were very constraining. Unfortunately,
Rachel was unable to keep her pupils quiet or focused for very long at a
time. She found her efforts to encourage pupil initiative rejected or
abused by students who had been socialized to expect teacher demands and
close control in a social context in which adults and children were
"natural" enemies. This was part of the ethos of the informal teacher
culture as well. From her colleagues Rachel had the scant consolation
that previous teachers too had found her class difficult to manage.
Rachel did not have the skill to overcome the pupils' long period of
induction into patterns of response other than the self-motivated
learning she hoped to encourage. Her doubts about asserting her
authority and her inclination to avoid too close relationships with her
pupils made it difficult for her to get their attention. Her interest
in mobilizing parent support and cooperation was thwarted by lack of
knowledge of the cultural content of her pupils' homes and her inability
to talk to people who did not feel confident speaking English. Her fear

of her principal's disapproval led her to early attempts to act the
authoritarian teacher that she believed her principal wanted her to be.
Her inability to get her pupils to behave when she tried to be strict
and demanding helped her to reaffirm her earlier perspective. Despite
her lack of support from colleagues, the rejecting and often disruptive
responses of her pupils, and her own feelings of despair, Rachel was
sustained by a few successes and continued to act as she thought a
teacher should, trying again and again to justify her faith that if she
could make the work interesting enough, involve students in active
learning, they would be intrinsically motivated to learn and even become
better behaved.

The pressure for Hannah to change her perspective was more subtle
but no less pervasive. There was almost no direct supervision of her
work by her principal since he was responsible for teaching one of the
grades on a regular, full-time basis. Minimal control came through
other elements of the formal culture; curriculum guides, for example,
were not even available to her until near the end of the school year.
The pressure was largely of an informal kind. Teachers shook their
heads in disapproval of her warm and close personal interaction with her
pupils. They warned "it won't work" to trust eighth graders to monitor
their own behavior, make decision; about where and with whom to work in
the classroom, to let pupils see the teacher as a person as well as a
professional or, conversely, to try to learn too much about the
nonschool lives of children and their families. Hannah chose to try to
know the community and her pupils' parents in order to understand her
pupils better, in order to help her convince parents that her
"different" school program was justifiable. At the same time, she chose

to exploit the openings in the weakly formed net of teaching constraints
in order to develop and implement a more varied program that relied more
on pupil participation and pupil judgment than was typical of the
school. Although her pupils, like Rachel's, had had seven years of
training in a different sytem of curriculum and of teacher-pupil
relations, Hannah's social and political skill, the pupils' traditions
of mutual peer support, and their warm acceptance of Hannah as
"teacher-friend" overcame any pupil resistance to learning new ways to
be pupils in school. In addition, there were obvious rewards to pupils
in having the school day become more enjoyable, less ego-destructive,
more productive of interesting things to do.

In contrast to the other three teachers in our study, Beth appeared
to shift away from her earlier perspective during her first year of
teaching toward one that was more bureaucratic in terms of teacher-role
and more impersonal and controlling in terms of teacher-pupil
relationships. This was consistent with a schoolwide emphasis upon
teaching knowledge as certain, through a curriculum organized to stress
the transmission of information and routine skills of language and math
rather than the examination of issues or the exploration of ambiguities.
Such a curriculum helped control pupil behavior by narrowing the range
of acceptable pupil response. It can support a view of student
diversity in which all pupils are expected to achieve the same results
although very likely at different rates. Beth had little patience with
pupil behavior or ideas that challenged or were different from the
official view.

This shift in perspective was encouraged by the direct control by
the principal, who wandered through the school looking and listening for

signs of conformity to the officially approved curriculum patterns and
maintenance of quiet, busy looking students. He was reinforced by the
bureaucratic organization of school into teaching teams. Although there
was no intermediate level of administration (e.g., teachers who were
"team leaders"), the teachers monitored one another since deviation from
the agreed-upon schedule or distribution of pupils affected the other
members in the team. Supervision of teacher behavior was facilitated by
the open architectural plan of the school which made large areas of the
school visible from any one vantage point. The "leakage" of sound and
the potentially disturbing effects this could have on other pupils and
teachers was a strong incentive to enforcing strict compliance to rules
of quiet work in order to avoid annoying one's colleagues. The
curriculum pattern itself, and the close interdependent timing of pupil
tasks, extended another form of control, constraining teachers to move
on to the next task whenever minimal achievement goals had been met and
discouraging teacher or pupil initiatives that took "too long" (longer
than planned) or aimed toward side roads of knowledge not part of the
preplanned (and post tested) curriculum.

Who and What Influences the development of Perspectives

All institutions, and schools are no exception, employ mechanisms
of control to exact greater productivity from workers and to try to
ensure that organizational members follow accepted procedures within an
organization. Richard Edwards (1979) identifies three different forms
of organizational control in his analysis of the struggles of management
and labor to exert control within the workplace.

First, with <u>personal or direct control</u>, superordinates (which in the case of the school would be the principal) personally supervise the activities of workers and through close monitoring of workers' actions ensure that workers comply with organizational norms. Secondly, with <u>bureaucratic control</u>, control is embedded into the social structure of the workplace and is enforced through impersonal bureaucratic rules and hierarchical social relations. Sanctions and rewards under bureaucratic control are dictated by officially approved policies to which workers, in particular rule groups, are held responsible. Finally, with <u>technical control</u>, an organization's control over its members (direction of work tasks, evaluation of work done, and rewarding an disciplining of workers) is embedded into the physical structure of the labor process, and jobs are designed in such a way as to minimize the need for personal supervision by administrators and to minimize the need to rely on workers' compliance with impersonal bureaucratic rules.

This framework for examining various forms of organizational control was very helpful to us for understanding how the first-year teachers learned what was expected of them, how desired behaviors were reinforced, and how organizational sanctions were applied. Generally, we found that there was very little direct and close supervision of the first-year teachers by their principals. Although all of the principals had very clear expectations for what the teachers were supposed to teach and for how they should manage their classrooms, there was very little effort on the part of principals (with the exception of Beth's principal) to attempt personally to ensure teachers' compliance.

On the other hand, as one would expect, there were numerous bureaucratic rules in each case which attempted to dictate to the

teachers how and what to teach, procedures for managing pupil behavior
in and out of the classroom, and the general activities of teachers and
pupils (e.g., rules for when teachers could leave at the end of the
day).

We found that bureaucratic rules and regulations (e.g., in
curriculum guides, teacher handbooks) gave the beginning teachers
varying degrees of information about what was expected of them and of
the limits beyond which organizational sanctions would be applied. We
also found, consistent with Weick's (1976) notion of schools as "loosely
coupled systems, that the first-year teachers were frequently able to
ignore or even to openly violate bureaucratic rules when they wished to
do so. For example, despite a policy in her school that required
teachers to grade pupils according to a standardized grading scale,
Hannah raised the scores of her pupils when she thought they had put
their best effort into their work. Sarah violated school rules and
procedures more subtly; so subtly, in fact, that it would be very hard
to know what she was doing unless one spent an extended period of time
in her classroom. Only Beth willingly complied with school rules and
regulations on a regular basis and adopted a "bureaucratic perspective"
toward her work. Despite the fact that bureaucratic control was able to
penetrate the classrooms of the four teachers, in three of the four
cases teachers were able to employ independent judgment and personal
discretion which had the effect of minimizing the impact of bureaucratic
rules.

One of the most interesting aspects of our findings is the
significance that technical control played in all the schools, but
particularly in Beth's experience. Technical control was embedded into

the form of the school curriculum and had a great deal to do with explaining how Beth learned what was expected of her (e.g., how and what to teach), and with understanding how her work was monitored and evaluated. In her school, curricular objectives, content, materials, and tests were largely predetermined before she came into the setting. The expectations for Beth were relatively certain in comparison with the other teachers we studied. Her activities were heavily influenced by the performance based curriculum which she was expected to follow closely. The form of control in this situation was very different from the three other situations, where teachers were given broad curricular goals, access to a variety of materials and where there were more opportunities for teachers to exercise independent judgment and initiative in their work. In these other situations, there was less certainty with regard to institutional expectations, although the teachers reacted to this uncertainty in different ways.

Apple (1983), Gitlin (1983), and Wise (1979) have recently argued, and have provided some empirical support for, the view that technical control is a significant aspect of the way in which teachers are socialized into their work and of how institutional norms are maintained over time. Our research confirms their more general position that schools exert varying types of organizational controls over teachers' work and that it is important to consider how _different_ forms of organizational control contribute to communicating institutional expectations to teachers, and provide various mechanisms for monitoring and evaluating teachers' activities.

There are some general statements that our data suggest and that may be applicable to other contexts than the ones we studied.

(1) As studies by Carew and Lightfoot (1979) and Metz (1978) have
suggested, it is at least sometimes the case that various and often
conflicting teacher subcultures and teaching styles exist within a
single school. The view expressed by Hoy (1968), that there is a single
and homogeneous teacher culture into which neophytes are socialized, is
not always correct. We found that this view of a consensus school
culture was not descriptive of three of our four schools. We had to
attempt to identify the various teacher subcultures within a school, as
well as formal and informal school cultures, and the often conflicting
attempts to influence beginners on the part of experienced colleagues.

(2) It cannot always be assumed when looking for the socializing
influence of experienced colleagues that there is an initial discrepancy
between beginners and veterans in terms of teaching perspectives as has
often been assumed. The "loss of idealism" (or "curve of disenchant-
ment") that is frequently referred to in the literature was not a
significant factor in two of our four cases (i.e., Beth and Sarah). In
one case, there was a very strong initial agreement between the beginner
and her colleagues, and there was not a loss of idealism because the
idealism was never there to begin with. In the other case, there was
initially a strong overlap between the perspectives of particular
experienced teachers and the beginner which the first-year teacher later
transcended in subtle ways.

(3) Direct and personal control, exerted by the principal, was not
a powerful factor in three of the four schools. Principals articulated
general guidelines to practice and for curriculum but did not monitor
compliance. None of the teachers looked to the principals for
assistance. Similarly, the self-contained organization of three of the

schools minimized the controlling effects of a bureaucratic
organization. In Beth's school,there was considerable pressure on all
teachers to conform to a perspective preferred by the administration and
the majority of teachers. This pressure took the form of the
principal's more frequent supervision, though it was often casual and
indirect; the bureaucratic organization into teaching teams, each team
of teachers planning for and teaching 80 to 100 or more pupils; pupil
and teacher success judged through pre-set tests. There was some
"slippage" even here, and some teachers resisted these constraints to
some extent, though Beth did not.

The most pervasive and powerful factor in determining the level of
institutional constraints in all the schools was technical control
exerted through the timing of instruction, the curriculum and curriculum
materials, the architecture of the school. Technical control reached
through the walls into every teacher's classroom. It was most powerful
for Beth, where the pace and form of instruction, the open architectural
plan, the precise time scheduled, etc., all made deviation from the
preferred pattern of teaching difficult. While present as a factor in
all the other schools, technical control was less complete, was not
reinforced by other forms of control (direct supervision or strong
bureaucratic structures), and was more easily manipulated or ignored by
the teachers.

(4) Possibly the most intriguing result of our study is the
discovery that perspectives toward teaching were not situationally
specific, as Becker and his colleagues (1961) discovered was the case
with perspectives toward the practice of medicine among medical
students. On the contrary, perspectives were generalized by three of

the teachers to situations which were very markedly different from those
during student teaching in which the perspectives took shape. This
generalized perspective persisted for two of the teachers even in the
face of strong institutional pressures to change.

Notes

[1] See Berlak and Berlak (1981) for a discussion of the concept of dilemmas of teaching.

[2] Lacey (1977, pp. 67-68) defines a _social strategy_ as the purposeful selection of ideas and actions by prospective teachers and the working out of their interrelationships in specific situations. He then identifies three distinct strategies that he claims are employed by prospective teachers in the face of institutional constraints. First, _internalized adjustment_ refers to a response where individuals comply with the authority figure's definition of a situation and believe these constraints to be for the best. This strategy indicates those situations where an individual willingly develops into the kind of person the situation demands and socialization entails both behavioral conformity and value commitment.

On the other hand, _strategic compliance_ refers to those instances where individuals comply with the constraints posed by a situation, but retain private reservations about doing so. This strategy implies that individuals do not act in ways consistent with their underlying beliefs, and conformity is essentially an adaptive response without the corresponding value basis on which the behavior presumably rests. Finally, the strategy of _strategic redefiniton_ refers to those situations where attempts to change are made by individuals who do not possess the formal power to do so. These individuals attempt to widen the range of acceptable behaviors in a situation and to introduce new and creative elements into a social setting.

7

75

[3] Despite the lack of significant shifts in the substance of teacher perspectives during student teaching, there were several kinds of changes that did occur for most students. The shift to full-time status in a school which occurred with the onset of student teaching helped students gain more realistic perceptions of the work of teaching and of the teacher's role. Also, most students grew increasingly confident in their abilities to manage a classroom and to teach in their preferred styles and became less fearful of the potential threat posed by observations and evaluations of their teaching. See Tabachnick, Zeichner et al. (1982) for a more detailed discussion of these findings.

[4] Two observers were present in each classroom for one or two days during each observation period.

[5] One of these teachers was identified as "mentor," by the teacher being studied (i.e., someone looked to for suggestions and advice). The second teacher was identified by the principal as a teacher who knows the school well and is aware of its history and culture.

References

Apple, M. Curricular form and the logic of technical control: The building of the possessive individual. In M. Apple & L. Weis (Eds.), Ideology and practice in education. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1983.

Becker, H., Geer, B., Hughes, E., & Strauss, A. Boys in white. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Berlak A., & Berlak, H. Dilemmas of schooling: Teaching and social change. London: Methuen, 1981.

Carew, J., & Lightfoot, S. L. Beyond bias: Perspectives on classrooms. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Dale, R. Implications of the rediscovery of the hidden curriculum for the sociology of teaching. In D. Gleason (Ed.), Identity and structure: Issues in the sociology of education. Driffield, England: Nafferton Books, 1977.

Day, H. Attitude changes of beginning teachers after initial teaching experience. Journal of Teacher Education, 1959, 10, 326-328.

Doyle, W. Classroom effects. Theory into practice, 1979, 18, 138-144.

Dreeben, R. The nature of teaching: Schools and the work of teachers. Glenview, Illinois: Scott Foresman, 1970.

Eddy, E. Becoming a teacher. New York: Teachers College Press, 1969.

Edgar D., & Warren, R. Power and autonomy in teacher socialization. Sociology of Education, 1969, 42, 386-399.

Edwards, R. Contested terrain; The transformation of the workplace in the 20th century. New York: Basic Books, 1979.

Gaede O. Reality shock: A problem among first-year teachers. Clearinghouse, 1978, 51, 405-409.

Gibson, R. The effects of school practice: The development of student perspectives. British Journal of Teacher Education, 1976, 2, 241-50.

Gitlin, A. School structure and teachers' work. In M. Apple & L. Weis (Eds.), Ideology and practice in education. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1983.

Goodlad, J. Let's get on with the reconstruction. Kappan, 1982, 63, 19-20.

7

Haller, E. Pupils' influences in teacher socialization: A socio-
    linguistic study. Sociology of Education, 1967, 40, 316-33.

Hammersley, M. Teacher perspectives. Milton Keynes, England: The Open
    University Press, 1977.

Hanson D., & Herrington, M. From college to classroom: The
    probationary year. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1976.

Hoy, W. The influence of experience on the beginning teacher. Journal
    of Educational Research, 1972, 66, 89-93.

Hoy, W., & Rees, W. The bureaucratic socialization of student teachers.
    Journal of Teacher Education, 1977, 28, 23-26.

Isaacson, N. A description of the nature and extent of support systems
    as perceived by beginning secondary teachers. Doctoral
    dissertation, University of Oregon, 1981.

Janesick, V. An ethnographic study of a teacher's classroom
    perspective. East Lansing, Michigan: Institute for Research on
    Teaching, Researh Series No. 33, 1978.

Johnston J., & Ryan, K. Research on the beginning teacher. In K. Howey
    & W. Gardner (Eds.), The education of teachers: A look ahead.
    New York: Longman, 1983.

Kuhlman, E., & Hoy, W. The socialization of professionals into
    bureaucratics. Journal of Educational Administration, 1974, 12,
    18-27.

Lacey, C. The socialization of teachers. London: Methuen, 1977.

Ligana, J. What happens to the attitudes of beginning teachers?
    Danville, Illinois: Institute Printers, 1970.

Lortie, D. Teacher socialization: The Robinson Crusoe model. In The
    real world of the beginning teacher. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1966.

Lortie, D. Observations on teaching as work. In R. Travers (Ed.),
    Second handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally,
    1973.

Lortie, D. Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago: University
    of Chicago Press, 1975.

Mardle G., & Walker, M. Strategies and structure: Critical notes on
    teacher socialization. In P. Woods (Ed.), Teacher strategies:
    Explorations in the sociology of the school. London: Croom Helm,
    1980.

McArthur, J. What does teaching do to teachers? Educational
    Administration Quarterly, 1978, 14, 89-103.

Mead, G. H. The philosophy of the act. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938.

Metz, M. Classrooms and corridors. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1978.

Newberry, J. The first year of experience: Influences on beginning teachers. A paper presented at the annual meeting of American Educational Research Association, New York, April, 1977. ERIC Document No. ED 137 299.

Petty, M., & Hogben, D. Explorations of semantic space with beginning teachers: A study of socialization into teaching. British Journal of Teacher Education, 1980, 6, 51-61.

Power, P. Aspects of the transition from education student to beginning teacher. Australian Journal of Education, 1981, 25, 288-96.

Ryan, K. Don't smile until Christmas: Accounts of the first year of teaching. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Sharp, R., & Green, A. Education and social control. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975.

Spradbery, J. Conservative pupils? In G. Whitty & M. Young (Eds.), Explorations in the politics of school knowledge. Driffield, England: Nafferton Books, 1976.

Stephens, J. The processes of schooling. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1967.

Tabachnick, B. R., Popkewitz, T., Zeichner, K. Teacher education and the professional perspectives of student teachers. Interchange, 1979-80, 10, 12-29.

Tabachnick, B. R., Zeichner, K., Densmore, K., Adler, S., Egan, K. The impact of the student teaching experience on the development of teacher perspectives. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York City, March, 1982.

Tisher, R. Teacher induction: An international perspective on research and programs. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York City, March, 1982.

Waller, W. The sociology of teaching. New York: Wiley, 1932.

Weick, K. Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1976, 21, 1-19.

Wise, A. <u>Legislated learning: The bureaucratization of the American classroom.</u> Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1979.

Wright, B., & Tuska, S. From dream to life in the psychology of becoming a teacher. <u>School Review</u>, 1968, <u>26</u>, 183-93.

Zeichner, K. Myths and realities: Field-based experiences in preservice teacher education. <u>Journal of Teacher Education</u>, 1980, <u>31</u>, 45-55.

Zeichner, K., & Tabachnick, B. R. Are the effects of university teacher education washed out by school experience? <u>Journal of Teacher Education</u>, 1981, <u>32</u>, 7-11.

APPENDIX A

Dilemmas of Teaching

Following are the definitions for each of the 17 dilemmas that were used to define teacher perspectives in this study. These dilemmas represent a refinement of our initial orienting framework and emerged from our study of 13 student teachers. If a dilemma was also utilized by Berlak and Berlak (1981) and/or by Hammersley (1977) this fact is noted in parenthesis at the ·· ·· the description of the dilemma.

<u>Knowledge and Curriculum</u>

1. <u>Public Knowledge--Personal Knowledge</u>

    ·On the one hand, an emphasis on <u>public knowledge</u> indicates a view that school knowledge consists primarily of accumulated bodies of information, skills, facts, etc. which exist external to and independent of the learner. On the other hand, an emphasis on <u>personal knowledge</u> indicates a view that the value of school knowledge is established primarily through its relationship to the learner. Implicit in this position is the view that school knowledge is useful and significant only insofar as it enables persons to make sense of their experience.

    What is at issue here is the clarity of the distinction that the teacher makes between public knowledge on the one hand and pupils' everyday knowledge on the other. To what degree is students' personal knowledge ruled out as irrelevant in the teacher's definition of the school curriculum? To what degree does the teacher allow or even encourage children's interests, background experiences, etc. to contribute to the school curriculum? (Berlak & Berlak; Hammersley)

2. <u>Knowledge is Product--Knowledge is Process</u>

    An emphasis on <u>knowledge as product</u> indicates a view of school knowledge as organized bodies of information, facts, theories, etc., and the evaluation of pupil learning is seen as a question of conformity to or deviance from specifications laid down by the teacher (e.g., the "correct" answer). The process by which the answer is reached is regarded as relatively unproblematic. Here there is a concern for the reproduction of an answer by whatever means. On the other hand, a <u>knowledge as process</u> emphasis indicates a concern with the thinking and reasoning underlying the production of a product and this thinking process is viewed as a way of establishing the truth or validity of a body of content. The central issue here is whether mastery of content or substance takes priority over the mastery of skills of thinking and reasoning. (Berlak & Berlak; Hammersley)

8ɔ

3. Knowledge is Certain---Knowledge is Problematic

An emphasis on knowledge as certain indicates an approach to school knowledge as truth "out there" to be uncritically accepted by children. On the other hand, where the emphasis is on knowledge as problematic, school knowledge is treated as constructed, tentative, and subject to social, political, and cultural influences. Here there is a concern with developing children's creative and critical abilities. (Berlak & Berlak)

4. Learning is Fragmented--Learning is Holistic

An emphasis on learning is fragmented indicates a view that learning is the accumulation of discrete parts or pieces; when one has mastered the pieces, one "knows" the whole. There is little concern that the parts be seen in relationship to the whole either before, during, or after the learning experience. From the learning is holistic perspective, the understanding of a whole is sought and is seen as a process that is something more than the learning of a series of parts. Learning is seen as the active construction of meaning by persons, and opportunities are provided for pupils to mentally act upon the material and to relate it to something already known. (Berlak & Berlak)

5. Learning is Unrelated--Learning is Integrated

This element is concerned with the degree to which teachers view school knowledge as compartmentalized within specific disciplines or content areas (unrelated) or the degree to which the boundaries between content areas are blurred (integrated). An integrated curricular emphasis would indicate that the teacher has made efforts to subordinate previously insulated subject areas to some relational idea or theme. (Hammersley)

6. Learning is Collective--Individual Activity

From the perspective of learning is an individual activity, learning proceeds best as an individual encounter between the child and material or between the child and teacher. Learning is seen as a function of each individual child's particular capabilities and/or motivation. On the other hand, an emphasis on learning as a collective activity indicates a view that learning proceeds best when ideas are exchanged in a cooperative and supportive setting where one person can test out his/her ideas against those of others. There is thought to be a construction of meaning by the community of learners that goes beyond what can be gained by individual encounters with materials and with teachers. (Berlak & Berlak; Hammersley)

7. Teacher-Pupil Control over Pupil Learning: High--Low

The question here is the degree of control that the teacher versus pupils exert over such aspects of learning as when pupils are to begin an activity, how long they are to work at a particular

task, how pupils are to perform the tasks, and criteria by which student work is evaluated. (Berlak & Berlak; Hammersley)

Teacher-Pupil Relationships

8. ## Distant--Personal Teacher-Pupil Relationships

A distant orientation to teacher-pupil relationships indicates a desire to maintain relatively detached and formal relationships with children, to maintain "a guarded professional face." On the other hand, a personal orientation to teacher-pupil relationships indicates a desire to establish close, informal, and honest relationships with children. Here the teacher is observed interacting with pupils about matters other than schoolwork, and "participates" with pupils rather than remaining detached. (Berlak & Berlak)

9. ## Teacher vs. Pupil Control over Pupil Behavior: High--Low

On the one hand, high control over pupil behavior indicates that the teacher makes many explicit rules for governing a wide range of pupil behavior. On the other hand, low control over pupil behavior indicates that children are asked to assume a great deal of responsibility for their behavior. There are not many explicit rules, and those that do exist are relatively ambiguous and/or narrow in scope. (Hammersley)

The Teacher's Role

10. ## The Teacher's Role: What to Teach.
     Bureaucratic--Functional--Independent

This element addresses the teacher's conception of his/her role regarding what to teach in relation to institutional requirements of schools and/or school districts. On the one hand, a bureaucratic response indicates that the teacher generally follows with little question the school curriculum that is prescribed by a school or school district. Here the teacher feels that it is inappropriate to alter that content which is prescribed from above, and the teacher recognizes the legitimate role of the institution to dictate practically all of the content of the school curriculum. On the other hand, a functional response indicates that there is evidence that the teacher adapts and interprets prescribed content for use in their particular situation. Finally, an independent response indicates that a teacher shows evidence of actively constructing curricular content independent of institutional directives. Here teachers may even ignore institutional directives and substitute content that they and/or the children have decided to address.

11. The Teacher's Role: How to Teach.
Bureaucratic--Functional--Independent

This element addresses the teacher's conception of his/her
role regarding methods of instruction and is concerned with the
degree of personal discretion utilized by teachers in determining
the processes of their lessons. Bureaucratic, functional, and
independent responses are defined as in the preceding dilemma.

12. The Teacher's Role: School Rules and Regulations.
Bureaucratic--Functional--Independent

This element addresses the teacher's conception of his/her
role in relation to school rules and regulations. A bureaucratic,
functional, and independent response are defined as above.

Student Diversity

13. Children as Unique--Children as Members of a Category

This dimension focuses on the degree to which teachers think
about children as alike (a focus on shared characteristics) or in
terms of a unique mix of many dimensions. How many and what kinds
of categories does the teacher use to draw distinctions among
children and how differentiated are the various categories?
(Berlak & Berlak)

14. Universalism--Particularism: School Curriculum

A universalistic position would indicate a belief that all
children should be exposed to the same curriculum either at the
same time or at a different pace. On the other hand, a
particularistic response indicates that a teacher feels and acts in
a way that indicates a concern that there are some elements of the
curriculum that should be offered only to certain individuals or
groups of children. (Hammersley)

15. Universalism--Particularism: Student Behavior

A universalistic position indicates a situation where the same
rules for behavior are applied to all students (e.g., uniform
sanctions for the same transgressions). A particularistic position
indicates a situation where rules for behavior are applied somewhat
differentially. Here when the teacher applies rules for behavior
he/she takes into account individual student characteristics such
as age, ability, home background, etc. (Berlak & Berlak;
Hammersley)

16. Allocation of School/Teacher Resources: Equal--Differential

On the one hand, some teachers take the position that all
students deserve an equal share (in terms of both quantity and
quality) of school resources such as teacher time materials, and

knowledge. On the other hand, some teacher's hold the view that some individual students or groups of students merit a greater share of resources than others. This element addresses the question of distributive justice in the classroom. (Berlak & Berlak)

17. Common Culture--Subgroup Consciousness

A common culture emphasis indicates a desire to develop in children a common set of values, norms, and social definitions. On the other hand, a subgroup consciousness emphasis indicates a desire to foster in children a greater awareness of themselves as a member of some subgroup distinguished from others by such factors as language, race, ethnicity, etc. (Berlak & Berlak)