DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 293 826 SP 030 163

AUTHOR Graber, Kim C.
TITLE Making the Grade: A Qualitative Study of Teacher Preparation Classes in Physical Education.
PUB DATE Apr 88
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 5-9, 1988).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cheating; Codes of Ethics; College Students; *Discipline Problems; *Education Majors; Higher Education; Notetaking; Physical Education; *Plagiarism; Preservice Teacher Education; *Student Attitudes; *Student Behavior
IDENTIFIERS *Studentship

ABSTRACT

Studentship, the focus of this study, is the process by which students react to the demands of the training environment. It consists of a perspective on the process of professional training that allows students to determine which dispositions they intend to acquire and which they will choose to ignore. Studentship also consists of an array of behaviors which students employ in order to progress through a training programs with greater ease, more success, and less effort. Because these behaviors include such things as cheating, taking short-cuts, psyching-out the teacher, and faking public expressions of belief, some trainees may never develop the professional values which they will be committed to implement once they become practitioners in the schools. This study describes the various studentship behaviors undergraduate preservice physical education students at Carrington College exhibit. It searches for the contextual conditions which surround the use of studentship; conditions which might, in part, encourage or reduce the tendency for students to employ such behaviors. (JD)

Making the Grade: A Qualitative Study of Teacher Preparation Classes in Physical Education

Kim C. Graber
University of Oregon

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA
April 1988

Making the Grade: A Qualitative Study of
Teacher Preparation Classes in Physical Education

Introduction

That period of time, prior to student teaching, in which preservice teacher trainees are formally engaged in learning to teach is intended to play an important role in the development of dispositions which will influence subsequent professional behavior. Unfortunately, however, some teachers implement relatively few of the skills teacher educators intended for them to acquire and betray little evidence of commitment to the beliefs espoused in the training program. Some of this may be explained by the impact of workplace environment in the schools. Some may also be explained by the powerful period of pretraining, sometimes referred to as anticipatory socialization, in which students acquire many strong beliefs about the role of being a teacher--some of which are so strong that Lanier and Little (1986) suggest the influence of preservice may not be able to sufficiently overcome these beliefs.

Some of the loss, however, must have its roots in the complex interaction between students and the professional training environment. Regretably, this is an area of educational research characterized more by neglect than by industry, and more by obvious avoidance than by interest. Teacher educators seem to know more about what happens to students in the public schools than they do about what happens to students in their own classrooms.

While some studies of professional training have been conducted in the fields of medicine (Becker, Geer, Hughes, & Strauss, 1961; Light, 1979;

Merton, Reader, & Kendall, 1957), nursing (Davis, 1968; Olesen & Whittaker, 1968; Simpson, 1979), and law (Lortie, 1959), only a handful of studies have been conducted in education (Crow, 1986, 1987; Graber, 1986, 1988; Lapin, 1985; Placek. 1985; Sears, 1984a, 1984b; Steen, 1985, 1986).

Studentship, an unexplored area of inquiry and the focus of this study, is the process by which students react to the demands of the training environment. At the most fundamental level, it consists of a perspective on the process of professional training which allows students to determine which dispositions they intend to acquire and which they will choose to ignore. Studentship also consists of an array of behaviors first described by Olesen and Whittaker (1968), which students employ in order to progress through a training program with greater ease, more success, and less effort. Because these behaviors include such things as cheating, taking short-cuts, psyching-out the teacher, and faking public expressions of belief, some trainees may in the process be prostituting themselves, never developing professional values which they will be committed to implementing once they become practitioners in the schools.

The purpose of this study, therefore, was (a) to describe the various studentship behaviors undergraduate preservice students exhibit, and (b) to search for the contextual conditions which surrounded the use of studentship; conditions which might, in part, encourage or reduce the tendency for students to employ such behaviors. No deliberate attempt was made to arrive at statements of causality. Instead, studentship was described against a background of contextual circumstances as a means of identifying patterns in

the data, and regularities in the association of student behaviors with events in the classroom or program.

Method

Setting and Subjects

This study involved an examination of students enrolled in the physical education teacher preparation program at Carrington College. The college, a private school, is located in the eastern portion of the United States and has a yearly enrollment average of over 2000 undergraduates and 400 graduate students. Two classes, Organization and Administration and Curriculum Development were observed for purposes of describing the studentship behaviors which occurred and the contextual conditions which surrounded the display of those behaviors.

The observed students were primarily seniors, completing the last period of on-campus study prior to student teaching. The students were enrolled concurrently in both classes which met intensively Monday through Friday. Organization and Administration, a three credit course, was scheduled for two hours each morning, and Curriculum Development, a two credit class, was scheduled for one and a half hours in the afternoon. Organization and Administration was taught by Elizabeth Jones, and Curriculum Development was co-taught by Christine Baker and Claire Smith.

Data Collection

Data were collected in the naturalistic setting of a teacher training program. Here the investigator relied on three primary sources from which to gather data. First, data were gathered through field observations in which the investigator assumed the role of a non-participant observer (Bogdan &

Biklen, 1982) throughout the duration of both classes. Here the researcher closely observed all interactions and events which occurred in the classroom while each class was in session. The role of a non-participant observer also allowed for interviews to be conducted away from the classrooms, documents to be examined, and the development of informal relationships outside of the observed classroom. It did, however, limit participation within the primary setting. This prevented the investigator from becoming distracted by demands and interactions in the setting, thus allowing complete attention to the context and subjects. This role also limited association with the instructors of each course because a close relationship would be dysfunctional if it caused students to perceive the observer as a snitch.

Field notes from observations were recorded in logs of three types, each focusing on a different aspect of data collection. The first, field notes, recorded observed classroom events, teacher behaviors, student behaviors, and other significant events which occurred within the training program. The second, the study log, contained a record of all inquiry procedures including how the methodology was influenced and altered as the study progressed. The third, the theoretical diary, contained questions, concerns, and personal comments, including those which addressed themes and meanings that began to emerge as a result of observations.

The second form of data collection consisted of two types of interviews, formal and informal. Each enabled the researcher to obtain addtional information from teachers and students about studentship and the context within which it occurred. The first type of interview was formal in nature. Specifically, these interviews employed what Patton (1980) refers to as the

interview guide approach. This approach allowed ample freedom to explore particular issues during the interview, setting forth in writing general areas of inquiry the investigator planned to discuss with each of the informants, yet not obligating the researcher to ask each interviewee the same standardized questions. Formal interviews were conducted with twelve students from each of the two classes and lasted approximately one hour to ninety minutes in length. Formal interviews also were conducted twice with each of the three instructors--during the first weeks of data collection and after data collection had been completed. They were further conducted with a key informant three times throughout the period of data collection, a female student chosen for various reasons, primarily because of her clarity and willingness to shed additional light on classroom events and other significant events which occurred outside of the classroom when the investigator was not present.

The second type of interview employed an informal approach. These interviews enabled the researcher to collect data while carrying on casual conversations with participants, usually without formal stipulation that an interview was taking place. The strength of this technique was that it enabled the investigator to collect data through informal conversations when participants were typically more at ease and willing to share their feelings. They also enabled the investigator an opportunity to speak with several individuals simultaneously, frequently resulting in participants building on the responses of their peers and resulting in a more vivid portrayal of what life in these two classes was like.

The third source of data consisted of documents that were collected and copied for later analysis. Here the investigator examined all documents disseminated in each of the target classes, all student course evaluations, teachers' grade books, and finally, student notes for the purpose of determining what students felt was important enough to write down.

Trustworthiness of the Data

Naturalistic researchers believe that truth exists only as it is experienced, and thereby truth exists differently for different individuals. A good naturalistic study can produce much knowledge about classes, teachers, students, and the operation of a professional preparation program. The truth in that knowledge, however, must be sustained by strategies appropriate to its definition. Not only does the investigator have a responsibility to describe the setting in ways which accurately portray how it was lived by its participants, qualitative researchers also have a responsibility to inspire the reader's trust. Scrupulously following procedures that are appropriate for obtaining and analyzing naturalistic data is not only the investigator's concern, it is their responsibility. This investigator, therefore, employed selected strategies introduced by Lincoln and Guba (1985) for assessing the trustworthiness of the data obtained through the naturalistic paradigm. Four of those strategies will be briefly discussed here.

First, triangulation was a strategy which improved the probability that findings would be found credible by preventing the investigator from accepting initial impressions, thereby improving the density, scope, and clarity of constructs (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). In short, triangulation was employed as a means of cross checking the data against multiple data

sources. By contrasting the findings obtained from direct observations with data derived from student accounts, faculty accounts, documents, and other data obtained throughout the courses, conflict, errors, and confusion could be located and confronted, either by revisiting data sources or enlarging the data base.

Second, member checks were employed throughout data collection to insure data credibility. Through formal and informal interviews, students were invited to correct errors of fact and inadequate interpretations of the data, volunteer additional information, summarize personal perceptions, and confirm the observations of the investigator. Although the investigator had ultimately to make all final decisions about what data to include in the analysis, data were only used after careful consideration of feedback and validation through the member checking process.

Third, a peer debriefer played a key role in establishing data credibility. In using the peer debriefer, investigator biases were probed, methodology questioned, and other relevant matters were discussed with a disinterested peer. One graduate student, familiar with naturalistic inquiry, was selected by the researcher for purposes of periodic debriefing. Here the peer had access to interview tapes along with all research logs. The peer's role was to assume the position of a devil's advocate, forcing the investigator to clarify possible biases, justify interpretations, and confront the need for changes in the process of investigation.

Fourth, negative case analysis involved the constant revision of hypotheses until all or most cases had been accounted for. Data here were continuously scrutinized for negative cases which did not fit evolving themes

and understandings. Where such occurred, they signalled the need either for follow-up investigation, or revision of tentative themes and hypothesized relationships.

Analysis of Data

Data analysis, an ongoing process in any naturalistic study (Bogdan & Taylor, 1975), was conducted with two purposes in mind. The first was to describe the studentship behaviors employed by students, and the second was to describe the contextual factors which surrounded studentship. Specifically, data were analyzed in the following sequential steps:

a) ongoing review of all logs throughout the process of data collection,
b) multiple reviews of all data subsequent to data collection,
c) sorting into preliminary categories with frequent re-sorting,
d) identification of 21 final categories which best described specific studentship behaviors and contextual conditions under which they occurred,
e) review to identify disconfirming data and to assess the appropriateness of the overall data classification scheme, and
f) preparation of summary descriptions from a triangulated perspective of teachers, students, and investigator.

Researcher Bias

In a naturalistic study of this type the investigator is the instrument through which data collection takes place and, therefore, there can be no perfect objectivity or separation of observer from the observed. As a result, the investigator from the outset had to be concerned about not allowing the "meanings of her world" to become entangled in the data in ways that were

undetected or not made apparent to the reader. While it was not possible or even desirable to eliminate all researcher bias, it was possible to address the issue. The investigator, therefore, listed personal assumptions which were held prior to data collection and which could inevitably influence how studentship was perceived. A frequent review of these biases was conducted throughout data collection and analysis, with a deliberate attempt made to not allow those biases to enter into what was being observed. In addition, the peer reviewer, triangulation, and the member checking process helped to insulate the researcher from forming conclusions which were inaccurate or which were formed on assumptions rather than fact.

Results

Four major classifications of behavior emerged as consistent patterns in the professional classes; short-cutting, cheating, colluding and psyching-out, and image projection. For some of the major behavior classifications, subcategories were developed to further describe the dominant patterns of student behavior used in the classes. Examples of common behaviors are cited to describe each category and to demonstrate the validity of the classification scheme. Finally, the context surrounding behaviors in each category is identified in order to understand the underlying conditions associated with the occurrence of studentship.

Short Cuts

The largest and by far the most frequently occurring studentship behavior was taking short cuts. Short cuts were behaviors students used to progress through the courses in the most efficient and economical way without sacrificing personal integrity, grades, or the chance of receiving a

good recommendation. Very simply, short cuts were used to regulate the amount of energy and effort expended in successfully completing each course. Short cutting strategies were evident in both classes and while the degree of involvement varied with each individual, taking short cuts appeared to be a common phenomenon in students' lives. Taking short cuts, however, was not necessarily peculiar to these particular classes because students readily admitted to engaging in many of these behaviors long before entering Carrington College.

Students engaged in short cutting for a variety of reasons that were highly individual. For example, students' sense of morality was one factor in determining when short cuts were used and when they were avoided. Short cutting also depended upon the perceived worth of assignments and students' level of interest in completing each assignment. In the following, the three dominant short cutting behaviors exhibited by the students, assignment completion, attendanceship, and note taking, will be explained and illustrated with examples.

Assignment completion. Assignment completion refers to short cuts intended to circumvent the arduous process of completing a required class task. When engaged in completing these tasks students employed a variety of short cutting behaviors. The first involved copying previous work. This behavior first emerged when the students were asked to complete a resume assignment, following a specific format, for Organization and Administration. While many students found this assignment to be the most valuable and worthwhile assignment of the term, one which would benefit them immediately because they would soon be applying for jobs, a few saw the

assignment as no more than another arbitrary obstacle to cross prior to graduating. Some of these students, therefore, completed the assignment by simply relying on previous resume work they had completed for another class. The instructor, Elizabeth Jones, discussed her feelings about how some students had copied previous work.

> Some of them I give them five points for the resume and five points for the cover letters. Some of them were just boring, and I put that on there, and I marked them down for it. They come to me and say, "When I redo this will you up the grading on it?" I say, "I don't accept redo, this is it. Take it over to Miss Brown and redo it for yourself, it's not for me." I just want to make sure they get those cover letters sort of ready, but they left off their practicums, you know their teaching, and they said, "Well I haven't done it yet." I say, "I know, but I directed you and told you to put that in here. You know where you're going." Well, what they did was copy one (resume) that they made last year for Dr. Jameson so they haven't updated it, they haven't put in, and I told them to update it. They just went up there, got that, and handed it to me. So I took off for it so they're not too happy with me. (Elizabeth Jones, p. 4-5)

The second short cutting strategy students used when completing assignments was to use other students for ideas. Frequently students would go to their classmates for assistance or to students who had already completed the course. By using other students for ideas, particularly the "brighter" students, the burden of the assignment was lessened and the perceived chance of success was enhanced. For example, one student, Mark, who was having difficulty with the resume assignment didn't hesitate to ask a friend for assistance, one who had already completed the course.

> When I was doing my resume and cover letter there was a friend of mine who did it last semester, and I had a little trouble with it, and he showed me his resume, and we worked on a few things, and that

> kind of sped up things a little bit, but basically if I have trouble I'm going to ask somebody for help. And if they've already done it before, and if they can help me out with what I have been doing than sure, I'll ask them, why not? Why bang my head against the wall when somebody can help me out? (Mark, p. 8)

In addition to receiving help from peers on take home assignments, some students also used their peers for help when studying for exams. For example, in Organization and Administration, one student, Sean, had been asked by the instructors to help lead the class in a review session prior to the next day's final exam. Following the review, Sean's peers quickly latched onto him prior to leaving the classroom. During an interview with the instructor, she indicated that using someone like this particular student was one of the biggest short cuts students take.

> One of the biggest short cuts that kids in that class use is for those who aren't, who don't manage their time well, or who think they can slide by, they let somebody else do the work. They used short cuts the day we had the study session in class. There were plenty of them trading on what they thought Sean's knowledge was. ...they were using his knowledge. So they will use one another, they will talk with one another in order to, to get ideas and do that instead of, instead of reading. (Christine Baker, p. 6-7)

A third form of assignment short cutting was <u>letting other students do the work</u>. This occurred when students allowed others in their assigned or selected groups to take primary responsibility for completing a majority of an assigned class task. For example, in Curriculum Development students were assigned to groups and asked to complete a major curriculum assignment. While many students found the assignment to be valuable, interesting, and who were committed to completing the assignment to the best of their ability, there were students who forced the remaining group

members to carry a heavier share of the workload by not engaging in as much discussion or task oriented behavior. This latter group of students, therefore, was able to slide by on the merits of those who showed commitment to the task. Frequently this caused resentment by those who felt they were forced to undertake primary responsibility for completing the assignment.

> Two of the people in my group are good friends of mine although they do diddley in the group. The don't do anything really. They don't help at all...you're busy enough as it is you don't need to do stuff for other people. (Frank, p. 9)

The fourth short cutting behavior pattern students exhibited when completing assignments was <u>using the work of those who have taken the class previously</u>. This behavior pattern is best described as copying directly from assignments completed in previous terms or extrapolating significant portions of work completed by past students and incorporating that work into a present assignment. This short cutting strategy was employed by many students and was heavily influenced by the contextual conditions of the classroom. While the degree of occurrence again varied among individuals, it was a strategy many students felt comfortable employing. This strategy was most frequently displayed in Organization and Administration when the students were asked to write a policy handbook similar to one they might find in a high school. Students were allowed to sign out from the instructor previous handbooks that had been used in past years. Many students did not sign out these handbooks, however, instead they obtained copies from students who had taken the class previously. In using previous handbooks some students chose to extrapolate significant portions of ideas without

giving credit for those ideas. Other students simply copied word for word and then submitted those to the instructor.

> I know definitely people that have taken short cuts. ...using other people's handbooks and just blatantly using their exact wording and using their same style. (Sue, p. 6)

> We have a copy of the handbook, and to be honest with you I don't think the teacher can remember what all of them are, and it wouldn't take much, and I know students who have just typed it over again and handed it in. (Jan, p. 6)

In attempting to discover why copying and lifting ideas from previous handbooks were such prevailing short cutting behaviors, it was determined that these behaviors occurred in association with two contextual circumstances. The first was a strong negative reaction to the nature of the assignment and feeling forced to complete it in a short amount of time. Almost all students who were interviewed, formally and informally described the handbook as either an unreasonable task to complete in a short amount of time, not worthwhile, or a waste of time.

> The handbook I thought was an unreasonable assignment to get done in that amount of time. ...Again, when I wrote my handbook I just pieced it together using several sources, mainly other students' handbooks. If I should ever have to come up with a handbook it won't be the one I put together for this class because it's not too much of my own thinking. I really didn't have time to think about what I wanted in my handbook. (Sean, p. 4)

The second contextual characteristic that played a part in determining whether or not students chose to take short cuts with the handbook assignment was the risk of being discovered. If students decided that the risk of being caught was great, they weren't as tempted to take short cuts.

Several students, however, determined that because the instructor would never be able to remember all of the handbooks that she had read in the past, it was safe to employ short cuts.

> ...in that particular class because there's so many handbooks going to be passed in, and because I think it's possible (to copy) as long as you don't do it too dramatic. ...I don't think you could get away with that in Christine's class (Curriculum). I know you could not get away with that. (Frank, p. 22)

Attendanceship. Attendanceship was a short cutting behavior which referred to the students' attitude and resulting actions toward actual classroom attendance. It was a behavior which appeared to be contingent upon the demands of each instructor. For example in Organization and Administration, the instructor allowed the students to miss three classes before their grade would be affected. In Curriculum, however, the students believed the instructors expected them to be present every day. As a result, students frequently took advantage of the three allowed absences in Organization and Administration, yet they consistently attended Curriculum unless they were ill or the weather prevented them from driving to the college. For example, on one particular day approximately eleven students were counted as absent in Organization and Administration, but all enrolled students were present that afternoon for Curriculum.

Note Taking. Another short cutting behavior which appeared was the manner in which students took class notes. It became evident that notes were taken based more on what students would need to know for the exam or assignment, and less on what might be important for them to remember once they became certified teachers. Students seemed to take notes whenever an

instructor wrote something on the board, particularly a definition or term, whenever an instructor repeated something slowly, twice, or with particular vocal emphasis, and always when an instructor indicated the students would be accountable for that particular information on the exam.

The influence of context on note taking first appeared after the students were informed that the final exam for Organization and Administration was to be based more on assigned book readings and much less on classroom lectures. Once informed of this many students were observed not taking notes or taking fewer notes than they had previously.

> I think any time a teacher tells you to list something, then I write down immediately. Any time they stress it by saying it twice or sometimes I just go by what I feel, you know, what I feel is coherent in the rest of the notes I write down. But I think, I don't know if this is a sidetrack, but in the morning class a lot of people have neglected to take their notes now they know that the test is coming on just the book. (Jan, p. 5)

Cheating

Cheating was a studentship behavior which was related to, but was not coterminous with short cutting. It was related to short cutting if students chose not to study for an exam because they planned on copying from another student's exam or from smuggled crib sheets. In this instance students would be reducing the amount of studying necessary for an exam because they planned on cheating. It was unrelated to short cutting if students studied as much as they ever would yet resorted to copying off of another student's exam because they felt copying was the only means of passing the test once they began the exam.

It also was a behavior which was defined differently by various individuals. There were, however, some student behaviors which were uniformly identified as cheating by those students who discussed its use. These behaviors were copying directly from another student's exam, using "cheat sheets", writing on one's hands, shoes or the desk, and studying from past exams that had been obtained illegally. Apparently, when students discussed cheating they associated its emergence more frequently with the taking of exams than they did with the completion of assignments.

All students who were interviewed admitted to taking short cuts of some form or another, most without feeling badly about doing so. When asked about cheating, however, most of these same students condemned the act. They believed that cheating was "immoral", against their personal standards, and students described their peers who engaged in cheating as only hurting themselves.

In analyzing each particular class, cheating was not observed during the Curriculum exam. Of course some students may have carefully positioned themselves or have been so careful when cheating as to avoid detection by either the investigator or the instructor proctoring the exam, but its emergence, if it did exist to any degree, was not detectable. Cheating was, however, observed to occur during the Organization and Administration exam. It was observed between several groups of students and among students who had strongly condemned cheating during interviews. To place this in context, a brief historical account will be given describing the final exam for Organization and Administration and the preceding events.

When students initially entered Organization and Administration they were under the assumption that their final exam would be a take-home. They believed this, not because the instructor had promised to administer a take-home, but because that is what had been done in previous semesters. Approximately one week prior to the exam the instructor informed the students that the test would take place in class, and it would be a closed book exam. Upon hearing this the majority of students began questioning the instructor about her decision. Further, they became very vocal during interviews about the unfair decision to administer an in-class exam. Several days later, the instructor informed the students that she would allow them to take the exam with a partner because she did not have an ample number of exams to go around. They were to find another student with whom they could work, and they would be able to complete the exam with that person. The students would be allowed to talk with that individual about each answer, yet they would have their own answer sheet in the case of a disagreement between partners.

On exam day each set of partners sat together. Prior to beginning the exam, one student began looking at his notebook and then writing on his desk. Approximately twenty minutes into the exam intergroup communication was observed. Len began looking over Jim's should who was in the group directly in front of him. Jim turned around and responded, "You dick, quit looking." Len continued to look at Jim's answer sheet when Jim turned around and asked, "What's up?" As the exam continued it was observed that Jim's group and another group in the front of the room were also quietly discussing the exam. When the instructor turned around and saw these two groups communicating,

nothing was said. After the exam several students began joking about how other groups of students had helped them to cheat and vice versa.

During ensuing interviews two students discussed the intergroup communication that had occurred during the exam. Jan described how she had talked about the test with other groups of students, but believed it couldn't be classified as cheating because several groups of students were doing the same, and she also believed the instructor was aware of the communication. Sean's beliefs were similar to Jan's. Sean also added that another strategy which helped improve his test performance was in obtaining a copy of a previous exam and discovering that the first 50 questions on the exam were exactly the same as on the test he had obtained.

In addressing the contextual conditions which surrounded cheating, Jan believed that teachers are largely responsible for cheating. She indicated that the moral pressure a teacher exerts on students can either prevent or provoke cheating. Students also suggested that the nature of an exam can be related to cheating. For example, the students indicated that it wasn't really possible to cheat on an essay exam.

While students indicated during interviews prior to the exam that cheating was "immoral," it was interesting to discover that many students engaged in this behavior during Organization and Administration. It seemed that in this particular case, because it didn't seem to bother the instructor, that it wasn't cheating, but only a vehicle for helping oneself and one's peers. It may also have been undertaken in retaliation because students perceived the instructor had broken the implicit rules of the classroom when she chose not to administer a take-home exam.

Colluding and Psyching-out

Another category of observed studentship behaviors included colluding and psyching-out. Colluding was the attempt by a group of students to encourage an instructor to reduce their expectations. It was a behavior in which students could act together to accomplish a desired result. The desired result, perhaps a reduction in workload requirements, did not need to be determined secretively or planned in advance. Many times students could glance around the room and decide that some action needed to be taken with regard to "encouraging" the instructor to reduce workload expectations. Psyching-out occurred when students employed skilled questioning techniques as a means of discovering specific instructor expectations such as what would be included on an exam. These behavior patterns were displayed with great enthusiasm prior to the final exam in both classes.

Psyching out was first evidenced one day prior to the final curriculum exam. On this particular day the instructors of the class held a review session. Throughout the review the students continually probed the instructors regarding what they should study, and when given a clue as to what might be asked, they would ask the instructors for the specific answers to those possible questions. The students attempted to psych-out the instructor, trying to discover the specifics for what should be studied. They used this particular studentship behavior overtly, not hiding their anxiety about the test from either of the instructors. While the dominant studentship behavior portrayed here was psyching-out, there was a tacit form of collusion which allowed the group to act in concert, exerting a power in the exchange

about instructor expectations that would not have been possible for individual students.

Colluding and psyching-out were observed for a second time prior to the final exam for Organization and Administration. This time colluding became the dominant studentship strategy with fewer observed psyching-out behaviors. These behaviors were witnessed for the first time one week prior to the final when the students were informed that the exam would not be a take-home exam. Upon hearing this the students immediately began engaging in colluding behaviors which continued until the day the final exam was eventually administered. These colluding behaviors included carefully orchestrated attempts by the students to encourage the instructor to change her mind. Several days prior to the exam the instructor informed the students that they would be allowed to take the test with a partner. The instructor informed the investigator she chose to allow this because there were only 16 tests to go around and not enough time to have more copied, and she decided working in partners was a good learning experience for the students. It is not possible to determine whether or not the students comments during class had some influence on the instructor's decision to allow the students to work with partners, but many students believed the instructor had "redeemed herself" by allowing what they considered a compromise.

Psyching-out and colluding, therefore, were behaviors which empowered the students with some control over their learning environments. Whether or not the students were successful in employing these behaviors in this particular instance will never be known. Nonetneless, the students did not hesitate to rely on these strategies when they perceived an opportunity to

reduce instructor expectations. The use of these behaviors certainly suggests that in the past they had proven to be successful.

Image Projection

Three forms of studentship behaviors fell within the realm of image projection. Each of these behaviors, fronting, brownnosing, and image management were used by the students to project an image of themselves to the faculty which they believed to be advantageous.

Fronting. Fronting was a studentship behavior exhibited by students who attempted to promote a favorable image of themselves to those with power. The distinguishing difference between fronting and the two other image projection behaviors is that it describes an individual who "fakes" their way through all or any part of a training program. It was a behavior which students never readily admitted to engaging in because they never felt fully comfortable behaving in a manner which was not congruent with their internal belief system. It meant that they would have to be willing to sacrifice a degree of personal integrity in order to be perceived in some advantageous fashion by the intructor. Many students also indicated they felt no need to front because the instructors encouraged them to share their own opinions even when their opinions differed.

Fronting, however, was observed to occur on several occasions and its use was discussed by students during several informal conversations. For example, Len indicated that while he felt free to have his own beliefs, when being tested it was necessary to think along the instructor's lines even when he didn't agree with what he was writing down. In this case, the importance of receiving a good grade on the exam was the overriding factor in deciding

whether or not to engage in fronting. While this behavior may seem relatively harmless and unsurprising, as Locke and Dodds (1984) have indicated, something less benign may emerge. If recruits are demonstrating skills and displaying beliefs just to please the faculty or in order to be perceived more favorably, they may as a consequence be distancing themselves from engagement with issues which demand reflection and resolution.

Fronting also became apparent when combining information obtained from interviews, observations, and document analysis. For example, in both classes Tiffany frequently participated in discussion, actively took notes, and further showed interest by asking questions and interacting with the instructors on a personal basis. When the investigator asked Tiffany for access to her notes she immediately gave permission and then told the investigator to throw the notes away after using them because she would never use any of the material again. In this case, it had not been obvious during class that Tiffany was using fronting behaviors. Instead she seemed genuinely interested in the class content, to value what was being acquired, and to be concerned about implementing the material when teaching. It wasn't until encountering her attitude about the accumulated "valuables" that disconfirming information became available.

Brownnosing. The second form of image projection was brownnosing, a studentship behavior similar to fronting. The main difference here is that when students chose to brownnose they frequently believed what they were saying. In this case students simply made the effort, sometimes extreme, to be sure the teacher was aware of a particular belief. It meant that students would underscore their possession of teacher santioned values in order to

curry favor and thus improve chances for success. It was most common in mild forms such as display of interest in the class, expressed agreement with the teacher, and publicly confirming one's level of commitment about becoming a physical educator. Frequently it was undertaken when students perceived brownnosing as a means of enhancing their grade and when they felt it was necessary to curry the teacher's favor in light of perceived pressure to meet faculty expectations. Here several students discuss the use of brownnosing.

> I think some student do (brownnose). Definitely, but it's the same students who've done it all along. I don't have any qualms with that because they're just trying to get the best grade possible. (Bob, p. 13)

> I think a lot of people try to brownnose. ...I try to be super friendly with people. I think if somebody's got a bad opinion of you, then it's gonna reflect on how they feel about you, how they teach to you, how they grade you. (Sean, p.)

> You probably heard r[illegible]aying, "Kiss ass to pass." I usually say that. I'm walking out and sometimes we'll kid around with each other and say, "Uh, you're kissing ass." I said, "Hey, you kiss ass to pass." (Jim, p. 9)

Image Management. Unlike fronting and brownnosing, the third form of image projection, image management, was used more as a means of showing respect or avoiding conflict than as an opportunity to gain some type of advantage. It can be defined as a behavior used to promote a certain image of oneself within the course of everyday life (Goffman, 1959). It allowed the students an opportunity to act a certain way in the classroom without feeling "fake" and allowed them to disagree with the faculty without having to be vocal about that disagreement. For example, students may have disagreed

with certain faculty positions, but they didn' t believe it appropriate to voice their disagreement. Frequently their fear of being vocal was related to the fear of obtaining a poor grade.

> Yeah, I think I am free to hold my own beliefs, but also I don't know how much anyone in the class is gonna say what they believe. Like I haven't come out and told Christine (Curriculu) that I don't think she has enough experience or anything like that. I guess there's some things that just, you know, some things your'e not gonna say, you know, to suffice because you want a good grade in the class. (Bob, p. 7)

> ...it's not like you're gonna change what they're talking about. Arguing about it is not going to change what you're going to have to learn. Saying, "Hey Christine, we're not goirg to use this shit" isn't going to help any. More than anything else it'll just make her angry. ...You're just sorta in there. You gotta sit there and take it. (Jim, p. 12)

The distinction between image management and fronting is subtle, and the distinction rests in how students regard particular disagreements with the instructor. In the latter they are hidden because they are a threat to success. In the former they remain unexpressed or are greatly moderated because they are inappropriate to the role and the social transaction of the classroom. Further, it may be that image management has the potential to be somewhat more destructive to the students' development than fronting. While fronting means that the recruit is faking certain behaviors, at the same time, they are playing at the role. As Davis (1968) discovered, the more students had an opportunity to simulate the role they were being asked to assume, the more they gained conviction about their performance. Templin (1984) also agrees with the importance of role-playing, indicating that performance can

bring about mastery, eventually validating training. If fronting leads to internalization of "played at" behaviors, it won't have been dysfunctional. With image management, however, the students submerge their beliefs, never publicly expressing doubts or hesitations about the role. It is here that students not only are disadvantaged by not playing at the role, but they also never verbalize dispositions which may eventually impede the intentions of training.

Conclusions

The studentship behaviors which existed in the two observed classes can be classified under four major headings of shortcutting, cheating, colluding and psyching-out, and image projection. Studentship was an action students employed as a means of reacting to the forces of socialization, empowering them with control over certain aspects of their lives in a teacher training program. It was a behavior pattern which they had learned prior to entering a teacher training program, and one which they continued to employ throughout their years at Carrington College. Studentship provided students a means of progressing through the program with greater ease, less effort, and increased chance of success.

The manner in which students engaged in studentship varied with each individual student and within each observed course. While some students admitted to having used some forms of studentship prior to entering Carrington College, the overall influence of the school upon the intellectual growth of students also had a strong bearing on whether or not studentship was employed. Some students were not able to engage in some forms of studentship because they believed that to do so would be a direct violation of

the high personal standards of behavior espoused at Carrington College.

There were contextual circumstances which surrounded studentship, some of which may have had an influence on students' decisions to engage in these behaviors. First, opportunity to engage in studentship was one factor which had to be present before studentship could even be considered. Not having an opportunity due to risk or lack of availability of previous assignments, automatically served to deter students from even considering studentship. Second, some forms of studentship were influenced by perceived pressure to meet instructor expectations, some of which had to be met in what students considered to be a short amount of time. Third, when students believed the instructors were treating them unfairly, in terms of particular demands such as having to take the Organization and Administration test as an in-class exam, students were more inclined to employ studentship. Fourth, students' perceptions regarding the worth of particular assignments was a contextual factor which heavily influenced when and if studentship occurred. Finally, the importance of receiving good grades and perhaps favorable faculty recommendations were factors which played a substantial role in determining if studentship would be employed.

It is reasonable to believe that if teacher educators were more sensitive to the emotional stresses encountered by students throughout the process of learning to teach, they might have greater control over studentship. In a recent study of teacher training, Clift, Nichols, and Marshall (1987) found that undergraduates "were concerned with their survival as students and not as teachers" (p. 13), frequently worrying about specific instructor expectations, what to study prior to a test, and becoming anxious over

workload requirements. While the role of teaching may seem somewhat removed from students' lives, the role of being a student is ever-present. Understanding student concerns and how those concerns might influence engagement in studentship seems a priority if teacher educators are to exert a measure of benign control over student responses to training program demands.

If trainees display particular beliefs or teaching behaviors purely in order to be perceived more favorably or in hopes of a higher grade, they may become less likely to implement those beliefs and skills once they leave the influence of the training program. Accordingly, if teacher educators can come to understand studentship behaviors as perfectly normal responses to the contextual conditions over which they exercise considerable control, they will have acquired powerful new leverage within the training process. To regard studentship simply as moral transgression, is to misunderstand both undergraduate trainees and the realities of professional socialization.

References

Becker, H. S., Geer, B., Hughes, E. C., & Strauss, A. L. (1961). Boys in white: Student culture in medical school. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1982). Qualitative research for education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Bogdan, R., & Taylor, S. J. (1975). Introduction to qualitative methods: A phenomenological approach to the social sciences. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Clift, R. T., Nichols, C., & Marshall, F. (1987). Turning opportunities into problems: Anger and resistance in teacher education. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C.

Crow, N. A. (1986). The role of teacher education in teacher socialization: A case study. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Crow, N. A. (1987). Hidden curriculum in a teacher education program: A case study. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC.

Davis, F. (1968). Professional socialization as subjective experience: The process of doctrinal conversion among student nurses. In H. S. Becker, B. Geer, D. Riesman, & R. S. Weiss (Eds.), Institutions and the person (pp. 235-251). Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. New York: Aldine Publishing Company.

Goffman, E. (1959). The presentation of self in everyday life. Garden City, NY: Doubleday Anchor Books.

Graber, K. C. (1986). Teacher socialization during professional preparation: The student response to perceived faculty expectations. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the New England Educational Research Organization, Rockport, ME.

Graber, K. C. (1988). A naturalistic study of studentship in the context of preservice teacher training for physical educators. Unpublished dissertation, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

Lanier, J. E., & Little, J. W. (1986). Research on teacher education. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed.), (pp. 527-569). New York: MacMillan Publishing Company.

Lapin, F. M. (1985). Professional socialization: A naturalistic study of students becoming teachers. Dissertation Abstracts International, 45(8), 2477A-2478A. (University Microfilms No. 84-26,174)

Light, D., Jr. (1979). Surface data and deep structure: Observing the organization of professional training. Administrative Science Quarterly, 24, 551-559.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Locke, L. F., & Dodds, P. S. (1984). Is physical education teacher education in American colleges worth saving? Evidence, alternatives and judgment. In N. Struna (Ed.), NAPEHE Annual Conference Proceedings: Vol. 5 (pp. 91-107). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics Publishers.

Lortie, D. C. (1959). Laymen to lawmen: Law school, careers, and professional socialization. Harvard Educational Review, 29(4), 352-369.

Merton, R. K., Reader, G. G., & Kendall, P. L. (Eds). (1957). The student-physician. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Olesen, V., & Whittaker, E. (1968). The art and practice of studentmanship: Backstage. In V. Olesen & E. Whittaker (Eds.), The silent dialogue (pp. 148-199). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Patton, M. Q. (1980). Qualitative evaluation methods. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Placek, J. H. (1985). Teacher educators and students: The communication gap. Paper presented at the Fourth Curriculum Theory Conference, Athens, GA.

Sears, J. T. (1984a). A critical ethnography of teacher education programs at Indiana University. Dissertation Abstracts International, 45, 2072A. (University Microfilms No. 84-22,814)

Sears, J. T. (1984b). An ethnographic account of everyday life in a school of education. Paper presented at the Sixth Conference on Curriculum Theory and Practice, Dayton, OH.

Simpson, I. H. (1979). From student to nurse: A longitudinal study of socialization. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Steen, T. B. (1985). Teacher socialization in physical education during early training experiences: A qualitative study. Paper presented at the National Convention of the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, Atlanta, GA.

Steen, T. B. (1986). A case study of teacher socialization in physical education during early training experiences: A qualitative analysis. Dissertation Abstracts International, 46 (9), 2668A. University Microfilms No. 85-26,256)

Templin, T. J. (1984). Developing commitment to teaching: The professional socialization of the pre-service physical educator. Paper presented at the Second National Conference on Preparing the Physical Education Specialist for Children, Orlando, FL.