

TEACHER SOCIALIZATION¹

Kenneth Zeichner and Jennifer Gore²

Teacher socialization research is that field of scholarship which seeks to understand the process whereby the individual becomes a participating member of the society of teachers (Danziger, 1971). This paper reviews that research, but rather than simply describing in a chronological, cumulative or even thematic way, studies which have been conducted since Lortie's (1975) classic work *Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study*, our intention is also to examine competing explanations of teacher socialization which have arisen from different intellectual traditions. In addition, we will address issues of the relation of the research to teacher education practice and issues related to the social relations of the research process itself.

Intellectual Traditions in Teacher Socialization Research

Three main traditions in teacher socialization research can be identified as functionalist, interpretive, and critical. Each is characterized by a theoretical orientation which shapes the questions that are asked, the way the research is conducted and the interpretation of the data collected. Given their distinctiveness, we might go so far as to call these "paradigms" in teacher socialization research. However, it is rare to find articulation of these paradigms in the teacher socialization literature. Too often, research methods precede research questions, and the questions themselves are narrowly construed.

In order to examine a research paradigm critically, to see it clearly, to begin to assess its contribution, one needs to step back from the particular paradigm and consider its location in a broader context. Since teacher socialization research exists as part of a larger body of research on occupational socialization, the paradigms in teacher socialization research have clear links with particular forms of sociological study. In the first section of the paper, we illustrate the links between the teacher socialization and occupational socialization research and trace that work back to its origins in particular schools of intellectual thought. Such a task could easily take all of the space we have been allocated for this chapter but would prevent us from pursuing our other purposes. Consequently the following discussion reduces the complexity and contradiction within the traditions, and simplifies the links between the intellectual paradigms, and occupational and teacher socialization. We have done this for

¹This paper will appear as Chapter 19 in W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education*. (New York: Macmillan)

²Kenneth Zeichner, professor in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at University of Wisconsin-Madison, is a senior researcher with the National Center for Research on Teacher Education. Jennifer Gore is a doctoral student. The authors would like to express their thanks to the following people for their helpful comments and criticisms of an earlier draft of this paper: Niels Brouwer, Nedra Crow, Sharon Feiman-Nemser, Mark Ginsburg, Sandra Hollingsworth, Karl Jordell, Gary Knowles, Judith Little, Bob Tabachnick, and Alan Tom.

purposes of analysis, clarity, and conservation of space.

The term "socialization" as it is used in teacher socialization research is relatively new. Danziger (1971) and Clausen (1968) trace the current usage of the term to Park (1939), Dollard (1939), Sutherland and Woodward (1937), and Ogburn and Nimkoff (1940) and point out that it emerged at around the same time in sociology, anthropology, and psychology. As Danziger (1971) comments: "In view of the rare occurrence of the term in earlier writings in the three disciplines, its sudden emergence to prominence suggests the operation of a powerful undercurrent of ideas" (p. 13). He describes that undercurrent as a shift from social philosophy to positivistic social science.

The Functionalist Approach to Socialization

The oldest and still most pervasive approach to teacher socialization, namely functionalism, is one rooted in the tradition of sociological positivism which arose in France (e.g., Comte, 1853; Durkheim, 1938). The functionalist paradigm holds a view of the social world which "regards society as ontologically prior to man [sic] and seek[s] to place man and his activities within that wider social context" (Burrell and Morgan, 1979, p. 106). Functionalism is a view which is characterized by a concern for providing explanations of the status quo, social order, consensus, social integration, solidarity, need satisfaction, and actuality. It approaches those general sociological concerns from a standpoint which tends to be realist, positivist, determinist, and nomothetic (Burrell and Morgan, 1979, p. 26). Functionalism is based on a conception of science which emphasizes the possibility of objective inquiry capable of providing true explanatory and predictive knowledge of an external reality. Functionalists tend to assume the standpoint of the observer, attempting "to relate what *they* observe to what *they* regard as important elements in a wider social context" (Burrell and Morgan, 1979, p. 107).

Within the functionalist paradigm several schools of thought can be identified such as structural functionalism (Malinowski, 1923, 1936; Radcliffe-Brown, 1952), systems theory (Bertalanffy, 1956), social action theory (Parsons, 1949; Weber, 1947), integrative theory (Merton, 1968), behaviorism (Skinner, 1953). Although important *within* the paradigm, for our purposes, the differences between these schools of thought are best seen as differences of degree rather than of fundamental perspective (Burrell and Morgan, 1979, p. 108).

Some of the earlier occupational socialization research arose out of this tradition. The best known study is unquestionably that of Merton, Reader, and Kendall (1957) published as *The Student Physician*. In this account of medical student socialization, the medical school was seen to infuse students with the orientations, the knowledge, and the skills fundamental for living the life of a physician (Wentworth, 1980, p. 52). Socialization was seen as "a smooth change in absolute personal qualities" (p. 54).

The link between Merton et al.'s (1957) work and *teacher* socialization research is often made

quite self-consciously even though the links to functionalism and positivism are not. For example, Hoy and Rees's (1977) study on the bureaucratic socialization of student teachers drew on Merton's notion that bureaucratic structures may have the capacity to modify personality types. They measured students' custodialism, bureaucratic orientation and dogmatism before and after a nine-week period of student teaching and found that "secondary school teachers become substantially more bureaucratic in orientation as a result of student teaching" (1977, p. 25).

If we consider Hoy and Rees's (1977) work in relation to the characteristics of the functionalist paradigm, it can be seen to corroborate Burrell and Morgan's (1979) description of the paradigm. It is realist in attempting to explain the status quo; positivist, in the methods employed and in the predictive intent; determinist, in that schools are seen as determining the orientations of student teachers--student teachers are viewed as passive or plastic; and nomothetic, in that law-like statements are made (e.g., "secondary schools in general began almost immediately to mold neophytes into roles devised to maintain stability"--Hoy and Rees, 1977, p. 25.) The functionalist paradigm emphasizes reproduction of existing arrangements and assumes that socialization produces continuity (Wentworth, 1980). It is "geared to providing an explanation of the regulated nature of human affairs" (Burrell and Morgan, 1979, p. 107), and in so doing, focuses on central tendencies and deemphasizes complexity, contradiction, and human agency.

The Interpretive Approach to Socialization

The interpretive paradigm is rooted in the German idealist tradition of social thought (e.g., Dilthey, 1976; Husserl, 1929; Kant, 1876; Schutz, 1967; Weber, 1947). "It challenges the validity of the ontological assumptions which underwrite functionalist approaches to sociology" (Burrell and Morgan, 1979, p. 32). Like the functionalist paradigm there are several schools of thought within the interpretive paradigm, such as hermeneutics (Dilthey, 1976; Gadamer, 1975), phenomenology (Husserl, 1929; Sartre, 1948; Schutz, 1967), and ethnomethodology (Garfinkel, 1967). Nevertheless, there is a common concern to understand the fundamental nature of the social world at the level of subjective experience. Interpretive approaches seek explanation "within the realm of individual consciousness and subjectivity, within the frame of reference of the participant as opposed to the observer of action" (Burrell and Morgan, 1979, p. 28). The descriptors used by Burrell and Morgan to characterize the paradigm are that it is "nominalist," "antipositivist," "voluntarist," and "ideographic" (p. 28). An outline of an occupational socialization study and a teacher socialization study that are interpretive in orientation will be helpful in understanding these descriptors.

Of the occupational socialization research, Becker, Geer, Hughes, and Strauss's (1961) study of medical students, titled *Boys in White*, is the best known and most commonly cited, often in juxtaposition to Merton's et al.'s study (e.g., Battersby, 1983; Olesen and Whittaker, 1970; Wentworth,

1980). Becker's research team attempted to get inside and understand from within the students' experiences of medical school. Students were attributed considerable agency and were understood as being able to turn themselves into the kind of persons the situation demanded (Becker, 1964). Socialization was therefore viewed as a more complex and problematic process than implied in the functionalist paradigm.

Lacey's (1977) study of teacher socialization in the United Kingdom is consistent with Becker's (1964) work. The study was designed in part to illustrate some of the perceived flaws of functionalist socialization theory, a feature which highlights the emergence of the interpretive paradigm in opposition to functionalism as a way of understanding teacher socialization. Lacey's (1985) study "aimed at developing a model of the socialization process that would encompass the possibility of autonomous action by individuals and therefore the possibility of social change emanating from the choices and strategies adopted by individuals" (p. 4076). Participant observation and questionnaire data were collected in an attempt to understand the experiences of student teachers.

Although Lacey and Becker both acknowledge structural elements or institutional constraints within the context in which socialization occurs, as seen in their use of terms like "situational adjustment" (Becker et al., 1961) and "strategic redefinition" (Lacey, 1985), their emphasis is on subjective meanings of participants. The studies are nominalist in terms of seeing the social world as largely existing through the names, concepts, and labels used by participants; antipositivist in that they reject the view that human affairs can be studied in the manner of the natural sciences; voluntarist, in that individuals are viewed as making choices and capable of "autonomous action," and ideographic in their emphasis on subjective accounts.

Functionalist and interpretive approaches to the study of teacher socialization are fundamentally distinct, with quite different assumptions regarding the ontological status of the social world (Burrell and Morgan, 1979). Nevertheless, there are similarities between the two approaches. Both are concerned with a "sociology of regulation," "a concern to provide explanations of society in terms which emphasize its underlying unity and cohesiveness" (Burrell and Morgan, 1979, p. 17). Both view socialization as an overarching process whereby the individual engages in role learning which results in the situational adjustment (passive or active) of the individual to the culture of the profession (Battersby, 1983, p. 327).

Neither challenges the status quo, operating as they do from a value-neutral research stance. The functionalist paradigm demonstrates a greater concern for *explanation* than the interpretive paradigm which aims for *understanding*. From a critical perspective (our third paradigm), neither of these research aims is sufficient; they are "merely moments in the transformative process" (Carr and Kemmis, 1986, p. 156). As we shall elaborate, the critical tradition emphasizes *transformation*.

The Critical Approach to Socialization

As with the functionalist and interpretive paradigms, the critical tradition encompasses several schools of thought including those which derive from Marxism and from the Frankfurt School. Furthermore, as Wexler (1987) observes, "the meaning of critical theory is changing" (p. 100). Nevertheless, two main approaches can be identified in the critical paradigm: one which emphasizes reproduction (e.g., Althusser, 1971; Bernstein, 1979; Bourdieu, 1977; Bowles and Gintis, 1976) and another which emphasizes production (e.g., Giroux, 1981, 1983; Willis, 1977). We want to present a view of the critical paradigm which acknowledges both production *and* reproduction, agency *and* structure. Weiler (1988) summarizes the concerns of such a position in her own conclusions about critical educational theory:

It is important to acknowledge the intended role of schools as apparatuses of social reproduction and sites of cultural reproduction at a high level of theoretical abstraction; we need to keep in mind the relationship of schools to the wider society and to recognize the realities of class and gender [and race] relationships in terms of power and control. But at the same time, the acts of resistance, negotiation, and contestation of individuals in the production of meaning and culture must also be recognized. (p. 24)

"People must be considered as both the creators and the products of the social situations in which they live" (Bolster, 1983, p. 303). Burrell and Morgan (1979) characterize what we refer to as the critical paradigm (which they refer to as "radical humanism") as concerned with totality, consciousness, alienation, and critique. A central purpose of critical approaches is bringing to consciousness the ability to criticize what is taken for granted about everyday life. Class, gender, and race relations become key foci, given the historical and contemporary alienation of particular groups. A vital concern of those operating within the critical paradigm is social transformation aimed at increasing justice, equality, freedom, and human dignity. Reality is viewed as socially created and sustained. Research which professes to be critical must be ideally participatory and collaborative. Underlying the critical paradigm is a reflexivity not found in the other paradigms, particularly as Gouldner (1976) says, "when at its best," it

eschews all temptations to claims of moral elitism and superiority, as well as all posturings of innocence. It never imagines--when at its best--that its own self-understanding can be taken at face value, or that its commitments are lacking in ambiguities or even contradictions. . . . Affirming human emancipation as a goal, it never allows itself to intimate--when at its best--that it itself has already achieved that emancipation and never allows itself to forget that it, too, possesses a repressive potential. . . . Knowing it will win no easy victories, relying upon its continual work and

struggle, . . . critical theory seeks to understand itself as well as serving the world, and its suspects--as self-serving and sycophantic--all offered conceptions of itself that bring it no painful surprises. When it is at its best. (pp. 293-4)

In the functionalist and interpretive traditions, we found it relatively straightforward to trace clear links between the teacher and occupational socialization literature and the intellectual paradigms from which they emerged. The same is not true in the critical tradition. One reason for the difficulty we encountered is that the term "socialization" arose out of the very positivism which critical theorists reject. Wexler's (1987) "deconstruction" of the term illustrates the problem:

The category of socialization affirms the powerlessness of the individual against a reified collectivity, a system which purportedly reproduces itself. . . . The concept of socialization surrenders in advance the capacity for collective appropriation and transformation, to a system view, in which individuals are merely structural supports. (p. 100)

Critical theorists tend to relate the term to its functionalist origins and hence reject it. However, as we have seen with the interpretive paradigm, alternative conceptions of socialization exist and still others are possible. Part of our aim is to present a reconception of socialization and to demonstrate that it warrants closer intellectual treatment by those who profess a concern for critical educational theory and practice.

Turning to the occupational socialization literature, we find no exemplary critical study of medical students to contrast with Merton et al.'s (1957) and Becker et al.'s (1961) work. However, many studies have been conducted that address power relations in medical school. One example is Shapiro's (1978) *Getting Doctored: Critical Reflections on Becoming a Physician*. Drawing on Marx's theory of alienation and Fromm's writings on authoritarianism, Shapiro traces socialization from acceptance into medical school to work on hospital wards. He argues that alienation and authoritarianism are rooted in an oppressive social order and that change in medicine "can only come as part of a more general transformation of society itself" (p. 205).

More generally in the occupational socialization literature, we find attention to the fact that until recently the sociology of occupations has been a sociology of *men's* occupations. Thus recent research tends to focus on the experiences of women (e.g., McNeil's, 1987, *Gender and Expertise*) and to highlight class, gender, and race relations as elements in the formation of work relations.

A critical approach to teacher socialization would also address these elements. For example, when we recognize that teaching is largely women's work (Apple, 1987; Mattingly, 1987), gender issues cannot be neglected. One reason which might account for such neglect by researchers in the other paradigms, is that they tend to focus on "the event" rather than viewing socialization as located in a

broader history. One does not have to look at too many events, or cycles of history (Braudel, 1980), to see that teacher socialization is a process in which men (teacher educators, school principals, administrators) exercise power over women, and that teacher socialization research is an enterprise traditionally designed and conducted *by* men, *on* women.

Few empirical studies of teacher socialization can be located within the critical paradigm. Ginsburg's (1988) work best exemplifies the approach we have articulated. He conducted a one-year ethnographic study of preservice teacher socialization, "the process of formally preparing to become a teacher" (Ginsburg, 1988, p. 1). The study was contextualized by addressing the historical development of teacher education in the United States, as well as the development of the specific teacher education program which provided the site for the study. Employing the concept of contradiction, Ginsburg tied the specific experiences of individuals to class, race, and gender relations within society and within education. His transformative intent is made explicit in the concluding chapter of his book which is titled "What Is to Be Done? Critical Praxis by Educators of Teachers."

As we proceed with our review of the teacher socialization literature, we encourage readers to consider the research reported here in light of the preceding analysis. Identification of the intellectual traditions from which particular lines of research have arisen will facilitate understanding of the questions that have been asked, the methodologies that have been employed and the results that have been presented. The following analysis of the teacher socialization literature will be organized around stages of teachers' careers. Specifically, we will review influences on teacher socialization (a) prior to formal teacher education, (b) during preservice teacher education, and (c) during the inservice years of teaching. Within that framework we will address three layers of social context: interactive, institutional, and cultural works published in English from a number of countries (Australia, Canada, United Kingdom, and United States) will be included in this analysis. We will discuss problems of generalizing across countries later.

Our discussion of the extant literature will be critical and analytic rather than merely descriptive. We want to assess the degree to which particular generalizations are supported by empirical evidence, the ways in which certain commonsense generalizations may need to be modified in light of the empirical evidence now available, and to identify alternative explanations of the same event that are plausible given the current state of our knowledge. We also will identify areas where further research is needed. Following our analysis of the literature, a final section will summarize that which has been concluded about the extant empirical literature and will highlight central issues and concerns in teacher socialization research and their "implications" for practice in teacher education.

The Teacher Socialization Literature

Influences on Teacher Socialization Prior to Formal Teacher Education

Given the widely accepted view that students come to any learning situation with previously constructed ideas, knowledge, and beliefs and with certain capabilities acquired through prior experience that affect the way in which they will interpret and make use of new information (e.g., Posner, Strike, Hewson, and Gertzog, 1982), it is not surprising that teacher socialization research has paid considerable attention to influences on teacher learning that predate entry into a formal program of teacher education. Dan Lortie (1975) argued in his highly influential work on the sociology of teaching, *Schoolteacher*, that students' predispositions stand at the core of becoming a teacher, exerting a much more powerful socializing influence than either preservice training or later socialization in the workplace. The apparent persistence of particular forms of pedagogy over time (e.g., see Cuban, 1984; Sirotnik, 1983) is frequently explained by the failure of school reform initiatives, staff development, or preservice teacher education to alter the predispositions of teachers.

There have been several major explanations available in the literature of pretraining influences on teacher socialization. Feiman-Nemser (1983) summarizes the arguments related to three of the most prevalent explanations of these influences. First, Stephens (1967) proposes an "evolutionary" theory to account for the socialization of teachers and emphasizes the role of primitive spontaneous pedagogical tendencies in explaining at least some of the reasons why teachers act as they do. According to this view:

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

In addition to these spontaneous communicative tendencies, Stephens (1967) also discusses the role of spontaneous manipulative tendencies in determining teaching practices. Here the focus is on a set of playful tendencies which have little immediate utility, but which over time have had tremendous survival value for the human race (e.g., making marks on rocks, playing with echoes). Stephens's theory of spontaneous schooling and his evolutionary account of teacher socialization stress those common aspects of teaching practice which exist apart from the deliberate rational actions of teachers or the specific contextual conditions in particular schools and communities. According to this view, teachers bring to teacher education a set of predispositions which are present in all individuals in varying degrees. Although Stephens' work has been largely ignored by scholars of teacher socialization, he presents a convincing case that at least some aspects of teaching cut across individuals and contexts.

A second position outlined by Feiman-Nemser (1983) is the psychoanalytic explanation found in the work of Wright (1959) and Wright and Tuska (1967, 1968). This line of work suggests that teacher socialization is affected to a considerable extent by the quality of relationships teachers have as children with important adults (e.g., mother, father, teachers) and that becoming a teacher is to some extent a process (sometimes unconscious and sometimes deliberate) of trying to become like significant others in one's childhood or trying to replicate early childhood relationships. According to this view, early relationships with significant others are the prototypes of subsequent relationships throughout life and the kind of teachers education students become is governed by the effects of this early childhood heritage on their personalities (Wright and Tuska, 1967).

These studies offer empirical data in support of this "childhood romance theory of teacher development" including statements written by teachers which illustrate the significance of conscious identification with a teacher during childhood (Wright, 1959). Although recent teacher socialization research has not explicitly pursued the psychoanalytic orientation of Wright and his colleagues, there are several very striking examples in recent studies of the effects of early childhood relationships on teacher practices.

One vivid example of this influence is found in Knowles's (1988a) case study of Cynthia, a student teacher who experienced failure in a graduate teacher education program. Here a number of learned behaviors that were important for Cynthia's survival at home during childhood (e.g., being quiet-spoken and unassertive) were also important for explaining her student teaching failure in a junior high school. Connell (1985) also provides evidence of teachers reproducing parent-child relationships experienced in their own childhood in their interactions with children.

A third viewpoint on the role of pretraining influences on the socialization of teachers emphasizes the influence of the thousands of hours spent by teachers as pupils in what Lortie (1975) refers to as an "apprenticeship of observation." According to this view, teacher socialization occurs largely through the internalization of teaching models during the time spent as pupils in close contact with teachers. According to Lortie, the activation of this latent culture during formal training and later school experience is a major influence in shaping teachers' conceptions of the teaching role and role performance. Formal teacher education is viewed as having little impact in altering the cumulative effects of this anticipatory socialization.

Lortie's (1975) argument is based, in part, on several studies where teachers attested to the tangential role of their formal training and where they frequently referred to the continuing influence of their earlier mentors. Recent work has shown that student teachers and teachers do indeed draw upon models provided by teachers experienced during the "apprenticeship of observation." These experiences provide them with both positive and negative role models. For example, Colleen, a secondary student teacher in a graduate teacher education program (Crow, 1987), discusses the continuing positive

influence of her 7th grade English teacher:

Miss Smoot, a 7th grade English teacher. She was extremely knowledgeable about literature and grammar. She stimulated me to want to know more. . . . I wanted to read and read and understand . . . she was always an English teacher and we [the class] all liked it . . . she had quite an influence on me. . . . I definitely will use a lot of different things like she did. (Crow, 1987, p. 10)

On the other hand, Ross (1987) cites several cases where previous teachers served as negative role models for secondary social studies teacher education students. For example:

To tell you the truth, some of the worst teachers I had were my history teachers in high school. They were the most boring teachers I ever had. Everything came straight from the book. . . . It was just so dull. They just basically said "turn to chapter eight, read section one, answer the questions at the end." I don't want to be like that. (Ross, 1987, p. 234)

Closely related to the influence of positive and negative role models provided by former teachers are cases where prospective teachers and teachers focus more directly on their own learning as pupils and deliberately seek to create in their own teaching those conditions that were missing from their own education. For example, Jack, a teacher in an action research seminar at the Horace Mann Institute, recalls:

When I think back to my own experience in school, I remember that I was a retarded reader. I was retained in the first grade. The reason--reading handicap. I could never understand how a teacher could do it to a first grader. I was injured. In the fourth grade, I suddenly caught up and saw the light. I did it on my own. No one handled me and my problem on an individual basis. As far as they were concerned, I could sink or swim. When I chose teaching for a profession, I guess the strongest point in its favor was that I wanted to do for children things that were not done for me. This is the sort of thing that inspires me in my educational work. (Shumsky, 1958, p. 75)

Ross (1987) argues that this process of modeling former teachers is a highly selective and deliberate process whereby student teachers and teachers pick and choose the various attributes and practices they observed as pupils and synthesize them into the model they would like to become. Although the teacher socialization literature tends to support this view of modeling as selective rather than as a global process (LeCompte and Ginsburg, 1987; Zeichner, 1979), this position does not account for any of the more subtle influences that prior school experience and former teachers may have had on individuals. The case study of the elementary teacher Rachel (Zeichner, Tabachnick, and Densmore, 1987) clearly illustrates how deeply ingrained and partly unconscious feelings and

dispositions developed as a pupil (in this case, regarding issues of authority) exert a continuing influence on teacher activity.

These three explanations of pretraining influences on teacher socialization (evolutionary, psychoanalytic, and apprenticeship of observation) have been discussed in the literature for many years. Recent work has expanded upon and/or elaborated these original explanations and has brought into focus other pretraining influences that have received little attention by researchers. For example, as a result of changing demographics in U.S. teacher education institutions, many "nontraditional" students are now entering teacher education programs. At least some of these students now coming into teacher education have had previous teaching or other work experience and/or experience in parenting. Even many of the so-called traditional teacher education students come to teacher education with prior experience in such activities as camp counseling, babysitting, teaching Sunday school, and so forth (Lanier and Little, 1986). To date, only a few studies have explored the influence of these kinds of experiences on teaching conceptions and practices (e.g., Bullough, 1989; Crow, 1987; Feiman-Nemser and Buchmann, 1986). Much more attention needs to be given to this issue in the future.

The use of various "life history" methodologies offers much promise for capturing the socializing influence of the full range of life experiences or "architecture of self" (Pinar, 1986) that individuals bring to teacher education programs and teaching (Goodson, 1980/81; Woods, 1987). In recent years studies in a number of different countries (but especially in Canada) have employed a variety of biographical, autobiographical, and life history methodologies to understand the development of teachers' knowledge. These include the use of autobiography (Grumet, 1980; Pinar, 1986), "collaborative autobiography" (Butt and Raymond, in press; Butt, Raymond and Yamagishi, 1988), "narrative inquiry" (Connelly and Clandinin, 1987), "repertory grid" techniques (Ingvarson and Greenway, 1984), "diary interviews" (Burgess, 1988), and the combined use of biographical and ethnographic methods in the same study (Raymond and Surprenant, 1988). These interpretive and critical studies have begun to provide us with rich information about the ways in which teachers' perspectives are rooted in the variety of personal, familial, religious, political, and cultural experiences that they bring to teaching (also see Casey, 1988; Knowles, in press).

One aspect of what students bring to teacher education programs (and teachers to teaching) that has received very little attention until recently is knowledge of and about subject matter and the teaching of subject matter and one's affective dispositions toward subject matter. Following Lee Shulman's (1986) influential critique of the absence of subject matter in studies of teaching and learning to teach, at least two groups of researchers have begun to focus on the subject matter knowledge and disciplinary perspectives of teachers as factors in the teacher socialization process. One group of researchers at the National Center for Research on Teacher Education plans in the future to track the continuing influence of subject matter knowledge on socialization into teaching (Ball and McDiarmid, 1987). To date, only

the entering conceptions of preservice teachers have been reported by this research group (e.g., Ball, 1988; Gomez, 1988; Neufeld, 1988).

The Knowledge Growth in a Profession Project at Stanford has also reported work on the subject matter conceptions and intellectual histories of preservice teachers. This research group has already been able to document the continuing influence of subject matter knowledge on teaching conceptions and teacher behavior (e.g., Ringstaff and Haymore, 1987; Wilson and Shulman, 1987; Wilson and Wineburg, 1988). Grossman (1987), for example, demonstrates how both the depth and character of a beginning English teacher's subject matter knowledge influenced her classroom teaching. Although more attention to the issue of subject matter is clearly warranted, there are also other conceptions that students bring to teacher education programs that need to be addressed. For example, researchers have suggested that prospective teachers' entering expectations regarding teacher education (Book, Byers, and Freeman, 1983) and their conceptions of the process of learning to teach (Amarel and Feiman-Nemser, 1988) may be important keys to understanding the socializing influence of subject matter knowledge, prior teaching experiences, and whatever else students bring to teacher education programs.

Several researchers have also shown that the nature of an individual's commitment to teaching as a career may be important to consider. Studies conducted by Anderson (1974) and Lacey (1977) revealed two broad orientations or types of commitment to teaching (professional and radical) that emerge early in the period of anticipatory socialization and that can be traced through the training period into the early years of teaching. This research suggests that there are distinct patterns of socialization experienced by individuals committed to a career as a classroom teacher (professional) and by those committed primarily to a set of ideals which may be realized in or outside of the classroom (radical).

One major problem with almost all of the research that has focused on the role of pretraining influences on teacher socialization (functionalist and interpretive) is that they have focused almost exclusively on the *individual* characteristics, conceptions, skills, and dispositions that students bring to teacher education programs and have ignored the *collective* aspects of socialization into teaching. Feiman-Nemser and Floden (1986) describe various ways in which the teaching force is segmented. Teachers are not just individuals possessing various knowledge, skills, and dispositions but are also gendered subjects who are members of particular generations, races, social class groups, and who teach particular subjects at specific levels in the system of schooling. Almost none of the existing research on teacher socialization has taken into account *patterns* of socialization into teaching that are related to the characteristics that segment the occupational group.

One area that has received at least some attention in relation to the collective aspects of teacher socialization is gender. Several researchers have focused on the influence of traditional and atypical socialization and gender identification patterns for both males and females on teaching conceptions and

practices (e.g., Barrows, 1978; Freedman, Jackson, and Boles, 1986; Goodman, 1988; McCarthy, 1986). In the example of Cynthia cited earlier, the fact that Cynthia was female was of no small consequence in her being taught to be unassertive and unassuming. Knowles (1988a), however, focuses exclusively on Cynthia's individual life history and ignores the role of gender in shaping that history. It is very clear that race, class, and gender, in particular, are related to different life chances and educational outcomes for individuals (e.g., Delone, 1979; Weis, 1988). These issues need to receive much more attention in explanations of teacher socialization.

One way to approach this issue is to do comparative studies of different *groups* of prospective teachers, each of which shares some collective attribute. For example, studies could be conducted on differences in socialization experienced by groups of male and female teachers, elementary and secondary teachers, teachers who teach different subjects, and on teachers who have different social class backgrounds. Cross-national studies could also be conducted on how the socialization process differs for particular groups of teachers across national and cultural boundaries. The socialization of minority teachers is another area that has been totally neglected in the literature to date.

Another "group characteristic" that warrants particular attention is the notion of subject subculture. Consistent with Bernstein's (1971) argument that induction in a subject is also induction into a subject culture or community that represents particular assumptions about knowledge and the nature of teaching and learning, both Lacey (1977) and Yaakobi and Sharan (1985) have identified distinct differences in teachers' theories of knowledge, beliefs, practices and, in Lacey's case, in patterns of socialization into teaching, that are related to particular academic disciplines. Although the notion of subject subculture does not give enough weight to variations within subjects (Ball and Lacey, 1980) or to how beliefs about subjects and within subject areas change over time (Goodson, 1983), this area has been identified as one of the key determinants of teacher actions (Hargreaves, 1988). Distinct patterns of socialization into teaching have also been identified for primary and secondary teachers (Gibson, 1972).

In summary, the key role of pretraining influences in understanding the socialization of teachers has been stressed for many years now. Studies in several countries have documented the continuing influence of teachers' predispositions during their training and into later school experience. Examples of these include studies conducted by Hogben and Petty (1979a, 1979b), Hogben and Lawson (1983, 1984) and Petty and Hogben (1980), in Australia; by Mardle and Walker (1980) and Hanson and Herrington (1976), in the United Kingdom; and by Zeichner and Grant (1981), Zeichner, Tabachnick and Densmore (1987), Crow (1987, 1988), Ross (1987, 1988), Knowles (1988a, 1988b), Hollingsworth (in press), and Ginsburg (1988) in the United States.

Early studies that stressed the role of these formative experiences in the socialization process (e.g., Lortie, 1975) were largely functionalist and adopted a very deterministic view of the process of

influence. In the minds of many, little could be done to overcome the powerful effects of prior experience. Most recent work, however, has stressed a more interactive view of the socialization process where formative experiences exert some influence but do not totally determine socialization "outcomes" (e.g., Hollingsworth, in press; Ross, 1988; Zeichner, Tabachnick, and Densmore, 1987). The level at which the analysis of data is conducted is particularly crucial in this regard. When the focus is on central tendencies in groups of individuals, little change in predispositions is noted. This approach, however, masks a great deal of individual variation which can be detected when the development of specific individuals is traced (Hogben and Lawson, 1984; Lacey, 1977; Pearson, 1987; Power, 1981). The shift from a deterministic to a more interactive view of the role of formative experiences in teacher socialization is a consequence, in part, of changes in data collection and analysis procedures employed by researchers which are in turn related to the increasing influence of the interpretive tradition in guiding teacher socialization research.

Crow (1987) and Knowles (1988b) have proposed a "Biographical Transformation Model" to explain the processes by which formative experiences are modified and are effectively enacted in teachers' practices. This model seeks to show the linkages between early childhood experiences with significant others, "teacher role identity" (a construct used to depict entering conceptions and dispositions), and subsequent actions in the classroom. Although Knowles (1988a) cites some theoretical support for this model in his own study of Cynthia and in studies conducted by Crow (1987) and Bullough (1987), he also admits that the model is still largely speculative at this point. The work of Nias (1986), Spencer (1986), Sikes, Measor, and Woods (1985), and the Canadian work using "life course methodologies" (e.g., Butt and Raymond, in press) suggests that Knowles' focus on "teacher role identity" may provide too narrow a lens for viewing what teachers bring to teacher education and the development of teachers over time. This work suggests the need for a much broader focus on a teacher's personal identity and on teacher role identity as one component of self-identity.

And, as previously noted, this focus on what *individuals* bring to teacher education, whether narrowly or more broadly defined, ignores the collective character of how teachers are socialized into their ideas. Jordell (1987) argues that the role of formative life experiences in the teacher socialization process diminishes as time goes on and individuals experience teacher education programs and careers in schools. Nias (1986) has shown, in contrast, that teachers continue to draw on their personal experiences as pupils even after up to nine years of teaching experience. This difference in perspective regarding the longevity of pretraining influences forces consideration of the role of formal teacher education and later work experience on teacher socialization.

The Socialization Role of Preservice Teacher Education

There are three major components in preservice teacher education programs which can

potentially exert influence on the socialization of teachers: (a) general education and academic specialization courses completed outside schools, departments, and colleges of education; (b) methods and foundations courses usually completed within education units; and (c) field-based experiences usually carried out in elementary and secondary school classrooms. In addition to the influence of these specific elements of programs, there are also the effects that stem from participation in the general life of the college or university in which the teacher education program is housed.

During the last three decades, a very substantial literature has emerged that focuses on the effects of colleges and universities on the cognitive, moral, political, and affective development of students. These studies have consistently shown a clear link between college attendance and a general liberalization of personality and values; increases in the sophistication with which students reason about moral issues; and increases in verbal, mathematical, and general knowledge, and various measures of cognitive development such as intellectual flexibility and reflective judgement (Feldman and Newcomb, 1969; Nucci and Pascarella, 1987; Pascarella, 1985). Despite these changes which have been identified for college students in general, this literature is also very clear that not all students change in the same ways after they enter college. Astin's (1977) study of 200,000 students over a 10-year period for example, identified several factors which mediate the socializing impact of the college on students. These included a student's age, gender, race, ability (as measured by college admissions tests), social class background, religious background, and the degree to which he or she actively participated in the life of the institution (also see Anderson, 1988). Very little attention has been paid by researchers to these issues in relation to the problem of teacher socialization.

The literature also suggests that at least some of the variation that exists in socializing experiences among students is a result of differences in the institutional environments of colleges and universities. Clark and Marker (1975) argue that these institutional differences are the major source of variation among teacher education programs:

Given the range of institutional settings, it is simply not reasonable to argue that one finds a common teacher education program wherever one looks. Institutional climates vary markedly and these variances affect the nature of the student population, the expectations held for student productivity, the background and activities of the faculty and the availability of physical and cultural resources. Such variances are not to be dismissed lightly. They affect all aspects of the relationship between the institution and its students, including the professional preparation of students in teacher training. Thus the critical variance in teacher education programs among institutions is perhaps more a function of variance by institutional types than by a systematic variance attributable to professional training itself. . . . Similarity in course structure does not mean identical content of instruction within courses. (pp. 58-59)

Studies of teacher socialization have rarely taken into account the character and quality of the

institutions in which teacher education programs exist. At most, we may be told the size (e.g., large), funding source (e.g., state) and geographical location (e.g., Midwest) of an institution, but little more. Even those who have carefully described the goals and priorities of teacher education programs that are under study (e.g., Feiman-Nemser and Buchmann, 1986; Ginsburg, 1988; and Hollingsworth, in press) have paid little attention to the intellectual, social, and political character of institutions. Studies on undergraduate education (e.g., Nucci and Pascarella, 1987; Pascarella, 1985) have suggested several different dimensions of institutions that could be taken into account by teacher socialization researchers such as the frequency of student-faculty interactions, the degree of curricular flexibility, and an intellectually challenging academic program, and strong cultural facilities. Because of the evidence suggesting a number of distinguishable subenvironments in any institution (Lacy, 1978) and the mediation of institutional effects by a variety of individual characteristics such as gender (Anderson, 1988), it is important for teacher education researchers to incorporate "institutions" into future studies by examining the different institutional environments that exist for particular students and groups of students under study. Although Clark and Marker (1975) are correct in asserting that the character and quality of teacher education institutions need to be taken into account in attempts to assess the impact of teacher education programs, to do so at the level of the global campus environment may be unproductive (see Pascarella, 1985, p. 23).

Despite many recent reports which have addressed the quality of undergraduate education in the United States (e.g., Boyer, 1987; U.S. Department of Education, 1984), there is a clear lack of empirical data about the impact of particular academic courses on students (Tom, 1987; Trow, 1987). Furthermore, although claims have been repeatedly made regarding the need to increase the period of time that prospective teachers spend in subject matter preparation, there is very little empirical evidence about how the amount of course work in academic subjects contributes to teacher effectiveness (Ashton and Crocker, 1987). Generally, this whole area regarding the socializing impact of specific academic courses and patterns of academic preparation is in need of further exploration. Both the Knowledge Growth in Teaching Project at Stanford (Grossman, 1987) and the National Center for Research on Teacher Education (Zeichner, 1988) are currently involved in attempts to assess the contribution of particular kinds of academic preparation and course work on how teachers learn to teach particular subjects.

When we examine the socializing role of the professional component of preservice teacher education programs, we need to distinguish between campus-based and field-based elements because they represent different and often competing notions of the process of learning to teach (Feiman-Nemser, 1983). First, with regard to the methods and foundations courses, there is much evidence that the knowledge, skills, and dispositions introduced to students in these courses have little influence on the subsequent actions of students even during initial training (Grant, 1981; Hodges, 1982;

Katz and Raths, 1982). There is very strong evidence, for example, that when attempts are made to train prospective teachers in the performance of specific teaching skills through microteaching and other systematic procedures, the continued use of the skills by prospective teachers outside of the laboratory is highly dependent upon whether the ecological conditions in specific classrooms are conducive to the use of the skills. Copeland's (1980) work suggests that the impact of education courses cannot be assessed apart from these ecological conditions. Students come into these courses with very low expectations about what can be learned from professional courses about teaching (Book, Byers, and Freeman, 1983) and typically evaluate the contribution of these courses to their professional development as minimal after the courses are completed (Yamamoto et al., 1969).

Consistent with Mardle and Walker's (1980) thesis that teacher education courses do little to alter and in all probability confirm and reinforce what students bring with them, many researchers have concluded that teacher education has a weak impact on at least some of the values, beliefs, and attitudes that students bring with them into their teacher education programs (Britzman, 1986; Bullough, 1989; Connell, 1985; Crow, 1987; Ginsburg and Newman, 1985; Knowles, 1988a; Ross, 1987).

Several explanations are offered in the literature for the apparent low impact of preservice teacher education courses on the socialization of students into teaching. First, there is the argument that formal teacher education is impotent because of the strong and enduring effects of the kinds of pretraining influences discussed earlier. Crow (1988), for example, documented how the teacher role identities brought into teacher education programs were still the major driving forces for two teachers after three years of teaching. Closely related to this argument is the position that the impact of preservice teacher education is diffused because of the segmentation that exists within teacher education programs and the mixed messages that are sent to students as a result (Atkinson and Delamont, 1985).

As case studies of students moving through teacher education programs have begun to accumulate in recent years, it has become more and more common to find examples of students interpreting the messages of teacher education courses in ways that reinforce the perspectives and dispositions that they bring to the program even when these interpretations involve a distortion of the intentions of teacher educators. One very striking example of this process is found in Feiman-Nemser and Buchmann's (1986) case study of Janice. In this example, Janice construes a critique, posed in one of her course readings, of the unequal distribution of knowledge according to social class as an argument for the way things ought to be. Other examples of this inversion process can be found in Ginsburg's (1988) studies.

Various challenges have been raised regarding this commonly accepted view that professional education courses have little impact on teacher education students. Recent studies of teacher education students, for example, have shown that students attribute worth and influence to their professional education courses (Grossman and Richert, 1988; Zeichner, 1988). Recent studies have also shown that

it makes little sense to talk about the socializing influence of teacher education courses without accounting for the particular focus of the courses in relation to the perspectives that students bring to the courses. Hollingsworth (in press), Crow and Kauchak (1988), Ball and Noordhoff (1985) each provide examples of cases where there is a varied response to the same teacher education program by different individuals.

Also, teacher education programs are not all alike. Several attempts have been made to describe the diversity of approaches that exist (Feiman-Nemser, in press; Hartnett and Naish, 1980; Kirk, 1986; Zeichner, 1983a). Several recent studies have shown that the particular focus of the professional education component of a program is related to the occurrence of certain kinds of changes in students. Grossman and Richert's (1988) study of knowledge growth in two teacher education programs, for example, shows that one program's focus on subject matter was related to particular kinds of changes in secondary teacher education students' conceptions of subject matter. These changes were not present for the students who participated in a teacher education program which emphasized things other than subject matter.

Other researchers have begun to identify certain key elements in courses or in the relationship between courses and students' latent perspectives that seem to enhance the socializing impact of professional education courses. Ball and Noordhoff (1985), Hollingsworth (in press) and Goodman and Adler (1985) spell out some of these key elements. Hollingsworth (in press) concludes in a study of 14 preservice teachers in one fifth-year preservice program, that some teacher education factors were more effective than others in preparing the preservice teachers to manage classrooms, teach reading, and understand student learning. She argues for example, that matched pairings of like-minded cooperating teachers and student teachers (a common practice in the United States) actually hinders knowledge growth and that exposing students to contrasting viewpoints is more helpful in clarifying the complex aspects of classroom life when also accompanied by "an expectation and support for preservice teachers to try out their own and program-related ideas" (p. 27).

Another challenge to the position that professional education courses have a weak socializing impact on students comes from those who consider the hidden curriculum of these courses. Ginsburg and Clift (in press), for example, describe how the hidden curriculum in teacher education sends messages to students concerning such issues as teachers as an occupational group (their status and power), the theory and practice of teaching, the nature of the curriculum and the teacher's role in making curriculum decisions and in relation to inequalities in society, and the role of the school in relation to these inequalities. They argue that the hidden curriculum constitutes the core of teacher socialization.

Ginsburg and Clift (in press) identify certain dominant messages that teacher education programs send to students. They also recognize, however, that contradictory messages also exist within

programs and the possibility of various possible responses by students to any messages sent through the hidden curriculum. (Also, see Ginsburg, 1988).

The studies of Dale (1977a, 1977b) and Bartholomew (1976) in the United Kingdom are representative of the work in this area. Dale (1977a,b) conducted a content analysis of "typical" British courses on the psychological, sociological, and philosophical foundations of education and concluded that initial teacher training fosters a cognitive style of "liberal individualism" which predisposes prospective teachers to see the world in particular ways, to become conscious of it having particular properties and possibilities and to reject or never recognize other properties or possibilities. Dale (1977a) specifically argues that this cognitive style directs teachers to seek the source of their problems in individuals (e.g., pupils) and not in the institutions in which they work.

Bartholomew (1976) analyzes other aspects of the hidden curriculum of preservice teacher preparation (the pedagogical practices and social relations in programs and the social organization of programs) and concludes that, despite the fact that teacher education programs encourage students to use liberal phrases and to affirm liberal slogans in places other than the university, the facts of socialization within the university (e.g., the separation of theory and practice) encourage the development of "objectivist" conceptions of knowledge, fragmented views of curriculum, and views of learners as passive recipients of officially approved knowledge. According to Bartholomew (1976) and others such as Giroux (1980), Popkewitz (1985), and Ginsburg (1988), the real impact of preservice preparation lies in these images of teacher, learner, knowledge, and curriculum which are subtly communicated to prospective teachers through the covert processes of the hidden curriculum of teacher education programs. Thus, despite the existence of many studies which suggest that teacher education courses have a low socializing impact, one must be cautious in accepting their findings.

Generally, arguments related to the impact of the hidden curriculum of preservice teacher education programs have been offered on logical and theoretical grounds with very little supporting empirical evidence. With the exception of Ginsburg's studies on the development of teacher perspectives toward professionalism (e.g., Ginsburg, 1988; Ginsburg and Newman, 1985) and the evidence provided by Connell (1985) of the psychologisation of social relations by teachers, we do not have very strong empirical evidence which confirms that teachers actually incorporate elements into their perspectives in ways consistent with the theoretical arguments. In fact, we know very little about what goes on inside teacher education courses at all beyond what students or faculty tell us or what foundation-sponsored studies report on the basis of the same sort of secondhand reports (Zeichner, 1988). Clearly more direct study of the formal and hidden curriculum of teacher education courses and of the ways in which the messages of these courses are received and interpreted by students is needed.

Another aspect of preservice teacher preparation which has received much attention in the literature in relation to the issue of teacher socialization is the field experience or practicum component.

Those who have analyzed the empirical literature have consistently characterized the knowledge base related to the socializing impact of these experiences as weak and ambiguous (Griffin, 1983; McIntyre, 1983; Watts, 1987; Zeichner, 1980). Today, despite the existence of numerous individual studies which have suggested specific effects of field experiences on the development of teachers, there continues to be a great deal of debate about the actual role they play. Generally, with few exceptions (e.g., Tabachnick, 1980), studies on the socializing role of field experiences have not attended to the quality or substance of these experiences which often differ from program intentions (Calderhead, 1988a) and have not identified the particular kinds of field programs and components within programs (e.g., characteristics of placement sites) which are related to different socialization outcomes for different students. Circumstances in individual schools influenced the experiences of students on Introductory School Experience (pre-student teaching practicums) and the impressions they developed or had confirmed about the nature of teaching--the extent to which school policy required teachers to follow the textbook, for example, as opposed to providing freedom to construct or amend the curriculum, or the extent to which other classrooms in the school were accessible, or the level of collegiality and discussion that was evident amongst teachers affected the nature of the learning experience for student teachers (Calderhead, 1988b).

Recent studies have suggested several factors that serve as obstacles to teacher learning during field experiences such as the norms regarding the process of learning to teach that exist in many placement settings (e.g., see Ball and Noordhoff, 1985; Calderhead, 1988b; Feiman-Nemser and Buchmann, 1987; Koehler, 1988). More studies are needed which attend to the complex set of interactions that exist among program features, dimensions of school contexts and individual classrooms as settings for learning to teach, and the characteristics and dispositions that individual students bring to the experience. The currently dominant practice of attempting to explain the socializing role of field experiences *in general* has not been very productive to date, nor is it likely to become more so in the future (Zeichner, 1986a).

In summary, the question of the socializing impact of preservice teacher education programs has several dimensions. Studies of the influence of the formal curriculum of programs suggest that preservice programs are not very powerful interventions. In contrast, studies of the influence of the hidden curriculum of programs suggest, with little supporting empirical evidence, that the impact of preservice preparation may be far greater than has been thought. Studies of field-based experiences indicate that these experiences have differential effects on teachers, but we are only beginning to gain an understanding of the specific factors that affect the course of teacher learning. Finally, research on undergraduate education has begun to illuminate some of the consequences of attending a college or university on the cognitive, moral, affective, and political development of students, but we still know very little about how the character and quality of particular kinds of institutions and of various

subenvironments within institutions affect student development in general and in particular, the development of teachers. There is a critical need for more empirical work regarding the impact of both academic and professional courses on students. To date there has been very little direct study of specific courses and their impact on prospective teachers.

Socialization in the Workplace and Culture

Pollard's (1982) conceptual model describing three levels of social contextualization is helpful in understanding the socializing influence of the workplace subsequent to preservice preparation. According to Pollard, teachers' actions represent active and creative responses to the constraints, opportunities, and dilemmas posed by the immediate contexts of the classroom and the school, and it is through these immediate contexts that the wider structure of the community, society, and the state have their impact on teachers. At the *interactive* level within the classroom, Pollard (1982) describes several different kinds of influences on teachers. Two of these influences, the socializing role of pupils and the influence of the ecology of the classroom, will be considered here.

First, the position emphasizing the significant role of pupils on the socialization of teachers is supported both on logical grounds and by empirical evidence. Haller (1967) and Doyle (1979) argue, for example, that the important role of pupils in teacher socialization is understandable given the typical isolation of teachers from their colleagues and supervisors and given the transitory and invisible nature of the learning process. These and other "logical" explanations of the importance of pupils in the occupational socialization of teachers are consistent with now widely accepted bidirectional models of childhood socialization (e.g., Baumrind, 1980; Drietzl, 1973) and are supported by a substantial number of empirical studies on the nature of classroom influence (e.g., Blase, 1985, 1986; Brophy and Evertson, 1981; McNeil, 1983; Riseborough, 1988). According to Doyle (1979), the influence of students ranges from effects on the general teaching approach and patterns of language that teachers use in classrooms to the type and frequency of specific teaching methods used by teachers. Furthermore, the individual characteristics of both teachers and students seem to affect the ways in which pupils influence teacher development. Larson (1986) argues that the socializing role of pupils becomes increasingly greater as teachers gain experience and become more aware of and concerned with pupils.

As a result of these classroom studies as well as studies on teacher socialization (e.g., Grant and Sleeter, 1985; Hammersley, 1977a, 1977b; Jordell, 1987; Metz, 1988; Tabachnick and Zeichner, 1985), there is little question that classroom influence is reciprocal in nature and that teachers' perceptions of pupils' characteristics, expectations, and behaviors influence the nature of teacher development. Despite this general knowledge, however, we currently have very little understanding of how the specific characteristics of teachers and pupils mediate the processes of teacher socialization. Doyle (1979) argues that pupil effects are just one facet of the larger question of the effects of classrooms on teachers.

Doyle (1977, 1979) and Copeland (1980) have emphasized the role of the ecology of the classroom in teacher socialization. Doyle and Ponder (1975) define the ecological system of the classroom as "that network of interconnected processes and events which impinge upon behavior in the teaching environment" (p. 183). Doyle (1986) has identified six distinctive features of classrooms that he feels are crucial in shaping the course of teacher development: multidimensionality, simultaneity, immediacy, unpredictability, publicness, and history.

Others such as Dreeben (1973), Westbury (1973), Sharp and Green (1975), Dale (1977a, 1977b), Denscombe (1980, 1982), and Connell (1985) all discuss various factors related to the material conditions and social organization of the classroom and how they affect teachers' work. Among these are teacher-pupil ratios, declining levels of resources, and limited time. According to this view of classrooms as ecological environments, learning to teach involves "learning the texture of the classroom and the sets of behaviors congruent with the environmental demands of that setting" (Doyle, 1977, p. 31). The environmental demands posed by current classroom arrangements establish limits on the range of teacher behaviors that can be successful in particular settings and that "successful" teachers must learn a set of coping strategies which are appropriate to particular settings. These classroom conditions, however, not only act as constraints on the actions of teachers, but they also exert positive pressures to act in certain ways. In any case, the actions of teachers, according to Hargreaves (1988), are closely tied to environmental circumstances:

Teachers do not just decide to deploy particular skills because of their recognized professional worth and value, or because of their own confidence and competence in operating them. Rather they make judgments about the fit between particular skills, constraints, demands, and opportunities of the material environment of the classroom; about the appropriateness of particular styles or techniques for present circumstances. (p. 219)

Although there seems to be little doubt at present that the characteristics of the classroom need to be closely examined in any attempt to understand teacher socialization, the analysis cannot remain at the level of the classroom because these ecological conditions are themselves products of policy decisions, political actions, and other influences at levels beyond the classroom. At the *institutional* level of analysis (Pollard, 1982), socializing influences related to schools as workplaces come into focus. Fenstermacher (1980) has argued that teachers' experiences with the institutional characteristics of schools are the most potent determinants of their perspectives toward teaching. In a similar vein Dreeben (1973), Larkin (1973), and Gitlin (1983) have written about how certain organizational properties of schools (e.g., internal spatial arrangements, authority relationships) have implications for the character of teachers' work. Two aspects of school level socializing influences will be considered here: the influence of teaching colleagues and the influence of evaluators.

There is little question that the influence of colleagues needs to be taken into account in attempts to understand teacher socialization despite the existence of an ethos of privacy and individualism within many schools (Denscombe, 1980; Eddy, 1969; Nigris, 1988). Given that teachers in a given school work under generally similar conditions, collegial influence is probably closely tied to the common circumstances that teachers face in the structural characteristics of schools and in the ecological conditions of classrooms. It is also clear, however, as studies by Carew and Lightfoot (1979) and Metz (1978) have shown, that several diverse "teacher cultures" often exist even in a single school and that teachers may often face conflicting pressures by colleagues to influence them.

Edgar and Warren (1969) challenge this view of the strong socializing role of colleagues and argue that colleagues per se and the contextual effects of the workplace are less important in explaining teacher socialization than are the attitudes of significant evaluators, those having power over teachers in terms of their ability potentially to apply organizational sanctions. However, despite the existence of this one study which addressed the socialization of teachers with regard to their perspectives toward autonomy in the teachers' role, the empirical literature does not generally confirm the view that teachers' superordinates contribute substantially to teacher socialization. On the contrary, there is overwhelming evidence that teachers generally receive very little direct assistance and advice from their superiors (Zeichner, 1983b) and that teachers can insulate themselves from at least some of the directives and sanctions of significant evaluators when they choose to do so (Zeichner and Tabachnick, 1985). This is not to say that the classroom is an impregnable sanctuary where teachers are free from administrative influence. The literature does suggest, however, that it is more through the structural imperatives of the job than through the influence of individual administrators that teaching perspectives are developed and maintained over time. Studies conducted by Zeichner and Tabachnick (1985) and by Connell (1985) indicate that there is a great deal of variation both among and within schools in the degree to which significant evaluators influence teachers' work.

At the *cultural* level of analysis (Pollard, 1982), attempts have been made to link the perspectives of individual teachers and groups of teachers as well as the microlevel of the classroom to both the immediate local community of the school and to ideologies, practices, and material conditions at the macrolevel of society (e.g., inequalities in wealth and power). First, drawing on the work of Arfwedson (1979) and his notion of the "local social context," Hatton (1987) challenges the position that it is the classroom context that is the chief socializing influence on teachers. She presents data from a study conducted in one high-status state primary school in Australia that shows parental power to be a significant determinant of pedagogical practices. According to Arfwedson (1979),

There is no such thing as a common working situation of all teachers. On the contrary, the working conditions of a teacher are strongly linked to the kind of school in which he serves. Consequently, the occupational socialization of teachers varies according to the school conditions which are, in turn, dependent on the local society surrounding the

school. (p. 93)

According to this view, schools that serve high and low socioeconomic populations can be thought of as providing quite distinct working situations for teachers and parents can be seen as exerting either direct or indirect influence on teachers. In high-status schools, the influence is seen to be exerted directly by parents while in low-status schools it is thought to be carried most frequently through the agency of the children as representatives of their families, their social class, and its interests. In any case parental pressure (from the most influential parents in a community) is seen as a basic mechanism for the socialization of teachers into the traditions of a school community. Teachers do not necessarily passively conform to these pressures, but they must take them into account in some way as they go about their work. Since Waller's (1932) seminal analysis which initiated the modern era of teacher socialization research, the local social context or community pressure has repeatedly surfaced in studies of teaching as a salient socializing influence (e.g., Carew and Lightfoot, 1979; Gracey, 1972; McPherson, 1972; Metz, 1978, in press).

Once we move beyond the immediate community of the school to consider forces and influences in the broader society, two main types of analysis can be found. First, those such as Wise (1979), Gitlin (1983), and Apple (1983, 1987) have explored how practices and policy initiatives outside of the school have affected the material resources available to teachers and the character of teachers' work. According to this view teacher actions represent active and creative responses by teachers to constraints and opportunities that are determined externally at a societal level and mediated through institutional structures and processes. Studies have clearly documented how such factors in a society such as the bureaucratization of work, the de-skilling of labor, the social division of labor, and stereotypes and discrimination against women (Ball and Goodson, 1985; Feiman-Nemser and Floden, 1986) have affected the circumstances of teachers' work, although the frequently alleged linkages to the perspectives of individual teachers have not been well documented empirically. Some progress has been made though, in general occupational socialization studies, in understanding how various structural conditions of an occupation (e.g., closeness of supervision, degree of routinization) affect various worker attitudes and dispositions (e.g., intellectual flexibility, self-directedness of orientation; see Kiecolt, 1988). Teacher socialization research could benefit from more attention to this sociological literature.

A second type of analysis of the relationship between cultural forms and teacher socialization has attempted to link the perspectives of individual teachers to forms of meaning and rationality which are dominant in a society. Dale's (1977a, 1977b) arguments related to the development of a cognitive style of "liberal individualism," Giroux's (1980) analysis of the development of a "technocratic rationality," and Popkewitz's (1985) thesis regarding the socializing influence of the professionalization of knowledge and the ideology of professionalism are examples of recent attempts to demonstrate the

effect of "cultural codes" on the development and nurturance of individual teachers' perspectives. As was argued above, however, there is currently very little, if any, empirical evidence available which substantiates these claims and which documents that individual teachers actually incorporate forms of meaning and modes of rationality into their perspectives in ways consistent with the macrolevel theories. In one interesting study involving teachers' interpretations of teacher actions in another culture, Spindler and Spindler (1987) are able to demonstrate the impact of deeply held and culturally determined values and beliefs on teaching perspectives.

Generally, the cultural level of analysis has received the least attention of the three levels in relation to teacher socialization (Atkinson and Delamont, 1985). Although many of the analyses at a macrolevel are very persuasive on logical grounds and although some definite influences have been amply documented regarding the link between the cultural and institutional contexts, there is much work that remains to be done regarding empirical substantiation of theories of the influence of "cultural codes" and the material conditions of a society on the socialization of teachers.

In summary, this analysis of workplace and cultural influences on teacher socialization at three different levels has revealed that there is some evidence in the literature supporting the view that pupils, the ecology of the classroom, colleagues, and institutional characteristics of schools all play significant roles in the socialization of teachers. The specific nature of these influences was described (e.g., the informal and contradictory nature of colleague influence) together with areas where more research is particularly needed. It was also concluded that research has not generally confirmed Edgar Warren's claim that "significant evaluators" play a substantial role in teacher socialization. Finally, it was also concluded that although some evidence has been accumulated related to the socializing influence of various factors in the culture as a whole on the conditions of teachers' work, the links between these cultural factors and the socialization of individual teachers has not been firmly established with the exception of the influence of parents and the local social context.

Discussion

Thus far, we have outlined three intellectual traditions in teacher socialization research as well as several alternative explanations of how teachers are socialized at various points in their careers. Until recently, the study of teacher socialization was dominated by functionalist studies which depicted teachers as either prisoners of their pasts (e.g., of anticipatory socialization during childhood) or as prisoners of the present (e.g., of pressures emanating from the workplace). In the last decade or so since Lacey's (1977) highly influential study in England and the increasing influence of interpretive perspectives in educational research generally, numerous interpretive accounts of teacher socialization have emerged in the United States, United Kingdom, and Australia which portray the socialization process as much more partial and incomplete than did many of the earlier functionalist studies. There is

a growing consensus in the field about the highly interactive nature of the socialization process and about the constant interplay between choice and constraint in the process of learning to teach.

The critical tradition, in contrast, has had very little influence on work in this area. Many of the alleged influences on teacher socialization emanating from the broader society have not been documented in empirical studies and generally the collective aspects of socialization, particularly with regard to the issues of race, social class, and gender, have not received adequate attention by researchers.

Functionalist studies, by focusing on the description of central tendencies in teacher development, fail to illuminate the diversity present in individual stories of teacher development. While the recent shift to interpretive accounts of socialization has resulted in much more attention being given to the unique elements of each teacher's socialization, this research has caused us to lose sight of many of the more collective aspects of the socialization process, of patterns in teacher socialization for particular subgroups of teachers, and of the social and political contexts within which the socialization process occurs (Atkinson and Delamont, 1985). The socialization stories of teachers of a particular gender, and who represent certain social class backgrounds, generations, races, and so forth, and of teachers who teach in particular kinds of settings, will have many things in common despite the unique aspects of each account.

In our view researchers need to pay attention to both uniqueness and commonality in the socialization of teachers. More attention to the collective aspects of socialization and to the kinds of "structural" issues that are raised by studies conducted in the critical tradition could help correct the imbalance that has developed in the literature from an overemphasis on individual stories of socialization and a lack of attention to institutional and cultural contexts in which socialization occurs. More attention needs to be devoted by researchers, in particular, to the ways in which race, social class, and gender mediate the socialization process and establish socialization patterns for particular groups of individuals who teach in particular kinds of schools.

One consequence of viewing teacher socialization as an interactive process is that teachers influence and shape the structures into which they are being socialized at the same time that they are being shaped by a variety of forces at many levels. This paper has concentrated on presenting a variety of explanations regarding how teachers are influenced by structural and personal factors. The emphasis has continually been on how teachers have been influenced and not on how the structures into which they are being socialized have been shaped and recreated by the teachers. An adequate account of teacher socialization must attend to both sides of this issue. Much of the work related to how schools and the contexts in which they exist are maintained and/or altered by the actions of teachers can be found in the sociological literature on social and cultural production and reproduction (see Weiler, 1988). While we have not discussed much of this literature, an important task for researchers in the

future is to address the reciprocal nature of the agency-structure relationship in any given piece of research--how teachers are shaped by and in turn influence the structures into which they are socialized.

Another problem that needs attention in the future is that of interpreting research findings that have been generated in a number of countries. This paper has dealt with research in the United States, the United Kingdom, and Australia without much attention to the different traditions and pressures that exist in these countries with regard to schooling, teaching, and teacher education. Furthermore, we have not dealt at all with substantial bodies of teacher socialization research that have been completed in many non-English speaking countries (e.g., see Jordell, 1987). Tabachnick (1988) has warned researchers about the dangers of transporting research generated in one country to another and has stressed the importance of accounting for the particular conditions and traditions in a country when interpreting research. One must be extremely cautious in interpreting the research on teacher socialization even when studies from several countries appear to converge around particular explanations of the socialization process as was the case in several instances in this chapter.

Earlier we cited studies from several countries that discussed the impact of the student teaching experience or practicum on prospective teachers. What has to be kept in mind is that student teaching/practicum has very different meaning in Australia than in the United States. For example, spending a full university semester working in a single classroom as is common in the United States provides a very different learning context than several shorter practicums in different settings as is common in Australia. To discuss the socializing role of any specific aspect of this experience (e.g., cooperating teachers) across cultures without taking into account the specific nature of the practicum experience in different countries is potentially misleading. And, differences in teacher education programs need to be taken into account as well in the interpretation of research findings.

This issue of how the cultural context of research influences the interpretation of research findings raises the more general question of the meaning of teacher socialization research for teacher education practice regardless of the similarity between the context of the research and the context of practice. In our view, there is not a direct link between teacher socialization research and practice in teacher education programs even within the same site in which a research study has been conducted. We agree with those who have stressed the point that the links between research and practice are always mediated by particular moral frameworks and that the same research findings can lead to a variety of "implications" for practice depending upon one's view of the purposes of teacher education, the role of the teacher in the school and society, and so forth (Buchmann, 1987; Tom and Valli, in press).

For example, studies which illuminate the ways in which various factors interact in their influence on the formation of teaching perspectives can be used either to enable teacher educators to exert tighter controls over the socialization process (an instrumental view of the research-practice relationship) or to empower prospective teachers to be more aware of and hence more in control over

the direction of their own education for teaching (an educative view of the research-practice relationship). Neither course of action is "implied" by a particular set of findings which enlighten us about the mysteries of the socialization process.

It is our belief that research on teacher socialization should be used by teacher educators and policymakers in ways that further the roles of teachers as "extended professionals" who play a significant part in the making of educational policies at the classroom and school levels within democratic school environments (Zeichner, in press). This research should also be used in a manner that helps teachers establish more control over their education for teaching by making them more aware of the nature of their socialization into teaching. This position is similar to the one advocated by various researchers with regard to the proper relationship between research on teaching and teachers (e.g., Fenstermacher, 1980; Zumwalt, 1982). One way that this can happen is for teacher educators to use accounts of socialization that are produced for research purposes as part of the curriculum of their teacher education programs.

This concern with the empowering potential of teacher socialization research raises a number of critical issues related to the social relations of the research process itself. In recent years a rapidly growing literature has emerged which has questioned the traditional hierarchical relationships existing between university researchers and either teachers or student teachers (see Bolster, 1983; Noddings, 1986; Reinharz, 1988; Roman and Apple, 1988; Wexler, 1987). The major points raised in these critiques are concerned with ethical dimensions of the research process such as whose perspectives are represented in the research and who benefits from the research. A great deal of concern has been expressed in this literature about the "wronging of persons" that may result from existing research practices. Teacher education students, teachers, and teacher educators are often portrayed in a negative way in these studies sometimes without having an opportunity even to read and respond to researchers' interpretations of their work. Research that is concerned with teaching and teacher education has rightly been criticized at times for being research *on* rather than *for* the people who are studied.

These criticisms of research practices are applicable to all three of the intellectual traditions which underlie teacher socialization research, for as Lather (1986) points out, even critical studies with their transformative intent have not necessarily redressed the unequal power relations between researchers and "the researched." Furthermore, as Noffke and Zeichner (1987) argue, this is also the case for some of the studies which researchers label as "collaborative." We believe that work on teacher socialization must begin to explore and practice ways of democratizing the research process if the empowering potential of the research is to be realized. One way to begin this democratizing process is to ensure that at minimum, those whose practices are studied in teacher socialization research have an opportunity to read and react to researchers' portrayals. If there are disagreements between researchers and researched about some aspect of the socialization account, then either these differences should be

negotiated until some agreement is reached or the perspectives of those who are studied should be published along with the researcher's account. Ideally, we would have mutual constructions of the socialization portrayals by the researchers and researched.

It needs to be emphasized that the socialization research that has been reviewed in this paper has largely been conducted on female teachers, oftentimes by male university researchers. There is burgeoning interest in "feminist methodology" in social science research which, in part, attempts to redress the inequitable relationships which typically exist between researcher and researched and to correct the distortions of women's experiences which are sometimes a consequence of these relationships. Recent work on feminist methodology (e.g., Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule, 1986; Scott, 1985) serves to remind us that we need to be more responsive to the fact that many of those who are portrayed in teacher socialization studies are women and of the necessity of developing new and more interactive methods of conducting our research which are able to illuminate teachers' own perspectives of their development.

A final issue is concerned with the question of who benefits from the kinds of teacher socialization studies that have been reviewed in this paper. While the academic researchers who conduct these studies usually benefit from public reports of the work by receiving traditional academic rewards of promotion, tenure, further research grants, and peer recognition, little is typically done with the research to better the life circumstances of those students, teachers, and teacher educators who are studied (e.g., Schneider, 1987). We feel that this state of affairs is morally unacceptable. A priority in teacher socialization research (in addition to its value in increasing our collective understanding of the processes of teacher socialization) needs to become one of finding ways to use our research studies to enhance the lives of those who open themselves up to us in these studies.

Knowles's (1988a) study of the "failure" of Cynthia provides one example of the kind of stance that we feel is important for researchers to adopt. This study illustrates how it is possible for a preservice teacher to benefit directly from a researcher's account of her socialization into teaching. After Cynthia withdrew from her student teaching experience, Knowles continued to meet with her in a series of "debriefing sessions" to discuss his interpretations of her experiences. Over a period of time and through these interactions, Cynthia gradually developed new understandings of her experience and "from a potentially devastating experience she was able to attain a new personal understanding" (p. 32). Knowles' commitment to helping Cynthia benefit in a concrete way from his research labors and his genuine concern for her plight is exemplary and serves as a model for the kind of moral commitment to *teacher education* that we feel needs to become an integral part of teacher socialization research. Some of the recent work using various forms of life history methodologies (e.g., Butt, 1984; Butt and Raymond, in press; Quicke, 1988; Tripp, 1987) also clearly illustrates the educative and emancipatory potential of research that seeks to understand the development of teachers' knowledge.

In addition to benefiting from researchers' accounts of their own socialization experiences, teacher education students, teachers, and teacher educators can also benefit from reading and reflecting on research accounts of the experiences of others. It is common practice, for example, for student teacher supervisors in the program with which we are both associated to use case studies of individual student teachers or research accounts of common patterns in student teacher socialization (e.g., Feiman-Nemser and Buchmann, 1983) as part of the curriculum in the student teaching seminars. Student teachers read and discuss these accounts of teacher socialization and relate them to their own experiences in learning to teach and potentially gain greater insights into and control over their own socialization.

At a different level, it is also important for faculty in teacher education programs to benefit from studies of teacher socialization as reports of research are fed back into program development efforts. These studies will not provide solutions or even directions for teacher educators to adopt. These will come from the interplay of the research with the moral frameworks and commitments of teacher educators. What the research can do, however, is to challenge our thinking and help us think more clearly about the consequences of our work for those we seek to educate. Ultimately, the questions that must be resolved are moral ones, and teacher socialization research needs to become part of a process of moral and political deliberation about the purposes and goals of teacher education and schooling.

Finally, the teacher socialization literature clearly demonstrates that interventions at the level of individual students or teacher educators such as the ones we have stressed here will be inadequate by themselves for altering the course of teacher education programs. Studies which have focused on the institutional and cultural levels of analysis have clearly shown, for example, that various ideological and material conditions within teacher education institutions, schools and societies serve to establish limits on the range of options available to both teacher education students and teacher educators. Teacher educators must, in addition to their efforts to shape the curricular and instructional practices *within* programs, work to alter the institutional, social, and political contexts, and the principles and practices of authority, legitimacy, and control underlying them (Liston and Zeichner, 1988; Popkewitz, 1985). The literature in teacher education is filled with examples of how external contexts of teacher education programs have undermined the intentions and hopes of program reformers, and in many cases, have served to sustain the very practices that are the foci of reform initiatives (Zeichner, 1986b). Only by our attention to these issues of institutional and social change will our hopes for the betterment of individual lives and the improvement of teacher education programs be realized.

A Brief Note on the Use of the Term Socialization

As we pointed out in the beginning of the chapter, the term socialization is commonly defined too narrowly. Such definitions as Danziger's (1971) with which we began this paper, legitimate only

functionalist studies and lack the element of reciprocity which characterizes much interpretive work. Other definitions, which support interpretive studies, allow for tension in the socialization relationship and emphasize interaction rather than internalization (e.g., Wentworth, 1980), but the focus is still on the *individual* in interaction. At various points, we have emphasized a "critical" view of socialization which depicts the socialization process as contradictory and dialectical, as collective as well as individual, and as situated within the broader context of institutions, society, culture, and history. We have also argued that socialization research conducted from a critical perspective must seek to redress the unequal power relations between researchers and the researched. Thus, rather than rejecting the term socialization as inherently limiting, we have taken the position that meaning is always open to challenge and redefinition (Weedon, 1987) and have tried to demonstrate that an alternative conception of the term socialization exists.

References

- Althusser, L. (1971). *Lenin and philosophy and other essays*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Amarel, M., and Feiman-Nemser, S. (1988, April). *Prospective teachers' views of teaching and learning to teach*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.
- Anderson, D. S. (1974). *The development of student teachers: A comparative study of professional socialization*. Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.
- Anderson, K. L. (1988). The impact of colleges and the involvement of male and female students. *Sociology of Education*, 61, 160-177.
- Apple, M. (1983). Curricular form and the logic of technical control. In M. Apple and L. Weis (Eds.), *Ideology and practice in education* (pp. 143-165). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Apple, M. W. (1987). *Teachers and texts: A political economy of class and gender relations in education*. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Arfwedson, G. (1979). Teachers' work. In U. Lundgren and S. Patterson (Eds.), *Code, context and curriculum processes* (pp. 87-100). Stockholm, Sweden: Gleerup.
- Ashton, P., and Crocker, L. (1987). Systematic study of planned variations: The essential focus of teacher education reform. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 38(3), 2-8.
- Astin, A. (1977). *Four critical years*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Atkinson, P., and Delamont, S. (1985). Socialization into teaching: The research which lost its way. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 6, 307-322.
- Ball, D. (1988, April). *Prospective teachers' understandings of mathematics: What do they bring with them to teacher education?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.
- Ball, D., and McDiarmid, G. W. (1987). *Understanding how teachers' knowledge changes*. Unpublished manuscript. National Center for Research on Teacher Education, Michigan State University, East Lansing.
- Ball, D., and Noordhoff, K. (1985, April). *Learning to teach by the book: The influence of persons, program, and setting on student teaching*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.
- Ball, S., and Lacey, C. (1980). Subject disciplines as the opportunity for group action: A measured

- critique of subject subcultures. In P. Woods (Ed.), *Teacher strategies* (pp. 149-177). London: Croom Helm.
- Ball, S. J., and Goodson, I. F. (1985). *Teachers' lives and careers*. London: Falmer Press.
- Barrows, L. (1978). *Student teaching and success: A field study of four male elementary school student teachers*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Bartholomew, J. (1976). Schooling teachers: The myth of the liberal college. In G. Whitty and M. Young (Eds.), *Explorations in the politics of school knowledge* (pp. 114-124). Driffield, England: Nafferton.
- Battersby, D. (1983). The politics of teacher socialization. In R. K. Brown and L. E. Foster (Eds.), *Sociology of education* (3rd ed., pp. 325-335). Melbourne: Macmillan.
- Baumrind, D. (1980). New directions in socialization research. *American Psychologist*, 35, 639-652.
- Becker, H. S. (1964). Personal change in adult life. *Sociometry*, 27, 40-53.
- Becker, H. S., Geer, B., Hughes, E. C., and Strauss, A. L. (1961). *Boys in white*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R., and Tarule, J. M. (1986). *Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bernstein, B. (1971). On the classification and framing of educational knowledge. In M. Young (Ed.), *Knowledge and control* (pp. 47-69). London: Collier-Macmillan.
- Bernstein, B. (1979). *Class, codes and control* (Vol. 3). Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Bertalanffy, L. von. (1956). General system theory. *General Systems*, 1, 1-10.
- Blase, J. (1985). The socialization of teachers: An ethnographic study of factors contributing to the rationalization of the teacher's instructional perspective. *Urban Education*, 20, 235-256.
- Blase, J. (1986). Socialization as humanization: One side of becoming a teacher. *Sociology of Education*, 59, 100-113.
- Bolster, A. S. (1983). Toward a more effective model of research on teaching. *Harvard Educational Review*, 53, 294-308.
- Book, C., Byers, J., and Freeman, D. (1983). Student expectations and teacher education traditions with which we can and cannot live. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 34(1), 9-13.

- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bowles, S., and Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America*. New York: Basic Books.
- Boyer, E. (1987). *College: The undergraduate experience in America*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Braudel, F. (1980). *On history*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Britzman, D. (1986). Cultural myths in the making of a teacher: Biography and social structure in teacher education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56, 442-472.
- Brophy, J., and Evertson, C. (1981). *Student characteristics and teaching*. New York: Longman.
- Buchmann, M. (1987). Reporting and using educational research: Conviction of persuasion. In J. Goodland (Ed.), *The ecology of school renewal* (pp. 170-191). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bullough, R. (1987). First-year teaching: A case study. *Teachers College Record*, 89(2), 39-46.
- Bullough, R. V., Jr. (1989). *First-year teacher: A case study*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Burgess, R. (1988). Examining classroom practice using diaries and diary interviews. In P. Woods and A. Pollard (Eds.), *Sociology and teaching* (pp. 192-208). London: Croom Helm.
- Burrell, G., and Morgan, G. (1979). *Sociological paradigms and organizational analysis*. London: Heinemann.
- Butt, R. L. (1984). Arguments for using biography in understanding teacher thinking. In R. Halkes and J. Olson (Eds.), *Teacher thinking* (pp. 95-102). Lisse, The Netherlands: Swets and Zeitlinger.
- Butt, R., and Raymond, D. (in press). Studying the nature and development of teachers' knowledge using collaborative autobiography. *International Journal of Educational Research*.
- Butt, R., Raymond, D., and Yamagishi, L. (1988). Autobiographical praxis: Studying the formation of teachers' knowledge. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 7(4), 87-164.
- Calderhead, J. (1988a). The contribution of field experience to student primary teachers' professional learning. *Research in Education*, 40, 33-49.
- Calderhead, J. (1988b). Learning from introductory school experience. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 14(1), 75-83.
- Carew, J., and Lightfoot, S. L. (1979). *Beyond bias: Perspectives on classrooms*. Cambridge, MA:

Harvard University Press.

- Carr, W., and Kemmis, S. (1986). *Becoming critical: Education, knowledge and action research*. Philadelphia: Falmer Press.
- Casey, K. (1988). *Teacher as author: Life history narratives of contemporary women teachers working for social change*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Clark, D., and Marker, G. (1975). The institutionalization of teacher education. In K. Ryan (Ed.), *Teacher education* (pp. 53-86). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Clausen, J. A. (Ed.). (1968). *Socialization and society*. Canada: Little, Brown and Company.
- Comte, A. (1853). *The positivist philosophy* (Vol. 1, H. Martineau, Trans.). London: Chapman.
- Connell, R. W. (1985). *Teachers' work*. Sydney, Australia: Allen and Unwin.
- Connelly, F. M., and Clandinin, D. J. (1987). On narrative method, biography and narrative unities in the study of teaching. *Journal of Educational Thought*, 21(3), 130-139.
- Copeland, W. (1980). Student teachers and cooperating teachers: An ecological relationship. *Theory Into Practice*, 18, 194-199.
- Crow, N. (1987, April). *Preservice teacher's biography: A case study*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC.
- Crow, N. (1988, April). *A longitudinal study of teacher socialization: A case study*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.
- Crow, N., and Kauchak, D. (1988, April). *Teacher socialization: A quasi-experimental case study*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.
- Cuban, L. (1984). *How teachers taught: Constancy and change in American classrooms: 1890-1980*. New York: Longman.
- Dale, R. (1977a). 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* (pp. 44-54). Driffield, England: Nafferton.
- Dale, R. (1977b). *The structural context of teaching*. Milton Keynes, England: Open University Press.

- Danziger, K. (1971). *Socialization*. Baltimore: Penguin Books,
- Delone, R. (1979). *Small futures*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.
- Denscombe, M. (1980). The work context of teaching: An analytic framework for the study of teachers in classrooms. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 1, 279-292.
- Denscombe, M. (1982). The hidden pedagogy and its implications for teacher training: An ecological analysis. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 3, 249-265.
- Dilthey, W. (1976). *Selected writings* (H. P. Rickman, Ed.). London: Cambridge University Press.
- Dollard, J. (1939). Culture, society, impulse and socialization. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 45(1), 50-63.
- Doyle, W. (1977). Learning the classroom environment: An ecological analysis. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 28, 51-55.
- Doyle, W. (1979). Classroom effects. *Theory Into Practice*, 18, 138-144.
- Doyle, W. (1986). Classroom organization and management. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed. pp. 392-431). New York: Macmillan.
- Doyle, W., and Ponder, G. (1975). Classroom ecology: Some concerns about a neglected dimension of research on teaching. *Contemporary Education*, 46, 183-188.
- Dreeben, R. (1973). The school as a workplace. In R. Travers (Ed.), *Second handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 450-473). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Dreitzel, H.P. (1973). *Childhood and socialization*. New York: Macmillan.
- Durkheim, E. (1938). *The rules of sociological method*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Eddy, E. (1969). *Becoming a teacher: The passage to professional status*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Edgar, D., and Warren, R. (1969). Power and autonomy in teacher socialization. *Sociology of Education*, 42, 386-399.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (1983). Learning to teach. In L. Shulman and G. Sykes (Eds.), *Handbook of teaching and policy* (pp. 150-170). New York: Longman.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (in press). Teacher preparation: Structural and conceptual alternatives. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education*. New York: Macmillan.

- Feiman-Nemser, S., and Buchmann, M. (1983). Pitfalls of experience in teacher education. In P. Tamir, A. Hofstein, and M. Ben-Peretz (Eds.), *Preservice and inservice education of science teachers* (pp. 61-73). Philadelphia: Balaban International Science Services.
- Feiman-Nemser, S., and Buchmann, M. (1986). The first year of teacher preparation: Transition to pedagogical thinking. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 18*, 239-256.
- Feiman-Nemser, S., and Buchmann, M. (1987). When is student teaching teacher education? *Teaching and Teacher Education, 3*, 255-273.
- Feiman-Nemser, S., and Floden, R. (1986). The cultures of teaching. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed., pp. 505-526). New York: Macmillan.
- Feldman, K., and Newcomb, T. (1969). *The impact of college on students*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Fenstermacher, G. (1980). On learning to teach from research on teacher effectiveness. In C. Denham and A. Lieberman (Eds.), *Time to learn* (pp. 127-137). Washington, DC: U.S. Dept. of Education.
- Freedman, S., Jackson, J., and Boles, K. (1986). *The effect of teaching on teachers*. Grand Forks: North Dakota Study Group on Evaluation.
- Gadamer, H. -G. (1975). *Truth and method* (G. Barden and J. Comming, Eds. and Trans.). London: Sheed and Ward.
- Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Gibson, D. R. (1972). Professional socialization: The effects of a college course upon role conceptions of students in teacher training. *Educational Research, 14*, 213-219.
- Ginsburg, M. (1988). *Contradictions in teacher education and society: A critical analysis*. New York: Falmer Press.
- Ginsburg, M., and Clift, R. (in press). Hide and seek: Researching the hidden curriculum of preservice teacher education. In W. R. Houston, (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Ginsburg, M., and Newman, K. (1985). Social inequalities, schooling, and teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 26*, 49-54.
- Giroux, H. (1980). Teacher education and the ideology of social control. *Journal of Education, 162*, 5-27.

- Giroux, H. (1981). *Ideology, culture and the process of schooling*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Giroux, H. (1983). *Theory, resistance and education* (pp. 193-212). Massachusetts: Bergin and Garvey.
- Gitlin, A. (1983). School structure and teachers' work. In M. Apple and L. Weis (Eds.), *Ideology and practice in education* (pp. 193-212). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Gomez, M. (1988, April). *Prospective teachers' beliefs about good writing: What do they bring with them to teacher education?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.
- Goodman, J. (1988). Masculinity, feminism, and the male elementary school teacher: A case study of preservice teachers' perspectives. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 7(2), 30-60.
- Goodman, J., and Adler, S. (1985). Becoming an elementary school social studies teacher. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 13(2), 1-20.
- Goodson, I. (1980/81). Life histories and the study of schooling. *Interchange*, 11(4), 62-76.
- Goodson, I. (1983). *School subjects and curriculum change*. London: Croom Helm.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1976). *The dialectic of ideology and technology*. New York: Macmillan.
- Gracey, H. (1972). *Curriculum or craftsmanship*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Grant, C. (1981). Education that is multicultural and teacher preparation: An examination from the perspectives of preservice students. *Journal of Educational Research*, 75, 95-101.
- Grant, C., and Sleeter, C. (1985). Who determines teacher work? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 1, 209-220.
- Griffin, G. (1983). *Clinical preservice teacher education: Final report of a descriptive study*. Austin: University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.
- Grossman, P. (1987). *Colleen: A case study of a beginning English teacher*. Stanford: Stanford University, School of Education.
- Grossman, P., and Richert, A. (1988). Unacknowledged knowledge growth: A re-examination of the effects of teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 4, 53-62.
- Grumet, M. (1980). Autobiography and reconceptualization. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 2(2),

155-158.

- Haller, E. (1967). Pupils' influences in teacher socialization: A sociolinguistic study. *Sociology of Education*, 40, 316-333.
- Hammersley, M. (1977a). *The social location of teacher perspectives*. Milton Keynes, England: Open University Press.
- Hammersley, M. (1977b). *Teacher perspectives*. Milton Keynes, England: Open University Press.
- Hanson, D., and Herrington, M. (1976). *From college to classroom*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Hargreaves, A. (1988). Teaching quality: A sociological analysis. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 20, 211-231.
- Hartnett, A., and Naish, M. (1980). Technicians or social bandits? Some moral and political issues in the education of teachers. In P. Woods (Ed.), *Teacher strategies* (pp. 254-274). London: Croom Helm.
- Hatton, E. (1987). Hidden pedagogy as an account of pedagogical conservatism. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 19(5), 457-470.
- Hodges, C. (1982). Implementing methods: If you can't blame the cooperating teacher, whom can you blame? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 33, 25-29.
- Hogben, D., and Lawson, M. (1983). Attitudes of secondary school teacher trainees and their practice teaching supervisors. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 9, 249-263.
- Hogben, D., and Lawson, M. (1984). Trainee and beginning teacher attitude stability and change: Four case studies. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 10(2), 135-153.
- Hogben, D., and Petty, M. (1979a). Early changes in teacher attitude. *Educational Research*, 21, 212-219.
- Hogben, D., and Petty, M. (1979b). From student to primary school teacher: Attitude stability and change. *South Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 7, 92-98.
- Hollingsworth, S. (in press). Prior beliefs and cognitive change in learning to teach. *American Educational Research Journal*.
- Hoy, W., and Rees, R. (1977). The bureaucratic socialization of student teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 28(1), 23-26.

- Husserl, E. (1929). Entry on "Phenomenology." In T. L. Garvin (Ed.), *Encyclopedia Britannica* (14th ed.). New York: Encyclopedia Britannica.
- Ingvarson, L., and Greenway, P. (1984). Portrayals of teacher development. *Australian Journal of Education*, 28(1), 45-65.
- Jordell, K. (1987). Structural and personal influences in the socialization of beginning teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 3(3), 165-177.
- Kant, I. (1876). *Critique of pure reason* (J. M. D. Meiklejohn, Trans.). London: Bell and Daldy.
- Katz, L., and Rath, J. (1982). The best of intentions for the education of teachers. *Action in Teacher Education*, 4, 8-16.
- Kiecolt, K. J. (1988). Recent developments in attitudes and social structure. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 14, 381-403.
- Kirk, D. (1986). Beyond the limits of theoretical discourse in teacher education: Towards a critical pedagogy. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 2, 155-167.
- Knowles, J. G. (1988a, April). *The failure of a student teacher: Becoming educated about teachers, teaching, and self*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.
- Knowles, J. G. (1988b, April). *Models for understanding preservice and beginning teachers' biographies: Illustrations from case studies*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.
- Knowles, J. G. (in press). A beginning English teacher's experience: Reflections on becoming a teacher. *Language Arts*.
- Koehler, V. (1988). Barriers to the effective supervision of student teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 39(2), 28-35.
- Lacey, C. (1977). *The socialization of teachers*. London: Methuen.
- Lacey, C. (1985). Professional socialization of teachers. In T. Husen and T. N. Postlethwaite (Eds.), *The international encyclopedia of education* (pp. 4073-4084). Oxford: Pergamon.
- Lacy, W. (1978). Interpersonal relationships as mediators of structural effects. *Sociology of Education*, 51, 201-211.
- Lanier, J., and Little, J. (1986). Research on teacher education. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed., pp. 527-569).

- Larkin, R. (1973). Contextual influences on teacher leadership styles. *Sociology of Education*, 46, 471-479.
- Larson, S. (1986). Learning from experience: Teachers' conceptions of changes in their professional practice. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 19(1), 35-43.
- Lather, P. (1986). Research as praxis. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56, 257-277.
- LeCompte, M., and Ginsburg, M. (1987). How students learn to become teachers: An exploration of alternative responses to a teacher training program. In G. Noblit and W. Pinle, *Schooling in social context: Qualitative studies* (pp. 3-22). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Liston, D., and Zeichner, K. (1988). Critical pedagogy and teacher education. *Journal of Education*, 169(3), 117-137.
- Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Malinowski, B. (1923). Supplementary essay. In C. K. Ogden and I. A. Richards (Eds.), *The meaning of meaning*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.
- Malinowski, B. (1936). *The sexual life of savages in northwestern Melanesia; An ethnographic account of courtship, marriage and family life among the natives of the Trobriand Islands, British New Guinea*. New York: Halcyon House.
- Mardle, G., and Walker, M. (1980). Strategies and structure: Critical notes on teacher socialization. In P. Woods (Ed.), *Teacher strategies* (pp. 98-124). London: Croom Helm.
- Mattingly, P. H. (1987). Workplace autonomy and the reforming of teacher education. In T. S. Popkewitz (Ed.), *Critical studies in teacher education: Its folklore, theory and practice*. (pp. 36-56). London: Falmer Press.
- McCarthy, C. (1986). Teacher training contradictions. *Education and Society*, 4(2), 3-15.
- McIntyre, D. J. (1983). *Field experiences in teacher education*. Washington, DC: Foundation for Excellence in Teacher Education and the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education.
- McNeil, L. (1983). Defensive teaching and classroom control. In M. Apple and L. Weis (Eds.), *Ideology and practice in schooling* (pp. 114-142). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- McNeil, M. (1987). *Gender and expertise*. London: Free Association.
- McPherson, G. (1972). *Small town teacher*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Merton, R. K. (1968). *Social theory and social structure*. New York: Free Press.
- Merton, R. K., Reader, G. G., and Kendall, P. L. (Eds.). (1957). *The student physician: Introductory studies in the sociology of medical education*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Metz, M. (1978). *Classrooms and corridors*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Metz, M. (1988). *Teachers' ultimate dependence on their students*. Madison: University of Wisconsin, National Center on Effective Secondary Schools.
- Metz, M. (in press). How social class differences shape the context of teachers' work. In M. McLaughlin and J. Talbert (Eds.), *The secondary school workplace*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Neufeld, B. (1988). *Why do I have to learn that? Prospective teachers' ideas about the importance of the subjects they will teach*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.
- Nias, J. (1986). *Teacher socialization: The individual in the system*. Geelong, Australia: Deakin University Press.
- Nigris, E. (1988). Stereotypical images of schooling: Teacher socialization and teacher education. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 15(2), 4-19.
- Noddings, N. (1986). Fidelity in teaching, teacher education, and research for teaching. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56, 496-510.
- Noffke, S., and Zeichner, K. (1987, April). *Action research and teacher thinking*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC.
- Nucci, L., and Pascarella, E. (1987). The influence of college on moral development. In J. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. 3, pp. 271-326). New York: Agathon Press.
- Ogburn, W. F., and Nimkoff, M. F. (1940). *Sociology*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Olesen, V., and Whittaker, E. W. (1970). Critical notes on sociological studies of professional socialization. In J. A. Jackson (Ed.), *Professions and professionalization* (pp. 179-221). London: Cambridge University Press.
- Park, R. E. (1939). Symbiosis and socialization: A frame of reference for the study of society. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 45(1), 1-25.
- Parsons, T. (1949). *The structure of social action*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

- Pascarella, E. (1985). College environmental influences on learning and cognitive development: A critical review and synthesis. In J. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. 1, pp. 1-61). New York: Agathon Press.
- Pearson, J. (1987). The problems experienced by student teachers during teaching practice: A review of research studies. *Journal of Teaching Practice*, 7(2), 1-20.
- Petty, M., and Hogben, D. (1980). Explorations of semantic space with beginning teachers: A study of socialization into teaching. *British Journal of Teacher Education*, 6, 51-61.
- Pinar, W. (1986, April). *Autobiography and the architecture of self*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC.
- Pollard, A. (1982). A model of classroom coping strategies. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 3, 19-37.
- Popkewitz, T. (1985). Ideology and social formation in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 1, 91-107.
- Posner, G., Strike, K., Hewson, P., and Gertzog, W. (1982). Accommodation of a scientific conception: Towards a theory of conceptual change. *Science Education*, 66, 211-227.
- Power, P. (1981). Aspects of the transition from education student to beginning teacher. *Australian Journal of Education*, 25(3), 288-296.
- Quicke, J. (1988). Using structured life histories to teach the sociology and social psychology of education. In P. Woods and A. Pollard (Eds.), *Sociology and teaching* (pp. 92-116). London: Croom Helm.
- Radcliffe-Brown, A. (1952). *Structure and function in primitive society*. London: Cohen and West.
- Raymond, D., and Surprenant, M. (1988, April). *Investigating teachers' knowledge through ethnographic and biographic approaches: A case study*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.
- Reinharz, S. (1988). *Social science methods: Feminist voices*. London: Pergamon.
- Ringstaff, C., and Haymore, J. (1987, April). *The influence of subject matter background on planning and instruction*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC.
- Riseborough, G. (1988). Pupils, recipe knowledge, curriculum, and the cultural production of class, ethnicity, and patriarchy: A critique of one teacher's practices. *British Journal of Sociology of*

Education, 9(1), 39-54.

- Roman, L., and Apple, M. (1988). *Is naturalism a move away from positivism? Materialist and feminist approaches to subjectivity in ethnographic research*. Paper presented to the Qualitative Inquiry Conference, Palo Alto: Stanford University School of Education.
- Ross, E. W. (1987). Teacher perspective development: A study of preservice social studies teachers. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 15, 225-243.
- Ross, E. W. (1988). Preservice teachers' responses to institutional constraints: The active role of the individual in teacher socialization. *Educational Foundations*, 2(1), 77-92.
- Sartre, J. P. (1948). *Existentialism and humanism* (P. Mairet, Trans.). London: Methuen.
- Schneider, B. (1987). Tracing the provenance of teacher education. In T. Popkewitz (Ed.), *Critical studies in teacher education* (pp. 211-241). New York: Falmer Press.
- Schutz, A. (1967). *The phenomenology of the social world* (G. Walsh and F. Lehnert, Trans.). Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Scott, S. (1985). Feminist research and qualitative methods. In R. Burgess (Ed.), *Issues in educational research: Qualitative methods* (pp. 67-85). London: Falmer Press.
- Shapiro, M. (1978). *Getting doctored: Critical reflections on becoming a physician*. Ontario, Canada: Between the Lines.
- Sharp, R., and Green, A. (1975). *Education and social control*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Shulman, L. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15(2), 4-14.
- Shumsky, A. (1958). *The action research way of learning*. New York: Teachers College Bureau of Publications.
- Sikes, P., Measor, L., and Woods, P. (1985). *Teacher careers: Crises and continuities*. London: Falmer Press.
- Sirotnik, K. (1983). What you see is what you get: Consistency, persistency, and mediocrity in classrooms. *Harvard Educational Review*, 53, 16-31.
- Skinner, B. F. (1953). *Science and human behavior*. New York: Macmillan.
- Spencer, D. A. (1986). *Contemporary women teachers: Balancing school and home*. New York: Longman.

- Spindler, G., and Spindler, L. (1987). Cultural dialogue and schooling in Schoenhausen and Roseville: A comparative analysis. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 18, 3-16.
- Stephens, J. (1967). *The processes of schooling*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Sutherland, R. L., and Woodward, J. (1937). *Introductory sociology*. New York: Lippincott.
- Tabachnick, B. R. (1980). Intern-teacher roles: Illusion, disillusion and reality. *Journal of Education*, 162, 122-137.
- Tabachnick, B. R. (1988, July). *Research on teacher education in the future: Naturalistic research that is culturally responsive*. Paper presented at the First Asia-Pacific Conference on Teacher Education, Bangkok, Thailand.
- Tabachnick, B. R., and Zeichner, K. (1985). *The development of teacher perspectives: Final report*. Madison: University of Wisconsin, Wisconsin Center for Education Research.
- Tom, A. (1987). A critique of the rationale for extended teacher preparation. *Educational Policy*, 1(1), 43-56.
- Tom, A., and Valli, L. (in press). Professional knowledge for teachers. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook for research on teacher education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Tripp, D. (1987). Teachers, journals and collaborative research. In J. Smyth (Ed.), *Educating teachers: Changing the nature of pedagogical knowledge* (pp. 179-192). London: Falmer Press.
- Trow, M. (1987). The national reports on higher education: A skeptical view. *Educational Policy*, 1(4), 411-428.
- U.S. Department of Education. (1984). *Involvement in learning: Realizing the potential of American higher education*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Waller, W. (1932). *The sociology of teaching*. New York: John Wiley.
- Watts, D. (1987). Student teaching. In M. Haberman and J. Backus (Eds.), *Advances in teacher education* (Vol. 3, pp. 151-167). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organization* (A. Henderson and T. Parsons, Trans.). Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Weedon, C. (1987). *Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory*. New York: Basil Blackwell.

- Weiler, K. (1988). *Women teaching for change: Gender, class and power*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin and Garvey.
- Weis, L. (1988). *Class, race and gender in American education*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Wentworth, W. M. (1980). *Context and understanding: An inquiry into socialization theory*. New York: Elsevier North Holland.
- Westbury, I. (1973). Conventional classrooms, "open classrooms," and the technology of teaching. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 5, 99-121.
- Wexler, P. (1987). *Social analysis of education: After the new sociology*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Willis, P. (1977). *Learning to labour*. Westmead, England: Saxon House.
- Wilson, S. M., and Shulman, L. (1987). "150 different ways" of knowing: Representations of knowledge in teaching. In J. Calderhead (Ed.), *Exploring teachers' thinking* (pp. 104-124). Eastbourne, England: Cassell.
- Wilson, S. M., and Wineburg S. S. (1988). Peering at history through different lenses: The role of disciplinary perspectives in teaching history. *Teachers College Record*, 89, 525-540.
- Wise, A. (1979). *Legislated learning: The bureaucratization of the American classroom*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Woods, P. (1987). Life histories and teacher knowledge. In J. Smyth (Ed.), *Educating teachers: Changing the nature of pedagogical knowledge* (pp. 121-136). London: Falmer Press.
- Wright, B. (1959). Identification and becoming a teacher. *Elementary School Journal*, 59, 361-374.
- Wright, B., and Tuska, S. (1967). The childhood romance theory of teacher development. *School Review*, 25, 123-154.
- Wright, B., and Tuska, S. (1968). From dream to life in the psychology of becoming a teacher. *School Review*, 76, 253-293.
- Yaakobi, D., and Sharan, S. (1985). Teacher beliefs and practices: The discipline carries the message. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 11, 187-200.
- Yamamoto, K., Pederson, D., Opdahl, R., Dangel, H., Townsend, C., Paleologos, M., and Smith, A. (1969). As they see it: Culling impressions from teachers in preparation. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 20, 465-475.

- Zeichner, K. (1979, January). *The dialectics of teacher socialization*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, Orlando, FL.
- Zeichner, K. (1980). Myths and realities: Field-based experiences in preservice teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 31*, 45-55.
- Zeichner, K. (1983a). Alternative paradigms of teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 34*, 3-9.
- Zeichner, K. (1983b). Individual and institutional factors related to the socialization of beginning teachers. In G. Griffin and H. Hukill (Eds.), *First years of teaching: What are the pertinent issues?* (pp. 1-30). Austin: University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.
- Zeichner, K. (1986a). The practicum as an occasion for learning to teach. *South Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 14*(2), 11-28.
- Zeichner, K. (1986b). Social and ethical dimensions of reform in teacher education. In J. Hoffman and S. Edwards (Eds.), *Clinical teacher education* (pp. 87-108). New York: Random House.
- Zeichner, K. (1988). *Understanding the character and quality of the academic and professional components of teacher education* (Research Rep. No. 88-1). East Lansing: Michigan State University, National Center for Research on Teacher Education.
- Zeichner, K. (in press). Preparing teachers for democratic schools. *Action in Teacher Education*.
- Zeichner, K., and Grant, C. (1981). Biography and social structure in the socialization of student teachers. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 1*, 198-314.
- Zeichner, K., and Tabachnick, B. R. (1985). The development of teacher perspectives: Social strategies and institutional control in the socialization of beginning teachers. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 11*, 1-25.
- Zeichner, K., Tabachnick, B. R., and Densmore, K. (1987). Individual, institutional, and cultural influences on the development of teachers' craft knowledge. In J. Calderhead (Ed.), *Exploring teachers' thinking* (pp. 1-20). Eastbourne, England: Cassell.
- Zumwalt, K. (1982). Research on teaching: Policy implications for teacher education. In A. Lieberman and M. McLaughlin (Eds.), *Policy making in education* (pp. 215-248). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.