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Introduction

• Student teaching is a common practice
  (Krysher, Robinson, Montgomery, Edwards, 2012).

• Student teaching has a significant impact on preservice teachers
  (Ronfeldt & Reininger, 2012)

• Yet preservice teachers continue to be challenged and face obstacles during their beginning years of teaching
  (Knobloch & Whittington, 2002)
• It is important that student teachers address the concerns
  (Knobloch & Whittington, 2012)

• Numerous studies have examined concerns of student teachers
  (Fritz & Miller 2003; Hillison, 1977)

• Beginning teachers face concerns dealing with their own adequacy and the teaching role
  (Stair, Warner, & Moore, 2012)

• Men and Women communicate their concerns differently in the workplace.
  (Barker & Zifcak, 1999)
Introduction continued....

• Why do we need to understand concerns of student teachers?

• Do student teaching concerns change over time?

• Do the student teaching concerns align with the phases of a first year teacher?
Conceptual Framework

Moirs (1990) phases of a first year teacher

Six attitudinal phases of a beginning teacher

Figure 1. Phases of First Year Teachers’ Attitude Towards Teaching. From “Phases of first year teaching,” by E. Moir, 1990, California New Teacher Project: California Department of Education.
Conceptual Framework continued….

• Conceptually, this study is based upon Fuller (1969) and Fuller, Parson, and Watkins (1974) that focused on first year teachers.

• Fritz and Miller (2003) identified the concerns of student teachers in Iowa by using the categories developed by Fuller, Parson’s and Watkins (1974).

• Fritz and Miller (2003) added two more concern categories that accounted for other communications by student teachers.
Purpose and Objectives

- Investigate concerns expressed by agricultural education student teachers
- Determine if the concerns align with Moirs (1990) phases of a first years teacher

Objectives

1. Identify concerns expressed by agricultural education student teachers
2. Determine if teaching concerns varied by gender
3. Determine if the teaching concerns expressed by student teachers are congruent with Moir’s (1990) phases of a first year teacher
Methods

• Agricultural Education Students Teachers 
  Iowa State University 
• Electronic Community of Practice using Twitter 
• Population (N=26)

Objective 1:
Tweets were collected and coded into one of six predetermined codes

1. Non teaching concerns
2. Self Adequacy Concerns
3. Teaching Task Concerns
4. Teaching Impact
5. Responding to a question or giving advice
6. Sharing lesson plans or ideas
Methods continued….

**Objective 2:**
- Tweets were coded, and then categorized by gender.
- A Chi-square test was used to determine differences in the tweets by gender.

**Objective 3:**
- Each tweet received a second code based upon Moir’s (1990) phases of a first year teacher.
- Organized by date and week.

Frequencies and Percentages
Intrarater reliability $\alpha = .95$ (high)  (Wier, 2005)
## Results/Findings

### Frequencies & Percentages of Student Teacher Concern Tweets by Semester (N = 2,071)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>Fall Tweets (n=768)</th>
<th>Spring Tweets (n=1,303)</th>
<th>Total Tweets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Teaching</td>
<td>196, 25.5%</td>
<td>325, 25%</td>
<td>521, 25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>572, 74.5%</td>
<td>978, 75%</td>
<td>1,550, 74.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Category</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Adequacy</td>
<td>105, 18.4%</td>
<td>514, 52.5%</td>
<td>619, 39.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Task</td>
<td>53, 9.3%</td>
<td>120, 12.3%</td>
<td>173, 11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Impact</td>
<td>82, 14.3%</td>
<td>119, 12.2%</td>
<td>201, 13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding or Giving Advice</td>
<td>289, 50.5%</td>
<td>174, 17.8%</td>
<td>463, 29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing Lesson Plan Ideas</td>
<td>43, 7.5%</td>
<td>51, 5.2%</td>
<td>94, 6.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Iowa State University**

Agricultural Education & Studies
The Chi-Square test indicated a non-significant relationship for gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>Female Tweets (n=18)</th>
<th>Male Tweets (n=8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f (%)</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Teaching</td>
<td>391 (25.5)</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>1142 (74.5)</td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Adequacy</td>
<td>443 (39.0)</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Task</td>
<td>135 (11.8)</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Impact</td>
<td>158 (13.8)</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding to or Giving Advice</td>
<td>342 (30.0)</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing Lesson Plan Ideas</td>
<td>64 (5.6)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results continued….

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tweet Phase</th>
<th>Anticipation Phase (n=298)</th>
<th>Survival Phase (n=551)</th>
<th>Disillusionment Phase (n=448)</th>
<th>Rejuvenation Phase (n=369)</th>
<th>Reflection Phase (n=404)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tweets</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipation</td>
<td>279 (93.6)</td>
<td>94 (17.1)</td>
<td>22 (4.9)</td>
<td>21 (5.7)</td>
<td>24 (6.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survival</td>
<td>19 (6.4)</td>
<td>274 (49.7)</td>
<td>48 (10.7)</td>
<td>21 (5.7)</td>
<td>19 (4.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disillusionment</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>173 (31.4)</td>
<td>293 (65.4)</td>
<td>31 (8.4)</td>
<td>11 (2.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejuvenation</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>8 (1.4)</td>
<td>85 (19.0)</td>
<td>285 (77.2)</td>
<td>125 (31.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2 (0.3)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>11 (2.9)</td>
<td>225 (55.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Anticipation phase = week zero through two. The survival phase = weeks three through five. The disillusionment phase = weeks six through nine, the rejuvenation phase = weeks ten through twelve, and reflection phase = thirteen through fourteen.
Phase of Pre-service teachers' Attitudes Towards Teaching

- Anticipation Phase (Weeks 1, 11, 21, 31)
- Survival Phase (Weeks 2, 12, 22, 32)
- Disillusionment Phase (Weeks 3, 13, 23, 33)
- Rejuvenation Phase (Weeks 4, 14, 24, 34)
- Reflection Phase (Weeks 5, 15, 25, 35)
Conclusions

• Willing to communicate concerns using electronic communication tools.

• This study supports findings of past research that indicated student teachers have **self adequacy concerns** in student teaching.

• There were **no differences** between the number of tweets in each concern category by gender.

• The concerns of student teachers **mirror the phases of a first year teacher**

• **Understanding concerns** in preservice teacher education is important
Implications/Recommendations

- Teacher education faculty should **adjust curriculum to address concerns** expressed by student teachers.

- Teacher educators will be able to **anticipate** when preservice teacher encounters concerns.

- Further research is needed to determine if the concerns of student teachers can be applied to other **professions**.


