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ABSTRACT

Anderson, J. A. Pre-service teacher socialization and self-efficacy while learning to teach. MS in Physical Education Teacher Education, August 2020, 54 pp. (D. Sazama)

Research in physical education has explored self-efficacy and teacher socialization independently, however, research investigating the relationship of socialization and self-efficacy is lacking. The purpose of this study was to discover the relationship between pre-service teachers (PTs) self-efficacy and their socialization while participating in an early field experience (EFE) class. Prior to the beginning of the study, informed consent was received. Participants were 28 college-age students (11 females and 17 males) enrolled in an on campus EFE course participated. The PTs completed the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy, 2001) four times over the course of the semester. Following data analysis, nine PTs were purposefully selected (three with the highest mean change in self efficacy, three with a decrease, or lowest mean change, and three that displayed mean change) for interviews regarding their acculturation and professional socialization. A Repeated measures ANOVA revealed significant differences with time, the self-efficacy constructs, and the interaction effect between time, self-efficacy, and time in program was also found to be significant. Four themes emerged from qualitative data analysis: (a)Time in physical education teacher education (PETE) influenced students with both positive and negative acculturation experiences; (b) hands on experience in PETE increased self-efficacy; (c) accountability of desired competencies increased self-efficacy; and (d) the self-efficacy survey acted as a positive reflective tool.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I need to thank Dr. Deb Sazama and her guidance throughout this thesis project. I made more trips from my office to hers more times than I could possibly count with questions and clarifications with this project. I am forever grateful for you for mentoring me in how to perform research, and how to become a better human being.

I need to thank Dr. Jenna Starck for teaching me how to code qualitative data. Without a doubt, this was one of the hardest things I have ever learned to do. However, your patience and confidence in me pushed me to learn and get better every day in coding qualitative data. The time spent learning here is something I will take with me to my future education, and for that I thank you.

To Dr. Ward Dobbs for taking the time to teach me statistics. I knew every time we had a meeting regarding the quantitative data, I would learn endless new concepts and would leave with a full brain. Your patience with me while I learned how to run a statistics program is something I will be forever grateful for and take with me as I pursue my future education.

To Dr. Brock McMullen for teaching me what self-efficacy is and what it entails. I learned more about self-efficacy from you than anyone else. I am grateful for your constant feedback and willingness to explain how self-efficacy works to me.

To my family, thank you for always believing in me. Your never-ending support, love, and guidance have made me who I am today. To Marissa, thank you for your belief in me to pursue further education. You are my rock and I can always count on you to pick me back up if I’ve fallen. I love you.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF APPENDICES</td>
<td>vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METHODS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protocol</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESULTS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABLE 1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIGURE 1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIGURE 2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISCUSSION</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFERENCES</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## LIST OF APPENDICES

### APPENDIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Informed Consent</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Semi-Structured Interview Questions</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Review of Literature</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

According to Malcolm Gladwell (2008), it takes approximately 10,000 hours to master a subject. If a person were to devote three hours per day, it would take a little more than nine years which is longer than it takes to attain a degree from a university. However, when a person reaches the 10,000-hours, are they now an expert or a master? The path to 10,000 hours is a path full of trials, failures, successes, gaining confidence, and life lessons. This study analyzed how PTs socialization impacted their self-efficacy toward using desired competencies and how pre-service teacher socialization impacts their self-efficacy toward content implementation.
METHODS

Participants

This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board at the University of Wisconsin – La Crosse. All participants provided written informed consent (Appendix A). There were a total of 28 PTs (11 women and 17 men). Nine students were in their third year at the university, eleven in their fourth, and eight in their fifth or more year. The EFE course the students were enrolled in is a required course that is taken twice during the university’s PETE program. For fifteen PTs, it was their first time in the course and for thirteen it was their second.

Protocol

The PTs taught homeschool students in groups of 7 - 15 students every Monday morning throughout fall semester. Each teaching team (3-4 PTs) created lesson objectives, lesson plans and assessments based on National Grade Level Outcomes and pre-assessment data. During each teaching session, two PTs individually implemented a 25-minute lessons. All PTs had seven opportunities to teach. To determine self-efficacy, the subjects completed the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001) which can be found in Appendix B. The internal consistency of the questionnaire was previously established by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001) with a Cronbach’s α of .94. The Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) consists of 24 questions and each question answered on a Likert Scale numbered 1-9. The self-efficacy survey contains three constructs, engagement, instruction, and management and each
construct includes eight questions. To ease the data collection process, the survey was converted to an online Qualtrics Survey (Qualtrics, Provo Utah). Pre-service teachers entered the classroom and a Quick Response (QR) Code was available for them to scan so they could complete the survey individually. To determine PTs baseline of self-efficacy, the survey was completed prior to the first teaching session on September 9th, which was the second day of class in the fall semester. The PTs then completed the self-efficacy questionnaire again on October 9th, November 6th, and the last questionnaire was distributed and completed on December 4th after all teaching sessions had occurred.

**Qualitative Methodology**

Once all surveys were completed, the average change across the three self-efficacy measurements within each participant from the first survey to the last survey had been calculated \([\text{last} - \text{first}/100]\). Nine PTs were purposefully selected to take part in the qualitative portion of the study. This included three individuals that displayed the lowest change, three individuals within the mean change, and the three individuals that showed that greatest change. Each PT was individually interviewed and asked semi-structured interview questions (Appendix C) regarding their acculturation, professional socialization, and their self-efficacy. The purpose of the interviews was to gather information to determine if and how a PTs socialization impacted their self-efficacy toward implementing desired competencies (best practices) taught and implemented within the PETE program.

**Statistical Analysis**

A mixed ANOVA was performed to assess the group by self-efficacy interaction across time. Mauchly’s test was performed to assess the assumption of sphericity in the
Repeated measures analysis and Greenhouse-Geisser correction was utilized for interpretation when sphericity was violated. The post-hoc tests were performed using a Bonferroni Pairwise Comparison. A Shapiro-Wilk test was run for normality between the two groups with $p<.001$ which indicates a violation of normality. However, repeated measures analysis is robust to violations of normality.

Statistical analysis was performed using Microsoft Excel 2016 (Microsoft Corporation, Redmond, WA, USA) and JASP statistics software 2018 (University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands). An alpha value of 0.05 was utilized for statistically significance and all data is displayed as mean ± SD unless otherwise noted.

**RESULTS**

Twenty-eight participants completed this study (17 male, 11 female) and descriptive statistics are presented in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Biological Sex</th>
<th>Year at University</th>
<th>Time in Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Internal consistency of each of the four survey measurements was evaluated through Cronbach’s $\alpha$ to ensure reliability across time, the scores were as follows: .94, .94, 95, and .96.

The sphericity test shows violations of assumptions within the interaction of time, self-efficacy, and time in the program which was handled with the Greenhouse-Geisser
correction. The three-way interaction between time, self-efficacy, and time in program was significant $F(4.27,110.95)=3.17, p=.015$. As displayed in Figure 2, the interaction suggests that while self-efficacy is increasing over time, the rate of increase is variable depending upon whether it was the participants first or second time in the program.

The main effect for time was significant, $F(2.38,61.82)=23.34, p<.001$. Bonferroni Post-Hoc analysis revealed time one ($6.118 \pm 0.237$) was significantly lower than time point two ($6.769 \pm 0.252, p=.001$), three ($6.982 \pm 0.202, p<.001$), and four ($7.305 \pm 0.248, p=.001$). Furthermore, time point two was significantly lower from time four ($p=.003$), and time three was significantly lower than time four ($p=.005$).

The main effect for self-efficacy constructs was significant $F(2,52)=13.51, p<.001$. Bonferroni Post-Hoc analysis indicated that Engagement ($6.546 \pm 0.492$) was significantly lower than instruction ($6.826 \pm 0.526, p=.007$) and management ($7.009 \pm 0.488$) ($p<.001$), while instruction was significantly lower than management ($p=.036$).
Figure 1. Statistical analysis of the interaction between time, self-efficacy and time in program.

Of the 28 participants in this study, 9 were purposefully chosen to be interviewed based on change in self-efficacy. The three individuals, numbers 1, 2, and 3 (see Figure 3) exhibited a decrease in self-efficacy were selected for the interview process. Three individuals were chosen for interviews from the mean of change (22%), numbers 15, 16, and 17 and the three individuals with the greatest increase in change, numbers 26, 27, and 28 were selected for the interview process.
The qualitative data analysis process resulted in four first order themes and associated subthemes that we believe describe the PTs self-efficacy growth through the lens of occupational socialization. These themes include: (a) Time in PETE influenced students with both positive and negative acculturation experiences; (b) hands on experience in physical education teacher education (PETE) programming increased self-efficacy; (c) accountability of desired competencies increased self-efficacy; and (d) self-efficacy survey acted as a positive reflective tool.
Time in PETE Influenced Students with both Positive and Negative Acculturation Experiences

Pre-service teachers’ acculturation experiences largely influence their beliefs and perspectives on what they believe quality teaching is based on their subjective warrants. Students are often resistant to practices that don’t align with their apprenticeship of observation. However, regardless of believing they had positive or negative acculturation experiences, PTs in this study appeared to have “bought into” PETE philosophies during their time in the program. For example, Rachel was able to reflect on her experience in physical education with a custodial teacher:

In high school we had to take it in ninth grade and tenth grade, first semester and then one other semester. My teacher was okay. He was also the football coach, but he focused a lot on the athletes. He helped me a lot athletically. So, I appreciate him that way. But now looking back, I'm like, okay, bad teacher.

Alternatively, Ashley who had a decrease in self-efficacy stated, “…I was homeschooled. I had absolutely no physical education experience before I came to school here.”

In some cases, the PTs stated how their K-12 teacher(s) could not have been any worse and identified them as custodial teachers. Lloyd stated, “One of my five teachers was actually my high school basketball coach and I absolutely hated that man. So, I'm pretty much doing anything to not be like him when I'm teaching.”

On the other side of the coin, the PTs reflected on their K-12 teachers as innovative which aided to their self-efficacy. For example, Ken stated, “I'd say [the teacher] was pretty good at management. He always had a pretty good sense of the room, and then instruction I think, yeah, he was pretty self-explanatory with instruction.”

Similarly, Erica stated:
When I got to high school and middle school, I would say that it improved just because they cared about you as an individual and they didn't want you to like be embarrassed, or they didn't put you on the spot, or just even like when they gave you like fitness gram testing, like it was all very private.

**Hands on Experience in PETE Programming Increased Self-Efficacy**

Pre-service teachers in this study referred to their time in the PETE program as contributing to their increase in self-efficacy. Pre-service teachers identified time spent with children and alignment and consistency within their PETE program as influential factors aiding in their mastery experiences. While working with children during a physical education homeschool program, PTs were able to recognize their improvement. For example, Erica referred to the program as being influential, “Interacting with kids, teaching kids, like that's a great experience that I won't like ever regret doing. But, obviously, like I saw myself improve a lot throughout the semester so that was also a good thing.”

Although teaching children provided hands on experience, the PTs identified the application of content and experiential learning as essential as opposed to just learning the content. Kelly stated, “Being able to get just that hands on experience is just super crucial… you get to see it in action, and you get to apply yourself. Obviously learning the content of what you're going to teach is super important.”

Likewise, the PTs recognized the value of their homeschool physical education program as pivotal to their self-efficacy and growth in comparison to teaching experiences they had heard of at other programs on campus and universities can provide. For example, Rachel stated:

I compare my brother [who] was a music education major here for a while and his experience with learning how to teach was just way different from mine because I was able to work with kids like my freshman year here. I was working with kids
all the time and he didn't see kids until this year and he's a junior/senior right now. So I've been working with kids a lot.

Not only did the PTs recognize that hands on experience with kids were important, they also noted that alignment and consistency within their PETE programming was important. The PTs believe that the way in which the sequence of classes within PETE programming has allowed them to learn skills effectively. Lloyd stated, “It started two years ago with [motor development program], just being around kids constantly and always having grad students who know what they're talking about…as well as professors that clearly know what they're talking about.”

On the contrary, some of the PTs stated that a change in the sequencing of the classes resulted in a more enjoyable experience for undergraduate PTs. For example, Sara stated: “From the beginning of the year, I've only taught children with disabilities, and this was the first class [homeschool teaching program] that I haven't. I think that really benefited me a lot. I wish it was earlier in my time here because I am a senior.” To promote the idea of potentially changing the sequencing of the classes even further, Kelly stated, “Having those prior experiences, I know how to interact with a child that has autism. That makes it a lot easier than just kind of being thrown into a situation…the [motor development program], that's a big class.”

While the sequencing of the PETE program was beneficial to the PTs, some of them noticed how a slight change or modification within the sequencing could benefit future PTs more than it already does. The PTs believed the goal of their PETE program was aiding them with a large toolbox to pull from when they are teaching in their own schools. For example, Sara stated:
[The PETE program] just has such a wide range of the teaching classes. There's a lot of things you don't take in count like dance. I've never been confident in gymnastics, but now I have some basis and that I can obviously learn from. I think that those teaching classes are very beneficial.

In addition to their coursework, the PTs also identified the importance of consistency and availability across instructors and professors which aided in their self-efficacy. For example, Martin stated, “You can definitely email, or even just quick stop by someone's office with two minutes and just that they'll help you with a problem… I'm sure I wasn't the only one at that point that was feeling the same way.” In addition, Ashley also discussed the positive support she felt from her faculty, “We receive a lot of support from [the faculty] and everybody, all the staff that like come in and that I think is really helpful in creating a positive experience, even if you're not doing like a great job.”

**Accountability of Desired Competencies Increased Self-Efficacy**

The PTs discussed being held accountable by faculty to teaching using the desired competencies (DC) was beneficial to increasing their self-efficacy. Desired competencies included best practices and effective management strategies to utilize when in proactive behavior management. During the homeschool program, the PTs used a systematic observation tool based on the DCs to provide peer and receive instructor feedback. Using this formative tool, the PTs recognized their growth among management and influenced their self-efficacy positively. Lloyd stated, “The desired competencies were huge, I could actually track my progress.” Sara also believed the detailed feedback was critical to learning, “I can't just be told it. I think that gave me a very good visual, especially receiving that feedback… It really outlined the things that you need to hit when you're teaching that you don't think of.”
The PTs spoke highly and were appreciative about having a document with best practices laid out for them. Ashley stated, “Having everything laid out of what you should do … was amazing because I already had this stuff in my head, and it just organized it super nicely… I think it greatly impacted my confidence and my ability to improve on it.” As stated by Ken also suggested that the DCs tool impacted him and other PTs, “It's a lot more organized, and when it's more organized and efficient, as a teacher, you feel more confident.”

Utilized in conjunction with the DC observation tool, video segments were used as a self-reflection tool which seemed to aid in the PTs growth and confidence. For example, Kelly stated, “[I] would catch everything… So, I think that's a really, really useful learning tool. It was actually one of my a-ha moments…”

In addition, Aaron reflected on using clear instruction from watching his video and recognized growth in his feedback and instruction:

My first time being filmed wasn't the greatest. My plan wasn't the greatest, but I feel like I executed it to where I actually got the kids to do the activity. I didn't stumble through instruction… I felt more comfortable with my [freeze] and actually complimenting students on specific feedback.

Interestingly, some PTs believed video self-reflection in the homeschool program was extremely beneficial to the point that they wished they would have been videotaped more. For example, Erica suggested, “Like just in general, being able to focus on it, I wish that we were kind of videotaped more and I could reflect more on how I taught.”

**Self-Efficacy Survey Acted as a Positive Reflective Tool**

As their time teaching in the homeschool program progressed, the PTs recognized their improvements in teaching due to the use of the TSES (Tschannen-Moran and
Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). Specifically, the survey promoted PTs reflection upon their teaching experiences in the month between the surveys. Kelly said, “I think the survey was really cool to answer to see how much you've progressed, overall how much we've learned within the teaching program, and how everyone's experiences are like different with their teaching team, grade level etc.”

Further, Kelly displayed the second highest change in self-efficacy over the course of the semester. She was able to identify why the survey was effective, and why it helped her reflect upon her teaching. “I noticed myself, as I took the survey again, Oh my gosh, my numbers are going up....” That's awesome… Because I noticed… Wow, I'm improving greatly… I'm learning more about what I'm doing, how to manage students…. [it’s] super important to me.” Ken also stated that the survey was a great reflective tool, “It impacts the way that I look at how I've been progressing… But it definitely made me a better reflector of what I think I've been doing and what I think I haven't been doing, so that helped me.” Further, Aaron discussed that like him, many others believed they didn’t consider the survey to be useful until they were able to apply it to teaching episode in the homeschool program:

I felt like at first doing it as a baseline coming in, I didn't really think about it that much. I just filled it out like a usual survey. Then after my first time teaching, I was able to actually look at most questions and picture scenarios where I'm like, "Oh, was I able to give the students a good question to test it, acknowledge it."
DISCUSSION

The purpose of this research was to discover what impact socialization had on the self-efficacy of PTs. Scholars (Lawson 1983a, 1983b, & 1986; Schempp and Graber, 1992; Doolittle et al., 1993) have promoted the idea that acculturation is stronger than professional socialization. They argue that ideals taught within TEPs will be negotiated in a dialectic and will bend what the PETE programs teach to fit their own ideals. This research does not give the teacher educators the credit they deserve in the role they play in building quality educators from PTs. The interviewees in this study negotiated what was taught to them in their own dialectics. They did not come into the program as “blank slates,” but had preconceived notions of what physical education is. They gave examples of their positive relationships with their K-12 teachers, but also stated that looking back on them now, they were able to identify whether the teacher they had a positive relationship with was a quality, or non-quality teacher. With this said, professional socialization can have a larger impact on PTs than their acculturation.

However, acculturation is still important. As we heard from Ashley, who was homeschooled, was one of the students who displayed a decrease change in self-efficacy, claimed she had no prior physical education experience before coming to the university. She said, “…I was homeschooled. I had absolutely no physical education experience before I came to school here.” Clearly, her time being homeschooled has had an impact on her time at the university, as she declined in self-efficacy score over the course of the semester.

On the other end of the spectrum, however, Lloyd stated in his interview that he had an idea of what it meant to be a good teacher prior to coming to the university. After
the average change was calculated he showed the largest increase in average change across all 28 PTs in the class. This demonstrates that Lloyd’s acculturation and professional socialization contributed his self-efficacy.

According to Bandura (1997) we know there are four sources of self-efficacy: mastery experiences, vicarious experiences (i.e., observing others coping and performing well), verbal persuasion, and experiencing positive physiological and affective states. The results of this study continue to support the idea that self-efficacy is not as simple as believing in doing it. There are many levels to self-efficacy, and within that, many constructs that must be considered. One thing that is supported within this study, is that over time whether the students were first or second timers in the program, their overall self-efficacy scores continue to increase. This provides evidence that PTs teaching in an on campus EFE is important in a PT’s undergraduate career. This study also supports that even though self-efficacy as a whole is increasing, the constructs have different starting points in terms of the Likert scale with engagement at 5.88, management at 6.36, and instruction at 6.1. This difference in starting points created a clear distinction as to which constructs the participants felt most comfortable with right away. This trend continued through to the end where the rank order stayed the same.

To help explain the average change of self-efficacy of the PTs in this class, we must look at the combination of self-efficacy and socialization. The average change in self-efficacy scores was +22%. This demonstrates that what this particular EFE is assisting students in gaining confidence in their teaching skills. However, there were students that declined in self-efficacy scores. To help explain this, we look back to the interviews and the negative cases we analyzed and the individuals who decreased the
largest amounts combined to only have one negative case within the four themes that were found. This negative case was Ashley, who was homeschooled, and as discussed earlier, had a negative impact on self-efficacy development. This specific negative case occurred within a theme that tells us about the participants acculturation experiences. Ashley did not have an acculturation in regard to physical education, thus having no physical education experience to compare her time in the PETE program, impacting their self-efficacy now. Meanwhile, the students who displayed an increase in self-efficacy gave four examples of negative cases of which two of the negative cases came from PTs who were able to critically reflect upon PETE class sequencing and whether it was beneficial or not. For these two PTs, they both suggested that if the PETE sequencing was slightly different, it could have a significant positive impact on pre-service teachers. The other two negative cases are from the PT who showed the largest increase in self-efficacy. Both negative cases come from his time in acculturation, one being he knew what it meant to be a good teacher prior to attending university, and the other about the negative experience with a K-12 physical education teacher. As stated before, acculturation is important to PTs development of self-efficacy, however, professional socialization is just as, if not more important.
CONCLUSION

Occupational Socialization theory, as related to the teaching profession, is defined as the “field of scholarship which seeks to understand the process whereby the individual becomes a participating member of the society of teachers” (Zeichner & Gore, p. 1, 1989). Self-efficacy is defined as the “beliefs in one’s capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments” (Bandura, 1997, p. 3). The research questions of this study were: 1) How does a PTs socialization impact their self-efficacy toward using desired competencies? and 2) how does a PTs socialization impact their self-efficacy toward content implementation?

It was hypothesized that PTs who had an innovative acculturation would have increased self-efficacy, while those with a custodial acculturation would have lower self-efficacy. This study supports the idea that acculturation is important to PT self-efficacy, however professional socialization has a more significant impact on PT self-efficacy at this point in their training. Further research is needed to fully support these findings.
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APPENDIX A

INFORMED CONSENT
Informed Consent

Protocol Title: Pre-Service Teacher Socialization and Self-Efficacy While Learning to Teach

Procedure:
- The purpose of this study is to determine how a pre-service teacher’s socialization, or prior experiences, can relate to their self-efficacy while learning to teach in an early field experience class.
- This study will include two parts: part one is all subjects completing a self-efficacy questionnaire, Part two includes interviewing eight select members of the study.
- The self-efficacy questionnaire will be issued four times throughout the semester.
- The interviews will take place during class time and all interview will be audio recorded.
- Questionnaires will be completed during class time of ESS 366.
- Participants will be notified via email if they have been selected for an interview and will set up an interview time with the principle investigator.

Risks:
- Potential risks/inconveniences will be addressed by arranging interviews when most convenient to the participants.

Confidentiality:
- My participation is voluntary. I can withdraw or refuse to answer any question without consequences at any time.
- I can withdraw from the study at any time for any reason without penalty.
- The results of this study may be published in literature and presented at meetings, conferences, and/or conventions.
- All questionnaires and audio recordings will be kept confidential through the use of number codes, all participants’ names will be kept confidential with the use of pseudonyms (fake names) and stored on a password protected word processor.

Possible Benefits:
- Subjects will gain a better understanding of how to build confidence and how to recognize self-efficacy.
- Will help physical education teacher education staff better understand how to help prepare pre-service teachers for teaching in the real world.
Informed Consent

Questions regarding study procedures may be directed to Jared Anderson (608-317-2077), the principle investigator, or the faculty advisor, Dr. Deb Sazama (608-785-8183). Questions regarding protection of human subjects may be addressed to the UW-La Crosse Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects, (608-785-8044 or irb@uwlax.edu).

Participant______________________ Date________________

Researcher______________________ Date________________
APPENDIX B

TEACHER SENSE OF EFFICACY SCALE
### Teacher Beliefs - TSES

**Directions:** Please indicate your opinion about each of the questions below by marking one of the nine responses in the columns on the right side, ranging from (1) “None at all” to (9) “A Great Deal” as each represents a degree on the continuum. Please respond to each of the questions by considering the combination of your current ability, resources, and opportunity to do each of the following in your present position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>None at all</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Some Degree</th>
<th>Quite a Bit</th>
<th>A Great Deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How much can you do to get through to the most difficult students?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How much can you do to help your students think critically?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in school work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To what extent can you make your expectations clear about student behavior?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in school work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How well can you respond to difficult questions from your students?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How well can you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How much can you do to help your students value learning?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. How much can you gauge student comprehension of what you have taught?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. To what extent can you craft good questions for your students?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. How much can you do to foster student creativity?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. How much can you do to improve the understanding of a student who is failing?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. How much can you do to adjust your lessons to the proper level for individual students?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. How much can you use a variety of assessment strategies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. How well can you keep a few problem students from ruining an entire lesson?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. How well can you respond to defiant students?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. How well can you implement alternative strategies in your classroom?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. How well can you provide appropriate challenges for very capable students?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
Semi-Structured Interview Questions
(Multiple Prompts Allowed)
(Be sure to prompt, whenever applicable, about Engagement, Instruction, and Management)

Acculturation

1. Describe what your K-12 physical education experience and environment was like. i.e. class size, content, teacher relationship, etc.
2. Walk me through a typical day in your elementary, middle, and high school physical education classes.
3. Why did you want to become a physical education teacher?
4. Explain how your K-12 physical education experiences have impacted your confidence in teaching.
5. How do you perceive your K-12 teacher(s) on being a quality educator in engagement, instruction, and management?
   a. How is this similar/different than your experience in the physical activity program?
6. If you could change anything about your elementary, middle, or high school physical education class, what would it be? Why? How has this impacted you in becoming a teacher?

Professional

7. How has your teacher preparation program helped you become a more confident teacher?
   a. Was there a specific moment that you feel like your confidence greatly increased? Or was it a more gradual increase?
8. How could your teacher preparation program help you become a more confident teacher?
9. How have your perceptions of physical education changed since coming to UWL?
10. Have you worked with children outside of the UWL PETE Program? How has this impacted your confidence in your teaching?
Self-Efficacy

11. Describe a time when you did/did not feel confident in your teaching.

12. Describe a time when you did/did not feel confident in your teaching within the UWLS physical activity program.

13. (Give the interviewee the questionnaire completed in class) Did the self-efficacy questionnaire have any impact on you? How? What stands out to you?

14. How has the UWLS physical activity program specifically impacted your confidence in engagement, instruction, and management?

15. Given your confidence in teaching during the physical activity program, what would you change or keep the same in regards to becoming an effective teacher?

16. Do you think that the focus on the desired competencies in the physical activity program has impacted your confidence in teaching and engagement with students?

17. Is there anything that is important that I have missed about your confidence in teaching in the physical activity program?
APPENDIX D

REVIEW OF LITERATURE
Review of Literature

Occupational Socialization Theory

Socialization theory, as related to the teaching profession, is defined as the “field of scholarship which seeks to understand the process whereby the individual becomes a participating member of the society of teachers” (Zeichner & Gore, p. 1, 1989). Socialization is divided into three phases: acculturation, professional socialization, and organizational socialization (Richards, Templin, & Graber, 2014).

The acculturation phase occurs from birth until an individual makes the decision to enter a teacher education program (TEP) (Richards et al., 2014). Evidence shows that the acculturation phase may be stronger than the teacher education phase. Within acculturation, an individual goes through what is referred to as the apprenticeship of observation. This apprenticeship is when the K-12 students are observing their teachers, coaches, and other parents surrounding the school culture. Students often spend upwards of 13,000 hours interacting with these individuals and give an insight into the world of teaching. While the students do not see the whole picture, they see what is happening and are making impressions based off of what they see. (Richards et al., 2014). Within the apprenticeship of observation, teachers’ subjective theories determine how students view the teaching profession. For example, if a K-12 physical education teacher promotes the custodial culture, the “roll out the ball”, the students that attend TEPs will likely overtly or covertly resist the experiences taught within the TEP. This creates a dialectic and is negotiated within the student’s subjective warrants, or the concept of task demands and
self-perception. The subjective warrant is not guaranteed to be completely accurate, however. The K-12 students rarely see the behind the scenes efforts of teachers to bring the lessons to life. Even if the subjective warrant is flawed, it still contributes to the theories that recruits bring into TEPs. (Richards et al., 2014).

Lortie (1975) investigated why individuals wanted to become schoolteachers and discovered that there were five attractors to teaching; (a) interpersonal theme; (b) service theme; (c) continuation theme; (d) material benefits; and (e) time compatibility. He also noted that there are two general facilitators for why individuals want to become schoolteachers, with the first being a wide decision range. By this, Lortie (1975) states that to children, the occupation of teaching is very visible from their early years until they decide to enter a collegiate program. Thus, at any point in that time, children can make the decision to become a schoolteacher. The second facilitator is the subjective warrant, which is an individual’s perception of the skills and knowledge needed for an occupation. The data that Lortie (1975) gathered suggested that subjective warrant implied in becoming a school teacher is not stringent. This means that it is easier to become a teacher than it is to become a surgeon, for example.

Lawson (1983a, 1983b) published a two-part article synthesizing research on the occupational socialization of physical education teachers. Lawson (1983a) summarized that when recruits enter the field of physical education, teaching physical education is often not identified as a reason for entering the field. Some recruits entering the field of physical education are not attracted to the role of teaching but the role of coaching because they view coaching and teaching as the same thing. Lawson (1983a) provided four hypotheses why recruits choose physical education. The first, students with
extensive primary and secondary involvement in sport, physical activity, and physical education will be attracted to physical education. Second, students who actually enter physical education programs will display lower mean intellectual aptitudes and abilities than students in non-teaching majors. Third, students with extensive primary involvements and achievements in interschool sports will be attracted to coaching, not teaching. Fourth, students with more primary and secondary involvement in physical activity and physical education than in sport will be attracted to teaching, not coaching.

Professional socialization phase typically begins when a recruit enters the TEP (Lawson, 1983a). Lawson (1983b) also suggested three types of TEPs that are responsible for developing a type of recruit. The first type of TEP is practicing teachers that are professional to the letter, and recruits may be expected to be oriented more towards teaching than coaching. The second TEP program is one that provides mixed messages. Within this program, teaching and coaching are not well differentiated and are often oriented more towards coaching than teaching. The third type of program is dwarfed by interschool sports and places little emphasis upon instruction, resulting in recruits being oriented toward coaching and toward a career in professional sports.

In 1986, Lawson summarized his findings, and provided explanations for five categories of occupational socialization: societal, sport, professional, organizational, and bureaucratic. Societal socialization is generally referred to as “common sense” because it is how people acquire dominant rules and meanings from society, which are often referred to as laws. Sport socialization is how individuals acquire knowledge and skills necessary for sport participation and includes the decision to complete a physical education major. This can come from participation in physical education or sport
participation in a K-12 setting. Professional socialization is how individuals recruited into the field of physical education acquire knowledge, values, sensitivities, and skills to teach and are typically provided through content and pedagogy courses throughout TEPs. Organizational socialization is how physical education teachers learn knowledge, values, and skills required by the work organization and are typically provided by the school that the teacher will be teaching at. Lastly, bureaucratic socialization is how the hiring organization wants the teacher to act. This is similar, but still different from organizational socialization because it relates to teacher professionalism, rather than knowledge, value, and skill development (Lawson, 1986).

The occupational socialization categories often have contradictory forms and contents, meaning that the different types of socialization do not always fit together. The multiple categories of socializations are variable and are why physical education recruits, teachers, and teacher educators have varying views on physical education (Lawson, 1986). Schempp and Graber (1992) agree that socialization is not a stable state of mind and theorized that socialization is a dialectic. A dialectic is a process involving the confrontation of contending propositions (ideas) that ultimately resolve into a synthesis of perspectives and actions of a new unique design (an individual’s view on an idea). Every person has a view in which they see the world, called a thesis, which means that an antithesis exists. It is the contestation of these two ideas (the synthesis), that allows researchers to analyze a dialectic. A dialectic is the analysis of the contestation between typical attitudes or beliefs as they define the instability of human experience (Schempp & Graber, 1992). Individuals choose to enter teaching, and physical education teaching, for differing reasons that are often the cumulative experiences of life in school (Schempp &
Graber, 1992). Often, teachers in primary and secondary school are more influential on potential teacher educators than the professors at post-secondary institutions (Lawson, 1986). Physical education teacher educators must understand that when recruits enter a program, they will have a preconceived notion of what physical education is, and when presented with new information, this dialectic will be formed, thus, the TEPs need to be cognizant of how students interpret material taught.

Organizational socialization, from a wide lens, is defined as, “…the process by which one is taught and learns the ropes of a particular organizational role.” (Van Maanen & Schein, p.3, 1977). The time when this is most evident is when an individual first enters their career. At this point, called the outsider to insider passage, is not the only time socialization occurs within an organization. Curtner-Smith et al. (2008) studied 10 physical educators in their first or second year of teaching and the purpose of the study was to determine factors that led to and facilitated teachers employing the sport education model, and which did not. Researchers concluded that one teacher chose not to implement the sport education model at all because the teacher did not think it would be advantageous for their students at their current time in life. Four teachers used the full version of the sport education model because they felt like they understood the structural advantages of sport education and using the model “made life easier.” Three of the teachers used a “watered-down version” which included organized formal competition but failed to include many of the other elements that make sport education seasons unique. Two teachers used a “cafeteria approach”, which means that the teachers took specific elements of the sport education model, and implemented them into their
traditional units. Based on this research, Curtner-Smith et al. (2008) summarized that there were three different types of recruits that enter physical education teacher education (PETE) and include hard-core coaching orientation, moderate coaching orientation, and teaching orientation. Students who enter a PETE program with hard-core coaching orientation are most likely not to attempt to implement the sport education model. Students entering with moderate coaching orientation, but receive high quality training, will attempt to implement the sport education model. However, if recruits attended TEPs with custodial cultures (new ideas tend to be rejected) or received low quality training, they will likely use the “watered down” version or not at all. Lastly, if students entering a PETE program with a teaching orientation are most likely to employ the full version or watered-down version, but if they received low quality training, they will be unlikely to implement the sport education model (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008). This research highlights the importance of the recruit’s socialization prior to joining the PETE program and their attempt to negotiate the dialectic that students enter programs with. It is also important to note that teacher education programs need to consider the dialectic that practices and orientations that are offered are negotiated within recruits, not simply accepted by them. This reiterates the point made above, that information taught to recruits will not be blindly accepted, but rather will be negotiated, creating a dialectic (Schempp & Graber, 1992).

In further exploring students’ beliefs and purposes of physical education, Doolittle et al. (1993) followed three pre-service teachers (PTs) over the course of three years in a TEP. Researchers investigated students’ beliefs and purposes of physical education from entry into the program to exit. Additionally, they examined the
mechanisms of change and the process through which the pre-service phase of professional socialization influences recruits’ beliefs about teaching during their college years. The results indicated that none of the three PTs core beliefs changed about what physical education should be or how they should teach it. Student A indicated that the TEP did not affect her core beliefs about the purpose of physical education or good teaching. Student A used an idea which fit her preconceived notion of the purpose of physical education. In large part, she actively rejected the programs strong message about the need for technical skills because it did not fit her preconceived notion of a good teacher. Student B’s core beliefs did not waiver, but an increase in facility (knowledge) of using educational language and practical teaching methods to facilitate her visions of teaching was indicated. The last student, Student C’s view of physical education and good teaching remained unchanged throughout the program but indicated that the program taught him technicalities that he would use in his future teaching. Out of the three students analyzed, student C was the only one who seemed to accept program messages about the purposes of physical education and good teaching (Doolittle et al., 1993).

Socialization is inevitable, it is the reason that people are who they are and how they’ve formed their beliefs. No matter how hard PETE programs will try, it is likely impossible to completely change or force a recruit to accept an idea. This is a challenge because the five types of socialization occur simultaneously and are often incompatible (Lawson, 1983a). Based on occupational socialization theory research, acculturation tends to impact PTs more significantly than professional socialization (Lawson, 1983a, 1983b) We know that information presented in PETE programming is negotiated with a
dialectic within a PT. Students do not enter TEPs as “blank slates”, but each arrives with background knowledge and preconceived notions of what quality physical education is and should be. (Doolittle et al., 1993; Schemp and Graber, 1992)

Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy is defined as the “beliefs in one’s capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments” (Bandura, 1997, p. 3) Within self-efficacy theory, Bandura (1977, 1986, 1997) states there are four principal sources from which individuals form their efficacy beliefs: mastery experiences, vicarious experiences (i.e., observing others coping and performing well), verbal persuasion, and experiencing positive physiological and affective states. These sources of efficacy and the processes involved do not occur in isolation, people are social beings who rely on others in their environment to inform their self-efficacy (Bandura, 2001). To determine what impacts the four sources of self-efficacy in PTs, multiple studies have investigated the impact of EFEs on PT self-efficacy.

To determine self-efficacy in physical education PT’s, Martins et al. (2014) surveyed 141 PTs with the purpose of discovering the nature of physical education PTs self-efficacy and the type of practicum training experiences that contributed to their self-efficacy. Following questionnaire data analysis, eight PTs (four with the highest and 4 with the lowest scores) were interviewed and questions were asked to provide insight to how their teacher education experiences influenced their answers. (Martins et al., 2014). Results of the quantitative analysis indicated that PTs had stronger self-efficacy on tasks related to teacher-student relationship (developing interpersonal relationships) and to
discipline promotion (the ability to establish routines and rules) and reported lower self-efficacy when implementing instructional strategies. When interviewing the eight PTs (four with the highest and 4 with the lowest scores), one experience kept recurring for the students with the highest self-efficacy. They indicated the most important professional experience prior to the PT practicum was coaching or teaching younger pupils (Martins et al., 2014). The students identified as having a lower self-efficacy indicated that their failure in teaching physical education was associated with classes’ characteristics and students’ disruptive behavior (Martins et al., 2014). Both the high and low self-efficacy groups recognized the importance of teaching experience, or the chance to use teaching techniques, before the practicum, as well as training experience during the practicum. The results indicate that integration of field experiences in TEP’s should be a priority, as these are considered mastery experiences (Martins et al., 2014). These results also demonstrate the importance for PTs to interact with children and gain some level of experience in a teaching or coaching role. Understandably, when an individual is placed in a teaching role they have never been in before, they may have less self-efficacy than someone who has had experience in a similar situation. Martins et al. (2014) hypothesized that this could be caused by the PTs reduced contact with teaching reality during the first years of their TEP which may be due to practicum occurring only in the last years of TEPs, which in turn may compromise mastery experiences and the development of self-efficacy.

Pfitzner-Eden (2016) surveyed and analyzed data from 359 beginning PTs and 395 advanced PTs who completed the German version of the Scale for Teacher Self-Efficacy, an instrument to assess Bandura’s (1997) four sources of self-efficacy. The
beginning PTs were in the early stages of their bachelors degree, while the advanced group was in their last year of bachelors or in the master’s program. The author determined that PTs changes in self-efficacy were directly influenced by the mastery experiences gathered during the one-month practicum. Data also suggested that positive feedback from the mentor teacher had a significant positive impact on the development of PTs self-efficacy. The author suggests that when mentor teachers provide feedback to PTs, it should be given in terms of achieved progress towards a standard, rather than in regard to shortfalls. Feedback provided in relation to PTs shortfalls can have a detrimental effect on development of teacher self-efficacy and may be due to the fact that negative physiological and affective states contributed to decrease self-efficacy (Pfitzner-Eden, 2016).

Using a questionnaire, Aiken and Day (1999) surveyed 114 general education graduates investigating their perception of early field experiences (EFEs) and how their perceptions of EFEs aligned to the goals set by the coordinators. Overwhelmingly, the graduates viewed EFEs as a necessary component of PT preparation but indicated that EFEs need to be carefully structured as some PTs may not be ready, cognitively, to benefit from the EFE. Cognitively was defined as the PTs previous experience and lack of content in the classroom which could prevent them from appropriately interpreting and analyzing events while teaching. The graduates also felt that EFEs provide the opportunity to develop a strong commitment to students, develop a commitment to teaching, and become motivated to teach. The education graduates clearly indicated that EFEs are a necessary to build skills in PTs. One of the implications from this study is that
the EFEs, as above mentioned, need to be carefully designed and need to be authentic classroom experiences (Aiken & Day, 1999).

Bandura (1997) laid the ground work for self-efficacy research by providing the four sources of self-efficacy. From this, researchers have found that mastery experiences and well-structured EFEs are of utmost importance to promote PT learning and development (Martins et al., 2014; Pfitzner-Eden, 2016; Aiken & Day, 1999). When EFEs are mastery experiences, structured correctly and positively it is very likely that PTs self-efficacy will increase.

Field Experiences

Field experiences and early field experiences are critical to PTs development. However, PTs in these experiences are often in a tough situation because they are expected to teach to standards as instructed in their PETE program, but unfortunately, and more often than not, cooperating teachers (CTs) do not follow these standards.

Lasley and Applegate (1985) surveyed 272 EFE students to identify problems that PTs confront during EFEs. Researchers found seven problems that PTs confront during their EFE experience including student management, working with the cooperating teacher, student needs, time problems, timing and practice, workload, and clear communication. Of the seven problems, three included the CT and the PETE program (working with the cooperating teacher, workload, and clear communication).
of the PTs disagreed with the management tactics and instructional strategies of the CT. Pre-service teachers are expected by the CTs to do things their way, and rightfully so, because it is their classroom. This becomes a problem for PTs because either their professional socialization in the PETE program has taught them that the CTs strategies may not be the most appropriate or follow best practices when managing a classroom. Secondly, the PTs were concerned with their ability to keep up with EFE work and their campus based classes. The third problem was that PTs wanted expectations to be spelled out clearly for them by the CT and the university faculty members. It can be difficult for university faculty to develop criteria for PTs in EFEs because each field location is different. For example, one CT may completely hand over their class to the PT, but another CT may be reluctant to give up control of the class and the PT may be relegated to observing the majority of the time. Early field experiences are a critical time for PTs development and are often a deciding factor to whether a PT stays in the program and on the path to becoming a full-time teacher. Lasley and Applegate (1985) suggest that positive effects of EFEs can be mitigated if teacher educators and CTs fail to create an appropriate structure and context for these experiences.

Investigating the impact of EFE classes on PTs self-efficacy, O’Sullivan and Tsangaridou (1992) provided critical incident forms and an open ended questionnaire to thirty-nine junior physical education majors enrolled in a secondary EFE (second of three pedagogy courses prior to student teaching) to determine the views on effective teaching, conceptions of the teaching-learning process and their role in that process. The critical incident forms directed the trainees to, “describe anything that happened during your experience today that you found particularly significant…” (O’ Sullivan and
Tsangaridou, p. 383, 1992). The open-ended questionnaire had students answer questions about their views of effective teaching, teachers, and programming for secondary physical education.

The PTs recorded critical incident forms for 5 weeks during the 10 week teaching process. These occurred in weeks 2, 3, 4, 5, and 10. Following the data gathering period the researchers inductively analyzed the data and seven themes emerged. The themes that emerged were quality of instruction, teacher’s planning, management and organization of the lesson, general demeanor of the students toward the teacher or the lesson content, success or failure of the students in achieving the goal of the lesson, safety issues in the lesson, and influence of peer observation on their teaching. The study determined that well-constructed EFEs are those that provide knowledge about good teaching, appropriate supervision, allow practice and time to reflect, opportunities to explore their understandings of teaching, schooling, and the role of the professional teacher in the education of children (O’Sullivan and Tsangaridou, 1992).

Curtner-Smith (1996) replicated the O’Sullivan and Tsangaridou (1992) study using 28 physical education PTs enrolled in a secondary methods course. It was concluded that PTs did not view success in the EFE as an end in and of itself, but as a necessary prerequisite for pupil (K-12 student) learning. Similar to O’Sullivan and Tsangaridou’s (1992), Curtner-Smith’s (1996) results indicated EFEs need to be well supervised and PTs need to be provided opportunities to reflect on their experiences.

When combining an EFE with a theoretical methods course developed from the knowledge base on effective teaching, a well supervised secondary EFE can be utilized to train PTs to focus on teaching effectiveness in terms of promoting student learning.
However, in order for an EFE to have positive effects on PTs orientation (athletic or coaching) it needs to be closely supervised by PETE faculty. With correct supervision, EFE can have a significant impact on PTs and can convert students who entered the PETE program with an athletic or coaching orientation to a teaching orientation. (Curtner-Smith, 1996). This research supports the need for EFE and indicates that an EFE combined with a theoretical methods course that is closely monitored, provide PTs with the opportunity to reflect can help PTs focus on teaching effectiveness and student learning.

Early field experiences are a very influential time for PTs development, however if EFEs are not structured correctly it can turn away potential teachers. Wasburn-Moses et al. (2012) investigated how EFEs influenced 75 PTs views of becoming a general education teacher. To analyze how the EFE affected these students, the students were asked to complete reflection papers at the end of the 10 to 12 required tutoring sessions. The reflection prompts included the dates and times spent in the field, description of the learners, service experience with comments, and how the experience affected the desire to become a teacher. It was determined that 69% of responses indicated an increased desire to become a teacher, 28% had no impact, and 3% indicated than an EFE had a negative impact on their desire to become a teacher. Fortunately, 97% of the students were still interested in becoming teachers. (Wasburn-Moses et al., 2012).

Larson (2005) questioned PTs to find out what they perceived as most surprising during their field experience (FE). The FE took place during the second phase of FE required for the physical education degree at this university. Students were enrolled in a 60-hour FE at a secondary site. Seventy two PTs completed an open-ended reflective
questionnaire to assess their experiences. Results revealed that PTs were disappointed by the cooperating teachers lack of interest in teaching towards student learning outcomes, were dismayed at CTs lack of a clear program vision, rigid teaching style, lack of contemporary programming ideas, and lack of interest in interacting with students. The results of this study support the continued schism between the ideals taught in PETE programs and realities of teaching in some schools. It is of foremost importance for the professors in PETE programs to make sure that CTs are on the same page as the university ideals so that the PTs can have a valuable and impactful experience in their FEs (Larson, 2005).

Moore (2003) studied 62 classroom teachers and 77 pre-service language arts education majors to compare if field experience settings were conducive to the model of inquiry and constructivist learning that was presented in the university classrooms or if procedural concerns such as lesson planning, time management, and content were perceived as more important. The results revealed that 88% of the strategies that PTs were taught at the university were expected to be used by the mentor teacher. Results indicated that PTs, university supervisors, and mentor teachers (CTs) need to examine and discuss the rationale behind pedagogical decisions. It was also noted that PTs adopted the teaching style of the mentor teacher regardless of conflict with practice suggested in the university classroom. This article suggests and supports the work of Larson (2005), O’Sullivan & Tsangaridou (1992), and Lasley & Applegate (1985), that regardless of what the university classes teach, PTs are going to adapt their teaching style to the CTs teaching style. Universities teach skills and ideals, but when push comes to
shove, the real world will almost always win over the ideals taught in a university classroom.

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, PTs will gain self-efficacy throughout different classes and field experiences in a PETE curriculum (Martins et al., 2014; O’Sullivan and Tsangaridou, 1992; Curtner-Smith, 1996; Pfiznner-Eden, 2016) when the field experiences are closely supervised, receive positively structured feedback, and when they feel like it is okay to fail. How PTs gain this self-efficacy is related to their socialization within physical education when they were still K-12 students. Within a student’s socialization, it is suggested that the PETE professors will be unable to completely change the way a student looks at teaching, but rather, it will be negotiated within that student. (Schempp & Graber, 1992). We know that CTs have one of the largest, if not the single largest impact on a PTs self-efficacy and socialization. Unfortunately, the schism between the ideals taught in PETE and the realities in teaching are far and wide. It is vital that the CT provides feedback in terms of progress toward a standard, not in terms of shortfalls. (Pfitzner-Eden, 2016). Socialization in physical education supports the idea of a dialectic and negotiation (Lawson 1983a, 1983b; Lawson, 1986; Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Doolittle et al., 1993). However, Moore (2003) suggests that PTs will adopt teaching styles that the mentor teacher uses over what the university taught them. Moore (2003) is not necessarily in direct conflict with the other authors, but supports the idea of negotiation and not simply acceptance. With this in mind, we need to know more specifically, how socialization affects the rate of self-efficacy change in pre-service
teachers. We know that it does, but we do not know the rate or what experiences increase or decrease this rate.
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