

CHAPTER 9

RESULTS: THE ROLE NORM INVENTORY DATA - 1978 (CASTLE HILL)

9.1 INTRODUCTION

As explained, that part of the research concerning the students' own and attributed views was replicated in 1978 in a college setting quite different in various respects to the first in an effort to ascertain the extent to which the levels of consensus and patterns of role perception found in the 1976 study might or might not be specific to the institution in which the data were gathered. Whereas these 1976 data came from a college that was in a rural setting, relatively large, residential and multi-purpose in its teaching functions, the 1978 data were collected in a college that was urban in its setting, relatively small, non-residential, single-purpose and for Catholic students. On the face of it at least therefore, the two colleges were dissimilar.

The results of this phase of the study are presented below. It is not intended to provide the detail given previously. Rather, summaries will be made of the relevant role sector analyses with full tables of mean responses, standard deviations, multivariate and univariate F values, and Agreement Scores being provided in appendices.

9.2 THE FACTOR ANALYSIS: COMPARISON WITH MITCHELL DATA

The first step taken, as for the 1976 data, was to factor analyse the responses of all students to all four inventories by role sector (i.e. four analyses) using the same principal components

computer programme. The results of these analyses are presented in Appendix 10. Though there were minor differences, the factors extracted were essentially the same as for the 1976 data thus enabling the basic descriptive framework to be retained for the 1978 responses. Tables 9.1 to 9.4 compare the factor structure of the two sets of responses as a means of establishing this close similarity. Table 9.1 shows the comparison for the classroom role.

The table shows clearly that in respect of the loadings on the major contributing variables the factor structure of each set of responses was very much the same. A sixth factor was extracted from the 1978 data with loadings of -0.76 on variable 14 (express own political views...), -0.52 on 10 (smoke in front of pupils) and 0.44 (give homework) but since the sort of behaviour this factor appears to describe seems similar to that covered by the factor 'formal teaching behaviour' and since it accounted for only 6.68% of the variance in the responses, barely achieving the accepted eigenvalue criterion of 1.00, it was not considered further as a separate entity.

TABLE 9.1

COMPARISON OF FACTOR STRUCTURE OF 1976 AND 1978

DATA: ACTING TOWARD PUPILS

FACTOR	GROUPS	% VARIANCE	VARIABLES AND LOADINGS
Traditional Authoritarian Behaviour	1976	15.07	12 (.60), 3 (.58), 1 (.58), 4 (.57), 7 (.56)
	1978	14.45	3 (-.78), 7 (-.61), 12 (-.55), 4 (-.32)
Freedom of Expression	1976	11.33	13 (-.79), 14 (-.78), 15 (-.48)
	1978	8.55	13 (-.78), 15 (-.69), 14 (-.19)*
Pupil-Centred Teaching	1976	9.36	11 (-.75), 9 (-.69), 5 (-.34), 8 (-.23)*
	1978	9.99	9 (-.66), 8 (-.63), 11 (-.54) 2 (-.34), 5 (-.25)*
Progressive Teaching Behaviour	1976	7.38	6 (-.67), 8 (.61), 5 (.50), 15 (.44)
	1978	7.95	6 (.69), 5 (-.61), 10 (.42), 12 (.36), 1 (.32), 8 (-.15)*
Formal Teaching Behaviour	1976	6.88	2 (-.73), 1 (-.32), 10 (.63), 4 (-.16)*
	1978	7.13	4 (.64), 2 (.62), 1 (.49)

* Did not reach accepted .30 criterion but included for purposes of comparison.

Table 9.2 compares the factor structure of the two sets of data for role sector two:

TABLE 9.2
COMPARISON OF FACTOR STRUCTURE OF 1976 AND 1978
DATA: ACTING TOWARD COLLEAGUES

FACTOR	GROUPS	% VARIANCE	VARIABLES AND LOADINGS
Professional Political Activism	1976	21.12	24 (-.76), 17 (.73), 19 (-.53), 20 (-.53), 18 (-.31), 22 (-.22)*
	1978	14.33	24 (-.84), 17 (-.75) 21 (-.32), 19 (-.23)*, 18 (-.20)*
Extra-Curricular Professionalism	1976	15.37	22 (-.72), 25 (-.62), 18 (.56), 23 (-.43), 21 (-.30)
	1978	11.43	22 (.80)*, 25 (.73), 21 (.47), 23 (.11)*, 18 (-.24)*
Extra-Curricular Altruism	1976	10.66	16 (.72), 21 (-.64), 20 (.47), 23 (.40), 17 (.29)*
	1978	22.80	16 (-.78), 21 (.51), 20 (-.66), 18 (-.37), 17 (-.34), 19 (-.32)

* Did not reach .30 criterion but included for purposes of comparison.

Inspection of Table 9.2 again reveals how similar were the two sets of responses. A fourth factor accounting for 10.31% of the variance was extracted in the 1978 analysis. It shows loadings of -.81 for item 23 (discuss serious personal problems with the principal)

and $-.59$ for 19 (include other teachers in their circle of close friends). This appeared to be describing behaviour toward colleagues characterised by closeness, warmth, respect and trust and so these descriptors were borne in mind when the patterns of role perception were later discussed.

Table 9.3 presents the same comparison for the role sector Acting Toward Parents:

TABLE 9.3
COMPARISON OF FACTOR STRUCTURE OF 1976 AND 1978
DATA: ACTING TOWARD PARENTS

FACTOR	GROUPS	% VARIANCE	VARIABLES AND LOADINGS
Teacher-Parent Co-operation	1976	20.54	33 ($-.70$), 32 ($-.65$), 34 ($-.63$), 31 ($-.56$), 28 ($-.34$), 26 ($.10$)*
	1978	12.91	33 ($.71$), 26 ($.67$), 32 ($.48$) 34 ($.41$), 31 ($.13$)*
Teacher-Parent Distance	1976	14.67	30 ($.80$), 29 ($.74$), 35 ($.51$), 28 ($.35$)
	1978	21.90	30 ($.87$), 29 ($.84$)
Teacher-Parent Formality	1976	10.47	27 ($.70$), 26 ($.67$), 35 ($-.20$)*
	1978	10.50	35 ($.80$), 27 ($.61$)

* Did not reach $.30$ criterion but included for purposes of comparison.

Though, again, the similarity in the factor structure of the two sets of responses is obvious there were some differences reflecting quite possibly the fact that components such as 'teacher-parent distance' and 'teacher-parent formality' tend to overlap somewhat. Once more the 1978 data yielded another factor. It showed loadings of $-.72$ for variable 28 (visit every pupil's home...), $-.56$ for variable 31 (attend parent-teacher association meetings), $-.54$ for 34 (attempt to find out what in the home situation may contribute to misbehaviour...), $-.36$ for 27 (insist parents contact teacher via the principal) and $-.31$ for variable 33 (contact parents whenever any problem arises about their children). The problem of overlap is again apparent here. The factor seems very similar to that labelled 'teacher-parent co-operation'. It is composed of the same variables for the most part, though with slightly different emphases. In all, it seemed that the descriptive framework previously derived was adequate to account for this additional factor so it was not stressed separately.

Finally, Table 9.4 compares the factor structure of the 1976 and 1978 responses for the role sector Acting Toward Community. Even a brief description of the table reveals factors that are virtually identical in structure:

TABLE 9.4

COMPARISON OF FACTOR STRUCTURE OF 1976 AND 1978

DATA: ACTING TOWARD COMMUNITY

FACTOR	GROUPS	% VARIANCE	VARIABLES AND LOADINGS
Community Supportiveness	1976	25.19	38 (.67), 37 (.64), 42 (.58), 39 (.55), 40 (.53), 41 (.43)
	1978	25.10	38 (.71), 40 (.65), 39 (.63), 42 (.59), 41 (.58), 37 (.55)
Independent Community Behaviour	1976	17.48	44 (.92), 45 (.91)
	1978	17.86	45 (.92), 44 (.90)
Correct Community Behaviour	1976	11.7	43 (.76), 36 (-.68), 41 (-.61)
	1978	11.01	43 (-.79), 36 (.66), 41 (.24)*

* Did not reach accepted .30 criterion but included for purposes of comparison.

In brief, Table 9.4 shows the factors emerging in the same order for each set of responses with each factor being composed of the same variables with closely similar loadings.

Overall, with the addition of a descriptor such as 'professional camaraderie' to take account of the extra factor found for the role sector Acting Toward Colleagues, it was considered that the factors derived from the 1978 analysis were so similar to those obtained from the 1976 data that the descriptive framework used for the latter could be retained.

Having established such a framework there follows a role sector by role sector description of patterns in the data in terms of the content of the students' own and attributed views and the levels of consensus found. This will then provide a basis for comparison of the patterns of role perception found in the 1976 and 1978 studies.

9.3 ROLE SECTOR 1: ACTING TOWARD PUPILS*

In respect of their future role as primary teacher the 6th semester students saw themselves as open and progressive (role norms 6, 8, 5), as generally non-authoritarian (7, 12) though permissive about depriving pupils of privileges (3), as not overly formal or traditional (1, 2, 4), as mildly pupil-centred (11, 9, 5) overall, and as democratic concerning issues pedagogical (6, 13, 15), though not so when it came to matters political (14).

This pattern held for the 2nd semester group with some variations in degree. Table 9.5, which summarises all of the relevant comparisons for the two student groups, shows 5 statistically significant differences between them. The tendencies were for the 2nd semester group to be rather more formal (2) and a little less pupil-centred (5, 11) in orientation but perhaps even more democratic (6, 14).

Both groups were idealistic in that for 6th there were no differences between their own norms and expectations, and for 2nd only one difference (they considered that, in practice, they thought they would be even less likely to express their own political views

* Means, standard deviations and multivariate F-values for Castle Hill respondents are given in Appendix 11.

TABLE 9.5

DIFFERENCES PER ROLE NORM, MEAN DIFFERENCES PER ROLE NORM, AND STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES FOR ALL 2ND AND 6TH SEMESTER COMPARISONS (CASTLE HILL):
ACTING TOWARD PUPILS

ROLE NORM	COMPARISONS											
	← 6TH SEMESTER →								← 2ND SEMESTER →			
	OWN NORMS VS OWN EXPECTATIONS	OWN NORMS VS NORMS ATTRIB. LECTURERS	OWN NORMS VS NORMS ATTRIB. TEACHERS	NORMS ATTRIB. LECT'S VS NORMS ATTRIB. TEACHERS	OWN NORMS VS 2ND'S OWN NORMS	OWN EXPECTATIONS VS 2ND'S EXPECTATIONS	NORMS ATTRIB. LECT'S VS 2ND'S NORMS ATTRIB. L'S	NORMS ATTRIB. T'S VS 2ND'S NORMS ATTRIB. T'S	OWN NORMS VS OWN EXPECTATIONS	OWN NORMS VS NORMS ATTRIB. LECTURERS	OWN NORMS VS. NORMS ATTRIB. TEACHERS	NORMS ATTRIB. LECT'S VS NORMS ATTRIB. TEACHERS
1.	.34	.18	.64*	.82*	.14	.39*	.08	.03	.09	.12	.81*	.93*
2.	.02	.46*	.36	.82*	.62*	.52*	.98*	.53*	.12	.82*	.45*	1.27*
3.	.06	.06	.44*	.50*	.13	.28	.41*	.14	.09	.34*	.43*	.77*
4.	.24	.34	.60*	1.06*	.04	.19	.19	.09	.09	.11	.45*	.66*
5.	.20	.12	.92*	.80*	.19	.13	.38*	.05	.14	.31*	.68*	.37*
6.	.12	.08	.36*	.28*	.43*	.35*	.19	.05	.19	.32*	.74*	.42*
7.	.06	.04	.58*	.62*	.20	.36	.45*	.48*	.10	.21	.86*	.65*
8.	.20	.16	.74*	.90*	.35*	.15	.25	.15	.00	.26*	.54*	.80*
9.	.28	.40*	.26	.34*	.04	.06	.27	.11	.26	.09	.19	.28
10.#	.24	.04	.24	.28	.24	.09	.16	.23	.09	.04	.25	.21
11.	.06	.56*	.24	.82*	.37*	.34*	.76*	.21	.03	.17	.10	.27
12.	.08	.22	.68*	.90*	.18	.08	.10	.02	.02	.50*	.48*	.98*
13.	.04	.10	.82*	.72*	.18	.45*	.40*	.19	.23	.32*	.83*	.51*
14.	.04	.24	.06	.30	.65*	.28	.41*	.02	.41*	.48*	.57*	.09
15.	.06	.04	.68*	.72*	.00	.29	.28	.36	.23	.24	1.04*	.80*
MEAN	.136	.203	.508	.659	.251	.264	.354	.177	.139	.289	.561	.601

N.B. An asterisk (*) signifies a statistically significant difference - (p < .01).

signifies univariate-F not statistically significant.

in the classroom than they ought). The differences between the groups' expectations were very similar to the differences between their norms: the 2nd semester group tended toward greater formality in approach (1, 2) and less pupil-centredness (11) but were even more democratic (6, 13).

The 6th semester students saw lecturers as very open and progressive (5, 8), as non-punitive (3, 7, 12), as pupil-centred (9, 11, 5) and as democratic in respect of teaching concerns (6, 13, 15) though this did not extend to expressing one's own political views in the classroom (14). Though perceived as very strongly approving of making and carefully following lesson plans (2), in other respects (1, 4) lecturers were seen as less than formal and traditional in approach.

Again, this pattern was repeated for the 2nd semester group. However, there were numerous differences of degree as reflected in the 7 statistically significant differences between the norms each group attributed to lecturers. The 2nd semester students saw lecturers as being much more formal than 6th (2), as more punitive in respect of depriving a pupil of privileges (3) but less as regards using academic work as punishment (7), as less pupil-centred (5, 11), and as less democratic in respect of encouraging discussion about religious beliefs (13) but more so as regards the expression of political views in the classroom (14). Overall, lecturers were seen as progressive by 2nd but less so than 6th semester saw them as being.

Whereas 6th semester perceived little difference between themselves and lecturers, 2nd semester perceived a good deal more. For 6th there were only 3 statistically significant differences with lecturers being seen as more formal in respect of lesson preparation (2) not surprisingly, and as even more pupil-centred (9, 11). For 2nd there were 8 differences. Though compared with the students themselves lecturers were seen as even less punitive (3, 12) and more open and progressive (5, 8) they were also seen as more formal (2) and less democratic (6, 13, 14, 15).

Summing up, 6th semester saw themselves as closer to lecturers in viewpoint about the classroom role than did the 2nd semester group.

Though the 6th semester students perceived teachers to hold views that were characterised by less than enthusiasm for democratic (13, 14, 15) and pupil-centred (9, 11) approaches, they were also not seen as overly formal, traditional and authoritarian (1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 12) in an absolute sense and, indeed, as moderately open and progressive in certain respects (5, 8, 6). Relative to the students' own position, however, the differences were many and often substantial as the relevant column in Table 9.5 reveals. There were no fewer than 10 statistically significant differences between the students' own norms and those they attributed to teachers. Relative to the students themselves, teachers were seen as more formal, traditional and authoritarian (1, 3, 4, 7, 12), less open and progressive (5, 8) and less democratic (13, 15, 6).

Once again this pattern was basically the same for the 2nd semester group. They saw teachers as more formal (2) and more punitive (7) than did 6th but about the same in other respects. However, relative to their own views, like 6th semester, they saw teachers as more formal, traditional and authoritarian (1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 12), less open and progressive (5, 8) and less democratic (6, 13, 14, 15), the extent of this perceived distance being reflected not only in the number of statistically significant differences (twelve) but also in the magnitude of them (0.657 for the 12 differences, and 0.561 over the entire sector).

Essentially then, both student groups perceived teachers as holding views about the classroom role that were much less progressive overall than the students' own. These were mostly substantial differences of intensity, though there were also directional differences (3 for 6th and 5 for 2nd). Table 9.5 also makes clear that both groups perceived even more distance between lecturers and teachers than between themselves and teachers. There were 11 statistically significant differences between the norms the 2nd semester group attributed to lecturers and those they attributed to teachers and a mean difference per role norm of .601 for the whole sector, and .742 for the eleven differences. For the 6th semester group there were 13 differences with mean differences per role norm of .716 for these and .659 for the sector. Both groups saw lecturers as holding views that were less formal, traditional and authoritarian and more open, pupil-centred and democratic - in brief, more progressive - than those held by teachers.

9.4 ROLE SECTOR 2: ACTING TOWARD COLLEAGUES

For the role sector Acting Toward Colleagues the multivariate F value of 4.9139 was statistically significant ($p < .01$) with statistically significant univariate F values for variables 16, 17, 20, 21, 22 and 25. Scheffé tests on these variables for all relevant within- and between-group comparison revealed the patterns shown in Table 9.6.

Reference to the table in the appendices showing all of the data for this role sector will show that, in terms of the descriptors derived from the factor analysis, both group's orientations might reasonably be described as professionally dedicated and altruistic (16, 21, 20), responsible (22, 25, 18, 23), moderately activist (17, 24) and relatively desirous of trust and closeness in professional relationships with colleagues (19, 23). Both groups' expectations closely followed this pattern as did the norms they attributed to lecturers and, indeed, the norms they attributed to teachers.

That there were differences of emphasis, however, is shown in Table 9.6. The 6th semester group foresaw the possibility that they would be somewhat less activist (role norm 17) than they ought, while they perceived lecturers as holding views that were rather more activist (17) and even more professionally responsible (22, 25). By contrast they saw teachers as less activist (17), less dedicated and altruistic (16, 20, 21) and less professionally responsible (25). Thus they perceived a substantial difference between lecturers and teachers. As Table 9.6 shows there were

TABLE 9.6

DIFFERENCES PER ROLE NORM, MEAN DIFFERENCES PER ROLE NORM, AND STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES FOR ALL 2ND AND 6TH SEMESTER COMPARISONS (CASTLE HILL ACTING TOWARD COLLEAGUES)

ROLE NORM	COMPARISONS											
	← 6TH SEMESTER →								← 2ND SEMESTER →			
	OWN NORMS VS OWN EXPECTATIONS	OWN NORMS VS NORMS ATTRIB. LECTURERS	OWN NORMS VS NORMS ATTRIB. TEACHERS	NORMS ATTRIB. LECT'S VS NORMS ATTRIB. TEACHERS	OWN NORMS VS 2ND'S OWN NORMS	OWN EXPECTATIONS VS 2ND'S EXPECTATIONS	NORMS ATTRIB. LECT'S VS 2ND'S NORMS ATTRIB. L'S	NORMS ATTRIB. T'S VS 2ND'S NORMS ATTRIB. T'S	OWN NORMS VS OWN EXPECTATIONS	OWN NORMS VS NORMS ATTRIB. LECTURERS	OWN NORMS VS NORMS ATTRIB. TEACHERS	NORMS ATTRIB. LECT'S VS NORMS ATTRIB. TEACHERS
16.	.02	.16	.52*	.68*	.21	.24	.01	.09	.01	.38*	.22	.60*
17.	.36*	.38*	.34*	.72*	.00	.21	.01	.58*	.15	.37*	.24	.13
18.#	.04	.18	.10	.28	.12	.24	.19	.27	.18	.27	.07	.20
19.#	.10	.06	.00	.06	.07	.18	.27	.22	.21	.26	.25	.11
20.	.02	.26	.60*	.86*	.71*	.96*	.70*	.33*	.23	.27	.22	.49*
21.	.22	.06	.58*	.64*	.29	.22	.10	.21	.29	.25	.50*	.75*
22.	.18	.48*	.24	.72*	.05	.05	.17	.17	.08	.36*	.02	.38*
23.#	.16	.12	.10	.02	.01	.14	.09	.30	.29	.22	.19	.41
24.	.04	.32	.04	.28	.04	.08	.13	.28	.08	.23	.36	.13
25.	.06	.42*	.28	.70*	.11	.12	.28	.11	.07	.03	.28	.31*
MEAN	.120	.244	.280	.496	.161	.244	.195	.256	.159	.292	.235	.351

N.B. An asterisk (*) signifies a statistically significant difference - $p < .01$

signifies univariate-F not statistically significant.

6 statistically significant differences averaging .720 per role norm for the six, and .496 over the whole sector, with teachers being seen as less activist (17), less altruistic and dedicated (16, 20, 21) and less professionally responsible (22, 25) than lecturers.

2nd semester, too, saw lecturers as even more dedicated (16) activist (17) and responsible (22) than they, the students themselves, were. And, like 6th semester, they saw teachers as rather less responsible (22). However, unlike 6th, they saw teachers as rather more than less activist (24). Again, like 6th, they saw lecturers as more altruistic (16, 20, 21) and more professionally responsible (22) than teachers, but, unlike the 6th semester group, a little less politically activist in orientation (25).

The difference between the student groups was minimal irrespective of inventory. In respect of both their own norms and expectations 6th semester saw themselves as being more professionally dedicated (20) than did 2nd and also attributed to both lecturers and teachers greater dedication than did 2nd. As well, 6th saw teachers as being less activist in the professional political sense than did 2nd.

9.5 ROLE SECTOR 3: ACTING TOWARD PARENTS

The F-statistic for the multivariate test of equality of mean vectors for this role sector of 3.3008 was statistically significant at $p < .0001$ and follow-up univariate F values were statistically significant ($p < .01$) for all variables except role norms 26 and 33. Table 9.7 shows the pattern of differences between the student groups for all relevant comparisons.

TABLE 9.7

DIFFERENCES PER ROLE NORM, MEAN DIFFERENCES PER ROLE NORM, AND STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES FOR ALL 2ND AND 6TH SEMESTER COMPARISONS (CASTLE HILL):
ACTING TOWARD PARENTS

ROLE NORM	COMPARISONS											
	6TH SEMESTER								2ND SEMESTER			
	OWN NORMS VS OWN EXPECTATIONS	OWN NORMS VS NORMS ATTRIB. LECTURERS	OWN NORMS VS NORMS ATTRIB. TEACHERS	NORMS ATTRIB. LECT'S VS NORMS ATTRIB. TEACHERS	OWN NORMS VS 2ND'S OWN NORMS	OWN EXPECTATIONS VS 2ND'S EXPECTATIONS	NORMS ATTRIB. LECT'S VS 2ND'S NORMS ATTRIB. L'S	NORMS ATTRIB. T'S VS 2ND'S NORMS ATTRIB. T'S	OWN NORMS VS OWN EXPECTATIONS	OWN NORMS VS NORMS ATTRIB. LECTURERS	OWN NORMS VS NORMS ATTRIB. TEACHERS	
26. #	.06	.06	.30	.24	.13	.16	.00	.07	.09	.07	.10	.17
27.	.08	.42	.34	.08	.08	.14	.28	.02	.14	.22	.44*	.22
28.	.42*	.24	.34	.58*	.59*	.48*	.40*	.40*	.31	.43*	.15	.58*
29.	.28	.18	.28	.10	.87*	.75*	.63*	.66*	.40*	.42*	.49*	.07
30.	.22	.06	.06	.12	.50*	.40*	.38	.34*	.32	.18	.10	.08
31.	.06	.32*	.36*	.68*	.06	.03	.11	.12	.03	.15	.30*	.45*
32.	.06	.12	.72*	.84*	.07	.17	.15	.19	.16	.04	.46*	.50*
33.	.20	.08	.44	.52	.22	.18	.22	.01	.16	.08	.21	.29
34.	.06	.14	.32*	.46*	.03	.02	.07	.16	.07	.18	.19	.37*
35.	.04	.08	.34*	.42*	.27	.08	.15	.20	.23*	.20	.13	.07
MEAN	.148	.170	.350	.404	.282	.241	.239	.217	.191	.197	.257	.280

N.B. An asterisk (*) signifies a statistically significant difference ($P < .01$).

signifies univariate-F not statistically significant.

Inspection of the table in the appendices showing the full data for this sector will show that both groups' norms and expectations revealed an orientation toward parents marked by a strong co-operativeness of intent (33, 26, 32, 34, 31), but in matters perhaps seen to be exclusively in the professional domain, a need to preserve some formality (35, 27, 26) and some distance (30, 29, 35, 28). In respect of this latter, the three statistically significant differences between the groups shown in Table 9.7 for role norms 30, 29 and 28 revealed this to be less pronounced in the 2nd semester group.

Both groups saw lecturers as holding views very similar to the students' own. 2nd semester saw them as being rather less distant in one respect (28) but more so in another (29) whereas 6th saw them as, if anything, even more co-operative in respect of teacher-parent relationships (31). Compared with 2nd, 6th semester saw lecturers as more distant in respect of discussing pupil's scores on standardized tests with parents (29) but less so in respect of visiting pupils' homes (28).

The 2nd semester group tended to see teachers as more formal in respect of teacher-pupil relationships (27), less unwilling to preserve professional distance (29) and, to a degree, not so co-operative (31, 32) compared with themselves. 6th semester also saw teachers as less co-operative (31, 32, 34) and more formal (35) to a moderate degree only. Nonetheless, for both groups the differences they perceived between lecturers and teachers were larger than those they saw between themselves and either. Both groups saw

teachers as less co-operative (31, 32, 34) and more inclined to parent-teacher distance (28, and, for 6th, 35). Compared with 2nd semester, the 6th semester group saw teachers as more desirous of keeping some professional distance on the issues of standardized testing and I.Q.'s (29, 30) but more approving of visiting pupils' homes (28).

9.6 ROLE SECTOR 4: ACTING TOWARD COMMUNITY

For the role sector Acting Toward Community the multivariate test of equality of mean vectors once more yielded a statistically significant ($p < .0001$) multivariate-F value (3.0947) and univariate-F values that were statistically significant on 8 of the 10 variables (all except role norms 37 and 42). Read in conjunction with Table 9.8 below which summarises the statistically significant differences for all relevant comparisons, the table in the appendices showing full details of the responses to this sector of the four inventories shows that both student groups held norms in respect of relationships between the teacher and the community that could be described as moderately supportive (37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42), cautious as regards 'correct' or decorous public behaviour (36, 43, 41) but relatively 'independent' in respect of behaviours perhaps seen to be private concerns or widely tolerated (44, 45). In practice, 2nd semester thought they would be even more cautious (43) and publicly supportive (39) than they ought, as did 6th semester (40, 43) who also saw themselves as being likely to be even more independent than they ought (44).

TABLE 9.8

DIFFERENCES PER ROLE NORM, MEAN DIFFERENCES PER ROLE NORM, AND STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES FOR ALL 2ND AND 6TH SEMESTER COMPARISONS (CASTLE HILL ACTING TOWARD COMMUNITY)

ROLE NORM	COMPARISONS											
	6TH SEMESTER								2ND SEMESTER			
	OWN NORMS VS OWN EXPECTATIONS	OWN NORMS VS NORMS ATTRIB. LECTURERS	OWN NORMS VS NORMS ATTRIB. TEACHERS	NORMS ATTRIB. LECT'S VS NORMS ATTRIB. TEACHERS	OWN NORMS VS 2ND'S OWN NORMS	OWN EXPECTATIONS VS 2ND'S EXPECTATIONS	NORMS ATTRIB. LECT'S VS 2ND'S NORMS ATTRIB. L'S	NORMS ATTRIB. T'S VS 2ND'S NORMS ATTRIB. T'S	OWN NORMS VS OWN EXPECTATIONS	OWN NORMS VS NORMS ATTRIB. LECTURERS	OWN NORMS VS NORMS ATTRIB. TEACHERS	NORMS ATTRIB. LECT'S VS NORMS ATTRIB. TEACHERS
36.	.06	.44	.10	.34	.25	.24	.43*	.51*	.05	.26	.16	.42*
37.#	.16	.20	.22	.02	.18	.08	.02	.02	.09	.00	.06	.06
38.	.04	.44*	.10	.54*	.05	.14	.07	.17	.15	.32*	.01	.30*
39.	.28	.20	.36*	.56*	.26	.18	.29	.08	.36*	.17	.18	.35*
40.	.38*	.42*	.12	.66*	.23	.11	.19	.34	.04	.38*	.01	.39*
41.	.14	.48*	.10	.38	.28	.42*	.40*	.41*	.00	.36	.03	.39*
42.#	.20	.22	.14	.08	.01	.31	.26	.17	.12	.05	.04	.01
43.	.56*	.34	.18	.52*	.14	.18	.29	.16	.52*	.19	.12	.07
44.	.64*	.16	.12	.28	.02	.38*	.08	.25	.24	.26	.15	.11
45.	.32	.32	.10	.42*	.14	.44*	.05	.41*	.02	.23	.17	.06
MEAN	.278	.322	.154	.380	.156	.248	.208	.252	.159	.222	.093	.177

N.B. An asterisk (*) signifies a statistically significant difference - ($p < .01$)
signifies univariate-F not statistically significant.

Both groups saw lecturers as even more supportive than they, the students, were (38, 40) while 6th semester saw them as even more approving of the necessity for a primary teacher to remember that a stricter standard of conduct is expected of him (41). Compared with 2nd, 6th semester saw lecturers as more approving of a cautious public image for the primary teacher (36, 41).

Apart from 6th semester's perception that, in one respect (role norm 39) teachers were mildly less supportive, neither group saw much difference between themselves and teachers in respect of relationships with the community. However, both groups did see lecturers as more supportive in orientation than teachers (role norms 38, 39, 40). Also, 6th semester saw lecturers as less approving of a primary teacher making political speeches and teachers as more approving of visiting a pub (45). The 2nd semester group saw lecturers as more cautious about the primary teacher's public image than teachers (36, 41). 6th semester saw teachers as more cautious (36, 41) than did 2nd but, in one respect (role norm 45), rather more independent. Finally, compared with 2nd semester, the 6th semester thought they might be more cautious about their public image in one respect (role norm 41) when they began teaching, but also more independent (44, 45).

9.7 COMPARISON WITH THE MITCHELL RESULTS

9.7.1 TRENDS IN STUDENTS' OWN AND ATTRIBUTED VIEWS

The foregoing relatively brief analysis will have made clear how very similar the results obtained at Castle Hill were when com-

pared with those obtained for Mitchell and given in detail in chapter 6. It is the intention here to draw attention to the most salient trends in summary form only. These are as follows:

- * With few exceptions the norms held for the primary teacher role by both Castle Hill student groups were very much the same as those characterising the role orientations of their respective Mitchell counterparts. That is, they were progressive, democratic, pupil-centred, dedicated, responsible, moderately activist in respect of professional political concerns, desirous of warm professional relationships with colleagues and strong co-operation with parents, formal with parents as regards strictly pedagogical matters, moderately supportive of the community, and cautious about matters of public propriety but relatively independent about private concerns. On the whole these tendencies were more pronounced in 6th semester than in 2nd semester students, as was the case for the Mitchell Cohorts.
- * Idealism, as measured by the degree of congruence between students' norms and expectations, was high for both student groups, as it was for the Mitchell groups.
- * Both groups saw lecturers as being more like themselves in the norms held for the primary teacher role than they saw teachers as being. As in the Mitchell study, this tendency was stronger in the 6th semester cohort. The 6th semester students saw themselves as closer to lecturers and further from teachers than did the 2nd semester group, and also perceived greater and more numerous differences between lecturers and teachers

than did 2nd semester. Essentially though, this trend was apparent for both groups, as in the Mitchell study. Table 9.9 below summarises these trends. It gives the mean difference per role norm and the number of statistically significant differences found for each group for each relevant role norm inventory comparison by role sector and by total role.

Table 9.9 reveals that, as in the Mitchell study, there was little difference between the Castle Hill students' own norms and expectations, less perceived distance between students and lecturers than between students and teachers, and greatest perceived distance between the norms attributed by students to lecturers and those attributed to teachers. This is precisely the order of differences found in the Mitchell study where, however, the trend was more marked.

Again, as in the Mitchell study, the role relationship sectors signifying greatest potential conflict were those concerning the classroom in particular, and parent/teacher expectations. On the other hand, the lowest level of potential perceived conflict was found for the role sector Acting Toward Community, as in the 1976 study.

- * Though the differences between the 2nd and 6th semester cohorts from Castle Hill were not as large, on the whole, or so numerous as those for the relevant Mitchell comparisons, there was the similarity that for both sets of data the greatest overall difference between the groups lay in their perception of lecturers.

TABLE 9.9

MEAN DIFFERENCE PER ROLE NORM AND NUMBER OF STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES* FOR COMPARISONS BETWEEN 2ND AND 6TH SEMESTER CASTLE HILL STUDENTS' OWN AND ATTRIBUTED VIEWS: BY ROLE SECTOR AND BY TOTAL ROLE

ROLE SECTOR	GROUP	OWN NORMS VS OWN EXPECTATIONS	OWN NORMS VS NORMS ATTRIBUTED LECTURERS	OWN NORMS VS NORMS ATTRIBUTED TEACHERS	N'S ATTRIB. LECT.'S VS N'S ATTRIB. TEACHERS
Acting Toward Pupils	2nd	.139 (1)	.289 (8)	.561 (12)	.601 (11)
	6th	.136 (0)	.203 (3)	.508 (10)	.659 (13)
Acting Toward Colleagues	2nd	.159 (0)	.292 (3)	.235 (1)	.351 (5)
	6th	.120 (1)	.244 (3)	.280 (4)	.496 (6)
Acting Toward Parents	2nd	.191 (2)	.197 (20)	.257 (4)	.280 (4)
	6th	.148 (1)	.170 (1)	.350 (4)	.404 (5)
Acting Toward Community	2nd	.159 (2)	.222 (2)	.093 (0)	.177 (5)
	6th	.278 (3)	.322 (3)	.154 (1)	.380 (5)
Total Role	2nd	0.159 (5)	0.254 (15)	0.317 (17)	0.380 (25)
	6th	1.167 (5)	0.231 (10)	0.346 (19)	0.504 (29)

* The number of statistically significant differences for each comparison is shown in parentheses.

- * Notwithstanding the overall similarity between the Mitchell and Castle Hill data, there were of course differences worthy of mention in responses to the role norm items. Notable amongst these were differences between the Castle Hill and Mitchell groups in responses to items 13 (encourage pupils to discuss various religious beliefs in the classroom) and 39 (attend church regularly). While the Mitchell groups tended to be equivocal or even mildly disapproving of these propositions the Castle Hill groups were solidly in favour - as perhaps is not surprising given the fact of their training in a specialist Catholic college. Though not quite so marked, disparities between the colleges were also found for the same items for students' attributed views.

9.7.2 ROLE CONSENSUS

The same analyses previously described for the Mitchell data were carried out. That is, firstly, between-group sector-by-sector comparisons were made and then Agreement Scores calculated for each role norm item for each group for each of the four inventory conditions. These data are given in appendices and the following summary of trends derived from them.

- * The between-sector comparisons revealed that, as for the Mitchell data, between-group consensus was very much the exception. For the sixteen comparisons (4 inventories by 4 role sectors) between 2nd and 6th semester consensus was only found for the groups' own norms and own expectations for the role Acting Toward Community.

- * The Mean Agreement Score calculated for each inventory showed that, as for the Mitchell data, within-group consensus was higher for 6th than for 2nd semester for every inventory and for the total role, with the exception in the Castle Hill case that for R.N.I. 4 (norms attributed to teachers) consensus was a little higher for 2nd (Mean Agreement Score of 0.436 to 6th's 0.422). On a sector-by-sector basis the pattern was also somewhat similar: consensus was higher for the Castle Hill 6th semester (compared with 2nd semester) for 11 of the 16 relevant comparisons while for Mitchell this was the case for 14 of the 16 comparisons. For both sets of data, consensus was higher for 6th than 2nd for the students' own norms in every role sector.

- * As for the Mitchell data, the mean level of agreement per role norm over all inventories was, for both groups, highest for role relationships with colleagues or the community and lowest for the classroom role. Overall levels of agreement were, on the face of it, low, seldom exceeding 50% agreement for any group for any sector. This, again, mirrored what was found in the 1976 study, the only difference being that overall agreement levels were rather lower for the Mitchell 2nd semester students than for their Castle Hill counterparts.

- * Analysis of Agreement Scores for each role norm item revealed, as in the 1976 study, a wide range for each group for all inventories. That is, on the whole, consensus ranged from very low to very high whether it was for students' own or attrib-

uted views. Unlike the Mitchell data, however, there was a tendency for the range of Agreement Scores to be somewhat high for the Castle Hill 6th semester when compared with their 2nd semester. Despite this difference there was the same tendency as in the Mitchell results for the extreme low Agreement Scores to be lower for 2nd than for 6th and extreme high scores to be higher for 6th than for 2nd. Moreover, the distribution of scores when ranked and plotted from low to high was very similar to that found for the Mitchell groups, thus indicating ranges that were truly wide rather than reflecting atypically high or low clusters of scores.

- * Comparison with the Mitchell data of high and low consensus items for each Castle Hill group (see chapter 6) also reveal marked similarities. For Castle Hill, the highest consensus was found over all inventories for role norms 35 and 42 (appearing 8 times out of a possible 8), 5, 16, 26, 31 and 38 (6 times), 8, 19 and 37 (5 times) and 45 (4 times). Eight of these 11 items were ranked in the top 11 (i.e. top quartile) for Mitchell. Similarly, 8 of the 11 items about which there was least consensus were the same for Castle Hill as for Mitchell. For Castle Hill these low consensus items were 36, 27, 32 and 30 (8 times out of 8), 29 (7 times), 7 (6 times), 15 (5 times), 14 and 33 (4 times) and 18 and 28 (3 times).
- * Overwhelmingly there were strong similarities between the relative degree of agreement accorded each role norm by the 6th semester groups when compared, and the 2nd semester groups.

The Agreement Scores for each group for each inventory were ranked from 1 to 45 and comparisons using Spearman's Rank Order Correlation Coefficient (ρ , or r_s) were made as shown in Table 9.10 below:

TABLE 9.10

COMPARISON OF RANKED AGREEMENT SCORES: RANK ORDER CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR MITCHELL AND CASTLE HILL 2ND AND 6TH SEMESTER COMPARISONS, BY INVENTORY

INVENTORY	2nd (C.H.) vs 2nd (M)	6th (C.H.) vs 6th (M)	2nd (C.H.) vs 6th (C.H.)	2nd (M) vs 6th (M)
1	.783 p < .001	.683 p < .001	.706 p < .001	.851 p < .001
2	.774 p < .001	.532 p < .001	.704 p < .001	.592 p < .001
3	.723 p < .001	.532 p < .001	.606 p < .001	.630 p < .001
4	.495 p < .001	.272 NS	.403 p < .01	.573 p < .001

The table shows that for only one of 16 comparisons - that between the 6th semester groups for the norms they attributed to teachers - was there a statistically significant difference in the relative degree of agreement accorded each of the 45 role norms. Overall then, the rankings (of Agreement Scores) for each of the sets of data from the two colleges were very similar.

* Comparisons were also made between the Mitchell and Castle Hill data in respect of the ranking of factors according to the average Agreement Scores (taken over all inventories) contributing to the factor in question. When the role norm items contributing to the ranked factors for the 1976 data in Table 6.27 (Chapter 6) were compared with the same items in the Castle Hill data, a rank order correlation coefficient of 0.90 ($p < .001$) was obtained. While other comparisons of the sets of ranked factors yielded lower coefficients, this result does indicate that, insofar as the factor structure of the two sets of data was earlier demonstrated to be similar, there was a marked similarity in the relative degree of agreement characterising the various factors extracted from the two sets of data.

9.8 SUMMARY

With only minor exceptions, the Castle Hill results were essentially the same as those found for Mitchell. There were marked similarities between the two sets of data in respect of students' own and attributed views, the levels of consensus found, and the numerous within- and between-group relationships concerning these matters. Perhaps the major difference between the sets of data was that differences between 2nd and 6th semester groups were rather greater for the Mitchell groups than for Castle Hill. However, the phenomenon of increasing identification by students with what were perceived to be the views of lecturers and decreasing identification with what were perceived to be the views of teachers over the period of training was found in the Castle Hill as well as the Mitchell data.

CHAPTER 10

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

We shall not cease from exploration
And the end of all our exploring
Will be to arrive where we started
And know the place for the first time.

- T. S. Eliot

(Four Quartets: Little Gidding, 239-243)

10.1 INTRODUCTION

In view of the predominantly descriptive intent and exploratory nature of this investigation, the results of the study - given in some detail and summarised throughout - largely speak for themselves. A summary is given only of the major findings therefore, by way of recapitulation. There follows a discussion of some possible implications of the more notable trends to emerge from the numerous analyses undertaken. In turn, this is followed by a brief listing of some of the limitations of the study and suggestions for further research.

10.2 SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS

1. Both student teacher groups' conceptions of the ideal primary teacher tended to be progressive for teacher/pupil relationships, professionally responsible, dedicated and activist in respect of relationships with colleagues, co-operative with parents but insistent on professional distance as regards matters seen as strictly teachers' affairs, mildly supportive of the community, cautious about the teacher's public image and relatively independent as regards certain 'private' rights. These tendencies were more pronounced for 6th semester students for teacher/pupil and teacher/parent expectations.
2. In the above respects lecturers were consistently more 'progressive' in orientation than teachers.

3. Idealism was high for both student groups in that they foresaw minimal modification to their ideal role conceptions for all role relationships when they began teaching.
4. Sixth semester students saw themselves as being very close to lecturers in role viewpoint and much closer to them than to teachers, especially for role relationships with pupils and parents. Overall, 6th semester perceived a substantial gap in viewpoint between lecturers and teachers. Teachers were seen as much more formal, traditional and authoritarian than lecturers, less pupil-centred and democratic, more formal with colleagues, less professionally dedicated, more activist in the professional political sense, more formal with parents and less co-operative, and less supportive of the community in which the teacher works.
5. Second semester students saw themselves as a good deal less close to lecturers than did 6th. Also, neither did they see themselves as close to teachers, though they perceived less distance than did 6th. The nature of the differences perceived between lecturers and teachers was essentially the same as for 6th semester.
6. There was a notable degree of inaccuracy in both student groups' perceptions of lecturers and teachers. The tendency was to overestimate how traditional, formal and, generally unprogressive teachers were and to overestimate how progressive lecturers were. Overall, 6th semester were less accurate about teachers than were 2nd but more accurate about lecturers. Both groups were closer than they thought to teachers. While there were substantial differences between lecturers and teachers, especially for the classroom role, the gap between them was mostly seriously overestimated by both student groups, particularly 6th semester. Students were correct about the nature of the differences between their significant others but wrong about the degree.
7. While 6th semester students identified strongly with lecturers but not teachers, 2nd semester identified closely with neither. The major difference between 2nd and 6th semester was that the latter saw themselves as closer to lecturers than did 2nd.
8. On the whole, both between- and within-group consensus appeared to be low. It was consistently lowest for the pupil and parent role sectors and highest for relationships with the community and colleagues. Overall, consensus tended to be higher for lecturers and 6th semester than for teachers and 2nd semester.

For all groups, consensus was almost continuously distributed from near zero to almost full agreement, with the relative degree of agreement accorded each role norm by each group being similar.

Most agreement was found for expectations concerning the teacher's role as a supporter of the community and certain of his rights as a private citizen within that community. Least agreement was found for role behaviours concerning freedom of expression on sensitive and controversial topics both inside and outside of the classroom, about aspects of the teacher's custodial and pedagogical functions in the classroom, and about certain teacher/parent role relationships.

9. Perceived differences amounting to possible incompatibility and hence potential conflict were found between 6th semester students and teachers for role relationships with pupils and parents. These trends were also evident, but not so pronounced, for 2nd semester students.

Objectively, the difference between students and lecturers was not as marked as perceived by students. Therefore, to the degree that there was misperception, such conflict was illusory.

Conflict was also perceived by students to exist between lecturers and teachers for role relationships with pupils and parents. Again this trend was more pronounced for 6th semester students than for 2nd, and again, students overestimated the differences between their significant others.

10. A considerable proportion of 6th semester students perceived differences between the role orientations of lecturers and teachers during practice teaching also. Predominantly, the difference was seen to be between the child-centred emphasis of the lecturer and the adult-centred preference of the class teacher. Fewer students saw themselves as in accord with their class teachers than with their college lecturer during practice teaching, though the degree of congruence with both was not high. A majority of students reported a shift in preferred role style during practice, chiefly from a style emphasising discovery learning to one emphasising control. There was a substantial degree of compliance with college or school supervisors when taken singly, but much less compliance with both supervisors taken together. Overall, perceived congruence between students and lecturer role models was considerably greater than between students and teacher role models.
11. The perceived normative world of all groups was characterised by greater proportions of permissive (may/may not) and preferential responses than mandatory responses, with 2nd semester being most demanding and least permissive, and lecturers the reverse of this.

Permissiveness was highest for all groups for role relationships with the community and colleagues and lowest for those with pupils and parents. The reverse of this was true for mandatory response categories.

Both student groups - especially 6th semester - overestimated how demanding lecturers were as regards role behaviours, and underestimated how demanding were teachers. Students also overestimated the difference between lecturers and teachers in these respects.

12. Changes in role perception between the beginning and end of the training period as gleaned from the longitudinal data mirrored the differences found between 2nd and 6th semester in the cross-sectional comparisons. The major shift toward lecturers occurred for the classroom role. Idealism, as reflected in differences between norms and expectations, remained high.
13. Evidence was found to suggest that degree of perceived role congruence with significant others, just prior to entering teaching, degree of commitment to teaching at that point and subsequent adjustment to teaching may be associated. It was found that for various sub-groups of one 6th semester cohort, high degrees of perceived role congruence with significant others and high levels of commitment to teaching were, together (and in some degree singly), associated with a relatively satisfactory adjustment to teaching, and vice versa.
14. Replication at Castle Hill College of Education of that section of the study using the Foskett Role Norm Inventory uncovered similar patterns of role perception, similarities in students' own and attributed views, and similar consensus levels to those found for the Mitchell College students of both the present study and the study out of which the present investigation arose. While differences between the Castle Hill 2nd and 6th semester students were rather less pronounced than those between the Mitchell groups, the same pattern was found of increasing identification by students with lecturers over the training period and a concomitant increase in perceived distance from teachers.

10.3 DISCUSSION

At the conclusion of the review of literature (Chapter 2) a number of broad questions that appeared worth investigating were asked. It was argued that there was a dearth of Australian data about the issues which gave rise to these questions: the nature of the gap between theory and practice in teacher education, the influence of lecturers and teachers on student teachers' developing role conceptions, the levels of consensus amongst student teachers

about appropriate teacher behaviour, and so on. The broad questions asked were broken down into more specific queries which could be answered - albeit limitedly - by this study.

The detail of the study's results, and the summary of those results given above, do in themselves provide some tentative data on the specific questions asked at the end of the literature review, and hence on the four broad questions from which those specific queries were derived. To orient this concluding chapter, the 'answers' yielded by this investigation to those four broad questions will be outlined immediately below. These answers will then be amplified in the discussion that follows.

The first of the broad questions investigated asked to what degree there could be said to be a 'normative world' of the student teacher. That is, the question was concerned with the degree of consensus about the primary teacher role amongst and between student teachers. Realistically, less than full agreement about clusters of important role expectations was to be expected. It could be anticipated however, that there would be at least some degree of agreement. Whatever this level was awaited empirical exploration since there were no published Australian data available on the matter.

Briefly, this study has suggested that, in an absolute sense, consensus amongst student teachers about their future role might be low: it falls short of even a reasonably high level when the primary teacher role is viewed as a whole. Whether, in a relative sense, consensus is low could not be assessed by this study. It would require data from comparable occupational groups to furnish such an answer.

What this study has been able to indicate about the student teacher's normative world is that it appears to be characterised by levels of agreement on single role expectations within and between groups that vary from no agreement to full consensus, with noticeably more instances of low consensus than high consensus. It has also revealed that agreement levels vary for different teacher role relationships. On the face of it, consensus was low on arguably the most crucial role relationship - that concerning the teacher's relationship with pupils in the classroom setting.

The second question posed concerned the prevailing views of student teachers and their significant others about important teacher role relationships. Very broadly, the data of this study suggest that, by the end of their teacher training, students' views have generally become more child-centred, progressive and liberal, and that this constitutes a shift toward both the actual and perceived views of their lecturers. A somewhat more conservative view of the teacher role was found amongst teachers, and amongst those students who were close to the beginning of their College training. On the whole, these findings conformed to the patterns consistently reported in studies on student teacher socialization.

The third broad question concerned the 'impress' of lecturers and teachers on students. In all, it was found that, over the period of training, lecturer 'influence' on students' role conceptions appeared to strengthen. However, no such growth of teacher influence was discerned. Even during practice teaching, where

the impress of teachers could be expected to be at its strongest, their influence was rather less pronounced than that of lecturers. Lecturers and teachers were seen by students to hold different views about the teacher role. By identifying increasingly with what they saw as lecturers' views, students moved away from what they perceived to be the prevailing views in the profession they were about to enter. The actual differences between students and their significant others were, to varying degrees, compounded by misperceptions. While students accurately perceived the gap between lecturers and teachers on the whole, they over-estimated the differences between the two.

The fourth question posed was about how the student teacher's normative world changed between entering College and leaving it to join the profession. Broadly, this study has shown changes occurring in the direction of more progressiveness of viewpoint, increasing identification with lecturers, decreasing identification with teachers, and some increase in consensus about the teacher role. Also, no decline in idealism by the end of training was found. However, the tendency toward misperception of teachers' views increased, if anything.

Some of the findings of the study such as those concerning the idealism characterising student teachers' in College years, and the growth in progressiveness and liberality of viewpoint, are, as stated, in accord with trends reported in the literature on teacher

training over the years. Since possible reasons for this were fairly fully discussed in Chapter 2 they need not be canvassed again here. However, these student teacher training-period characteristics do appear to be related to the major problem explored in this study - that of the discontinuity between theory and practice. The discussion that follows will therefore focus mainly upon those aspects of the discontinuity theme mentioned above in outlining the findings for the four broad questions which orientated the study. These aspects are:

- * the growth of student teachers toward their lecturers and away from teachers;
- * the nature and some possible consequences of student teachers' misperceptions;
- * the locating of particular role relationships (and specific clusters of expectations within those relationships) which revealed most potential for conflict; and,
- * some possible implications of the consensus levels revealed.

This study, then, provides one body of empirical data which suggests that the gap between teacher training college and school frequently and for many years pointed to in the teacher education literature, and almost universally bemoaned, may possibly constitute the perceived reality for the student teacher in training. The results of the present investigation not only confirm the findings of the author's original study (as summarised in Chapter 1) in virtu-

ally every important detail, but indicate through the very similar results obtained from Castle Hill students, and data emerging from recent inquiries into teacher education in Australia, that the patterns of role perception discovered may not be confined merely to the institution in which the research was conducted.

Predominantly, it was found that by the end of training the students of this study perceived substantial differences in viewpoint between lecturers and teachers about numerous recurrent aspects of teacher/pupil classroom role relationships in particular, and also about role relationships with parents. Moreover, at the end-point of the course the students tended to see themselves as considerably closer to their college lecturers than to the teachers they were about to join in the school system. Disturbingly perhaps - depending upon one's viewpoint - this perceived distance from teachers and, more especially, perceived closeness to lecturers, had noticeably increased between entering and leaving college. Given that no college could, or would, acknowledge that it was doing other than its best to ensure that its graduates might see themselves as teachers by the end of training and take their places in the schools with a minimum of trauma, such a result should provide no little cause for concern. It would appear to lend some credence to the Anderson and Western thesis mentioned in the opening chapters that while the concept of being socialised into a professional culture was appropriate for such professions as medicine, law and engineering, it might not be so for teaching.

If student teachers were being satisfactorily socialised into a professional culture it might reasonably be expected that, at the conclusion of training, there would be relatively strong identification by them with what they see to be the views characteristic of the profession they are to join. It might also be expected that students perceive a reasonable degree of agreement between those who have trained them, about the nature of the service provided to the teacher's clients. It might further be hoped that such perceived accord between training institution and school be matched in reality.

This was undoubtedly not so for the students of this study, when looked at overall. Substantial and numerous differences between lecturers and teachers (and also between final-year students and teachers) were perceived, not only as elicited by the hypothetical situations students responded to in the role norm inventories, but also in the real situation of practice teaching as conveyed by the results of the Teaching Style Inventory. In effect, as training proceeded, students increasingly perceived - and therefore had to cope with - two frames of reference for teaching rather than one (cf. Finlayson and Cohen, 1967).

Overwhelmingly, the preferred frame of reference was that of the training college insofar as students oriented themselves strongly to the expectations of lecturers in important role areas, and away from teachers. This is scarcely surprising when it is considered that the students concerned had no extended contact with teachers as student teachers until as late as the fifth semester of a six semester (3 year) course, that - as in most colleges

- there was much more interaction between student and lecturer over the training period than between student and teacher, that student-lecturer relationships at the college in question could reasonably be characterised as relatively close (see Chapter 5), and that, in the final analysis, it was the college which had the power to determine whether or not a student entered the profession.

At the time this study was commenced therefore, the students involved had their first real taste of life in classrooms as a teacher only in their final year. As related in Chapter 5, there had been much criticism by both students and co-operating teachers during this period that the practical component of the course was inadequate. Responses to questions asked of students before and after leaving college about satisfaction with their training, about the relevance of courses, and about what emphases there should have been in their course, clearly register both the thorough-going practical orientation of the group and their strongly held view that practice teaching should be the most important component of a teacher training course.¹ In addition, a number of lecturing appointments to the teacher education programme from the ranks of practising teachers during those years resulted in further pressure for change to rectify what was then almost universally conceded to be a serious deficiency in the course. These pressures coincided with the arrival of a new Director of Teacher Education

1. This can be gleaned from responses to the relevant questions in the background section of the Teacher Training Project Questionnaire and in the Follow-Up Survey (see Chapter 5, and the relevant appendices).

who himself had spent many years as a successful classroom teacher. The upshot was that, as a first step, the course was soon revised to incorporate a third semester as well as fifth semester practice.

However, as persuasive as it might appear to argue that the placement of practice teaching so late in the course may have been principally responsible for many students identifying with lecturers but not teachers, and failing to 'feel' that they were 'already...a member of the teaching profession' (see Chapter 5), it is likely to be only one factor in a complex situation. The fact is that the same patterns of role perception were found for the 1978 6th semester (Mitchell) students who had been the 2nd semester group of 1976, and yet these students underwent a 3rd semester practice as well as one in 6th semester. Similarly, the trends in the data were essentially the same, if not so pronounced, for the Castle Hill groups despite the fact that they had earlier and more frequent practice teaching sessions. Clearly then, the relative failure of students in this study to identify strongly with practising teachers is not reducible to explanation solely, or necessarily even chiefly, in terms of earlier and more sustained contact with teachers.

This is not to say that earlier and more frequent contact with the profession would not contribute - perhaps considerably - to closer identification with it. The important recent State and Australian reports on teacher education all insist upon adequate and properly integrated teaching practice. However, as raised in the review of literature, those reports also stress the importance

of the quality, as well as the quantity and placement, of the student's practical experience. For example, The Report of the National Inquiry Into Teacher Education (1980: xxviii) pointedly recommends that supervising teachers should be carefully selected co-operatively by the teacher education institution and the headmaster of the co-operating school, and should receive appropriate training from college and school. It also advises that teachers chosen as supervisors should have an appropriate time allowance built into their teaching programme to facilitate proper performance of their additional duties. (Report: xxviii).

Implicit in such recommendations, and explicit elsewhere in the National Inquiry and various State reports is criticism of a perceived, widespread relative lack of co-ordination and co-operation between training institutions and schools. As the chapter on the institutional context for the present study suggests, such was commonly held to be the case for the college concerned at the time the data for this investigation were collected. Thus it may be advanced that infrequent and lack of sustained contact by students with teachers, the very late placement of practice teaching in the course and inadequate relationships between college and school may, in conjunction, have contributed to the propensity of students to grow away from the profession rather than toward it.

Even so, this was very likely compounded by other factors. The data show, for instance, that there were actual differences between the college (as manifested in lecturers' views) and its

co-operating schools (as represented by the views of teachers). Generally speaking, these differences were along well-established progressive/traditional lines. No doubt there are many reasons for such differences. An adequate consideration of this would necessitate a discussion of matters such as the degree to which lecturers are divorced from classroom reality (practice) and teachers divorced from theory, the degree to which schools need to take more responsibility for preservice education and colleges for inservice education, the nature of the reasons as to why those who left teaching to become teacher educators did so, and so on. Some such issues were touched upon in the review of literature so it is not intended to belabour them here. Suffice it to say that because there were real differences between college and school, and this was perceived to be so by students, any shift toward lecturers - for whatever reason - meant a corresponding shift away from teachers and thus exacerbated problems of identification with the profession.

In turn, such problems were worsened by the fact of student misperception. While students correctly perceived the nature of the differences in expectations between lecturers and teachers overall, they overestimated the extent and degree of those differences. Moreover, the degree of misperception of teachers increased by the end of training. Summarising the discussion so far then, it has been suggested that factors such as amount of practice teaching, its late placement in the course, questions about the quality of supervision and other aspects of the linkage between college

and school, the nature of the real differences that exist between lecturers and teachers about important teacher role relationships, and overestimation of those differences by students provide, when considered together, a plausible explanation in one particular context for the relative failure of students by the end of training to see themselves as being like the practising professionals in the schools.

As mentioned, the findings of the present study replicate those of the author's original investigation. In the wake of those original findings a number of recommendations were made which were aimed at fostering a greater degree of co-operation between the College and its associated schools. It was suggested, inter alia, that there ought to be earlier practical experience for students, that supervisors should be carefully chosen as good role models and, where possible 'matched' with their student teacher in certain respects, that they should be brought into the College periodically so they and the College lecturers might arrive at a better appreciation of each others viewpoints and develop sets of common expectations, that local teachers be co-opted to contribute to the in-College training of students, and that lecturers be required to increase their overall involvement in schools, especially by teaching in them. It was hoped that the implementation of such proposals insofar as they proved to be feasible might go some way toward narrowing the gap between college and school and, by presenting one frame of reference rather than two, facilitate a smoother transition for students from the hitherto relatively isolated world of the training college to the school system.

Subsequently the previously mentioned State and National inquiries into teacher education overwhelmingly confirmed the findings of the author's original study and hence those of the present investigation. A recurrent theme in these important recent reports is the urgent need for real rather than token co-operation between training institutions and schools. For example, the New South Wales inquiry Teachers For Tomorrow (1980: 241) has recommended that:

...in view of the importance of teaching practice in pre-service programmes, adequate arrangements should be made by teacher education institutions for the training of supervisors and for consultation with schools about mutual expectations

while, similarly, The Asche Report - Teacher Education In Victoria (1980: 215), devotes a chapter to the question of communications between teacher training institutions and schools, noting that:

During the last ten years or so, there have been increasingly frequent calls for improved communication between teacher training institutions and the schools on which they must depend...

and that:

Among the benefits seen as accruing from improved communications two seem especially important. On the one hand, institutions and schools need to be able to develop common expectations of the school experience programme. On the other, the student teacher needs to be able to see a common purpose between the theory and practice in his or her course.

The recommendations made by these reports and the National inquiry to bring about the desired rapprochement between theory and practice, are very much along the lines advocated by the author following his initial study, except that, as befits such influential reports, their recommendations are more numerous and detailed, and are costed. They pertain to a host of matters all apparently

designed to ensure a more adequate professional socialisation for the student teacher by presenting him, not with two frames of reference for teaching, but one in which theory and practice have been seen to be better integrated. Thus it is that many specific recommendations are made in the reports about matters such as:

- the need for earlier, better planned, better supervised, and more practice teaching, involving the careful selection of experienced supervising teachers and a more active role for college lecturers
- the provision of courses by training institutions for school practice supervisors
- the encouragement of exchanges of staff between schools and teacher education institutions
- the involvement of teachers and educational authorities in the planning of pre-service programmes
- the formation of associations between training institutions and their co-operating schools in order to improve communication, make possible joint decisions about school experience and create frameworks for planning in-service activities
- the importance for lecturers to have had, and continue to have teaching experience in schools and the need for teachers to try to keep abreast of new developments and theory.

Thus it is at the time of writing, that a number of substantial Government reports have emerged in Australia articulating what can now be seen as widespread concern about issues in the professional socialisation of the student teacher which were the raison d'etre of the author's original and present studies. Recommendations

such as those listed above therefore, and those made in respect of the author's original investigation, are precisely those that would need to be made for this present investigation since the thrust of them is to improve the quality of preservice education, primarily by fostering genuine co-operation and more enduring links between college and school.².

Notwithstanding the good sense behind these recommendations and the likelihood of their improving teacher education in this country, it is probable that there will always be some differences between the training institution and the school. Arguably, as long as such differences are recognised and respected, this is desirable, for a degree of tension between theory and practice may be vitalising for both. However, it is where such differences are not known about or misperceived that avoidable trouble can occur.

Some possible implications of students' misperceptions as found in this study warrant mention. Because students and teachers were in fact less unlike each other than the former realised, it is possible that many students are not entirely aware of the degree of understanding and support they may receive when they go into the schools. It is imperative that the real nature of the differences that do lie between students and teachers be comprehended by both for there is always the possibility that misperceptions can result

2. It perhaps needs to be stated that since the time when the data for this investigation were gathered, the College's pre-service course has been substantially modified, very much in the direction of subsequent recommendations made by the National and State inquiries.

in a student teacher unhappily attempting to accommodate his behaviour to perceived differences in role expectations between himself and his more experienced colleagues that objectively may not exist at all or to any appreciable degree. Thus it is possible for example, as the literature on probationers would affirm, that the neophyte may sometimes over-react to an overestimation of what he sees as his colleagues' views on classroom control, and become too authoritarian - against his own and (if it were known) others' wishes. An actual instance of this as reported by one of the students (O27M) of this study may be cited. In an interview a few months after entering teaching the student revealed that he was 'very tough on the kids' because he wanted to gain his colleagues' respect. This caused the parents of the pupils to complain because, as he put it, 'I didn't punish one, I punished the whole lot'. He was defended by his principal who however advised him to 'tone it down a bit'. He subsequently did so. 'But,' the student observed, 'the kids hated me.'

More generally, if students enter teaching misperceiving the nature of their colleagues' views - as indeed the students of this study did in overestimating how formal, traditional and conservative teachers were - then they may attempt to adjust to situations which may barely exist and hence actually create problems, as the above example illustrates. Clearly, underestimation of differences can result in similar problems for it can result in behaviour by the neophyte which he thinks is acceptable but which may be regarded as deviant or capricious by his colleagues.

A similar observation may be made as regards misperceptions of the degree to which behaviours are held to be mandatory by colleagues. If, as found in this study, students underestimate the degree to which teachers see some role behaviours as mandatory, then failure to conform may elicit disapproval or censure. Again, failure to appreciate how permissive teachers' expectations are for other behaviours may result in neophytes feeling constrained to act in ways where there is little real pressure to do so. In all, the point to be made as regards the misperceptions found in this study is that they are potentially more troublesome than if there is awareness of differences. A consequence of recommendations previously made about bringing colleges and schools into a more co-operative, organically integrated relationship is that the scope for student misperception would be minimised and differences appreciated. Where differences are known to exist then a degree of legitimacy may attach to another viewpoint, and a firm basis exists for greater tolerance of and discussion about different views. An implication of this for all of those concerned with the induction phase of teacher preparation is clear: policies planned to help ease the transition from student to teacher must be underpinned by an adequate knowledge base which will include both awareness of the important differences that exist between teachers and those about to enter the profession, a means of ensuring such differences are properly communicated, and provision for discussing the more critical discrepancies of viewpoint.

Indeed, perhaps one of the more useful results of this study has been to help begin provide such information by pointing to, amongst other things, particular role relationships and specific expectations within those relationships where students entering teaching are most likely to see differences between themselves and their colleagues-to-be. Repeatedly, students saw themselves as different from teachers in respect of how pupils should be taught and the degree to which parents should be involved in the educative process. Moreover, role norms within these areas were generally those for which lowest within-group consensus was found for all groups. That is, the evidence strongly suggests that some degree of disagreement and ambiguity may characterise the nature of the service provided by the primary teacher to his most important clients - his pupils and their parents. Though comparative studies would need to be undertaken before such a thesis could be more generally sustained, the review of literature in Chapter 2 did point to research such as that by Foskett (1967a), Sieber and Wilder (1967), Musgrove and Taylor (1969) and Anderson and Western (1970) which corroborated this.

With respect to consensus levels, another major result of this study has been to present a body of data bearing on the question of the extent and degree of agreement amongst and between student teachers and their significant others. The data show that even amongst professionally trained groups assumedly cohesive by virtue of a common professional ethic and purpose, there seldom was found full agreement, that agreement varied on a virtual continuum

from zero to full consensus, and that, on the whole, average agreement levels were not high, often falling below fifty percent. This finding accords with a great deal of research in the last two or three decades which has made untenable the always unrealistic 'postulate' of role consensus (cf. Gross et al., 1958), with its apparently implicit assumption of shared norms between groups of related position incumbents and hence virtually full agreement on role expectations.

While, a priori, it might have been hypothesised that a common working situation and professional orientation, relatively high levels of interpersonal contact, similar levels of education, and other such factors should have resulted in higher degrees of agreement than were found amongst and between the groups in this study, it must also be said that very similar consensus levels were found amongst teachers, principals, and other school and community groups in the Foskett studies, and that the question of what is a 'high' or optimum level of agreement awaits empirical exploration. Also, as Foskett (1969: 111) has observed, the very factors associated with consensus formation may also generate differences of viewpoint.

Part of the answer as to why agreement was apparently low might be found in the nature of the role norms themselves. Though there were only a few items where consensus was truly high for all groups, there were, comparatively, a good many more where agreement was truly low, whether it was for respondents' own or attributed views. That is, while there were some norms which were relatively unambiguous in the sense of being clearly defined, there were more which, irrespective of respondent group, were not widely accepted.

Examination of these more ambiguous norms reveals that some of them would appear to embody disagreements that transcend the teaching fraternity. In general such norms reflected issues of freedom of expression and behaviour which are not confined to educators but are very much part of the wider culture. For example, norms such as those concerning the expression of views on sensitive or controversial issues both inside and outside of the classroom (items 13, 14, 15, 36, 43) would seem to exemplify issues of wider concern. Thus it is possible that the degree of disagreement found for such norms in this study is partly a consequence of disagreement about such issues in the wider society and that other groups outside of teaching might equally reflect such ambiguity.

Similarly, other low consensus role norms dealing with aspects of the teacher's custodial and pedagogical functions may be touching upon nerves as raw outside the community of educators as within. For example, arguments about matters such as the role of the 'basics' and rote learning in the education of the child (role norm 4) flared again in the 1970's, reflecting a perennial tension between progressive and traditional 'philosophies' of education which went to such extremes at times as to devolve upon considerations of ideology, with politicians and others 'outside' of education making their views known. In addition, other items showing low agreement for all groups dealt with the part that parents might play in the educative process. These issues too were not only the focus of vigorous community debate in New South Wales in the 1970's (as mentioned in Chapter 2), but may have been subsumed in the broader issues of democratic rights. Summing up therefore, it might be, as Foskett (1967a: 83) suggests in explaining similar findings,

that the seemingly low levels of agreement found for teacher role relationships with pupils and parents are as much a function of circumstances outside of teaching as of any absence of a consensus forming process within.

The results lend empirical substance to Anderson and Western's (1972) notion that there is not an unambiguous image of the teacher with which students can identify. No doubt such ambiguity is compounded by factors such as the diffuseness and diversity of the teacher's role (Wilson, 1962) and that the teacher has become a 'victim of role inflation' as was advanced in an article cited well over a decade ago by Kelsall and Kelsall (1969: 55). Long before that the novelist D.H. Lawrence perhaps best summed up the situation when, in reflecting on his own teaching experience, lamented that '...you never know what you have done or if you have really done anything' (Lawrence quoted in Spolton, 1965-6: 31).

Finally, in respect of results obtained from exploring relationships amongst perceived role congruence with significant others, commitment to teaching and subsequent adjustment to the profession, it must first be said that the status of the findings based on analyses of relatively small sub-groups of students is such as to suggest, only, that there may be grounds for more intensive investigation of the relationships found. Since the approach used in these analyses was essentially associative or correlational, the direction of the findings was equivocal. Thus it could be said equally, for example, that high committed students who perceived themselves as close to their significant others in role viewpoint

tended toward subsequent high satisfaction in teaching or that those who proved to be highly satisfied with teaching tended to be the ones who had been highly committed before leaving college and had been relatively close to one or both of their significant others. It must be stressed that this part of the investigation was undertaken as much in response to suggestions in the literature that the variables in question might be associated as to any accumulation of studies showing that they were (and which thus provided a foundation to build upon).

The results that were obtained, while not to be taken for granted, came as no surprise since they are in accord with theory which posits, for example, that role congruence tends to equate with harmonious relationships, job satisfaction, high morale, and the like (see chapters 2 and 3). In this study the findings suggested a strongish link between degree of commitment and degree of perceived role congruence and that these factors may, together, be more strongly associated with subsequent adjustment to teaching than either variable taken singly. The study thus underlines the importance of role models in teacher socialisation (cf. Anderson and Western, 1973) and suggests that role identification and commitment may develop together and facilitate subsequent adjustment to the profession.

However, the associations found overall tended to be moderate thus indicating - not surprisingly - that factors other than level of commitment and identification with significant others are important for adjustment to the profession. It is suggested therefore

that, while degree of commitment and degree of identification with significant others would need to be incorporated in any subsequent investigation of factors associated with adjustment to teaching, they would be only part of a more comprehensive model and that, if, sample sizes permitted, techniques such as path analysis and multiple regression analysis might be used to assist in determining the direction of relationships and the relative importance of contributing factors. Moreover, this would need to be followed up by intensive, interview-based case studies to acknowledge the complexity inherent in any such data. In this present study, while commitment and role identification were broadly associated with adjustment, there were one or two students, for example, who appeared to have no role model, were nonetheless highly committed, and subsequently made a satisfactory transition to teaching. Clearly, much research needs to be done before the relative significance of factors such as commitment and role identification can be properly assessed.

10.4 CONCLUSION

This study points to the need for the closest collaboration between teacher training institutions and their co-operating schools in order to foster in student teachers the development of expectations congruent with those of the profession and thus facilitate the difficult transition from student to credible professional. Specific recommendations to achieve this end have been mooted in the discussion above. They reflect urgent proposals made by

very recent government-sponsored reports into teacher education in Australia which, amongst other things, have argued forcefully that the quality of preservice programmes is largely dependent on the forging of closer, more organic links between the school system and the training institution.

As well, the findings of this study suggest that those involved in the delicate process of inducting the neophyte into teaching need to base policies on bodies of data such as presented here, for studies like this can point usefully to areas of potential trouble for students entering teaching and thus contribute to their amelioration. This investigation, for example, has indicated possibly troublesome role relationships, specific areas of student misperception of teachers and other relevant information such as that concerning levels of agreement on role expectations. Forewarned is forearmed: only when such information is known can it be communicated, and when it is communicated only then does a rational basis exist for tolerance of differences and resolution of problems.

10.5 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Some of the more obvious limitations of the present study are summarised below:

- (i) The normative network analysed was less than complete in that, while it encompassed the views of students, lecturers and teachers, and students' perceptions of the views of these 'others', it did not accommodate lecturers' and teachers' perceptions of each other's views and of the views of students. Such an approach is necessary and possible but it was considered that it would add further complexity to what was already a considerable number of relevant and essential comparisons.

- (ii) Reliance on questionnaire data: it is always possible that responses were distorted by factors such as untruthfulness, ignorance and the like. While precautions were taken to reduce the likelihood of obtaining other than honest responses, the basic doubt always remains with questionnaire data as to the degree of correspondence between actuality and what was reported.
- (iii) The generalisability of the results. Either a series of comparative studies would need to be undertaken, or one in which respondent groups were properly sampled over a wider population before it could be known as to how representative were the results of this study. The Castle Hill data provides some external validation for some of the principal findings.
- (iv) For the most part, the study was conducted at the macro level of the whole group and thus individuality was inevitably sacrificed. However, the principal concern was to explore trends and patterns in the data.

10.6 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The experience of completing this study and the findings that have emerged from it suggest the desirability of research into the problems listed below.

1. How teacher training institutions and their co-operating schools can together present students with a more clear-cut, less potentially conflicting set of norms for the primary teacher role. The point of this would be to facilitate the difficult transition to practising professional rather than to add to those difficulties by unwittingly presenting seemingly opposed views of teaching for students to resolve. If, as appears possible, the major findings of this study are more widely applicable, it is suggested that the most productive areas to probe might be teacher role relationships with pupils and with the parents of pupils. If the student teacher is to enter teaching with a less ambiguous professional image it is suggested that factors such as:

- ignorance of the norms held by significant others for crucial role relationships
- the misperception of others' norms
- shared misperceptions
- accurate knowledge of and tolerance for others' norms, and
- levels of consensus on teacher behaviours

might need to be considered as at least one aspect of the problem faced by training institutions and schools in presenting a more united front to students.

2. If and how differences in the norms student teachers perceive lecturers and teachers to hold contribute to problems students might subsequently experience in adjusting to the profession. It is suggested that, in part, this might need to proceed by intensive case study in accord with verstehen interpretive approaches that characterise some current methodologies in this field. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, there appears to be a need for more such research into the development of identification with the teaching profession.

3. The nature, extent and origin of differences in norms held for the primary teacher role by lecturers and the co-operating teachers with whom they are associated. While this study provides some leads in this respect, there is a clear need for Australian research into this problem as an important part of the broader problem of how and why student teachers tend to see theory and practice as independent rather than perceive its essential interdependence.

More generally, it might be recommended that similar future research consider matters such as:

- extending analyses to incorporate both the actual and perceived views of all respondent groups so as to describe more completely the relevant normative network;
- sampling across institutions so that findings are more generalisable;
- using case study and interview material to flesh out questionnaire responses and reduce reliance on questionnaire data;
- using terminology developed recently by Biddle (1980) as a step in the directions of precision and clarification in a field beset by terminological confusion in the past;
- updating instruments such as the Foskett inventory which, though containing items of perennial relevance in teaching, would need to include material on matters like team teaching, open classrooms and school-based curricula to reflect adequately the educational zeitgeist of the 1980's and beyond.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ABELSON, R.P. and TUKEY, J.W. 'Efficient Conversion of Non-Metric Information into Metric Information', in Tufte, E.R. (ed.) The Quantitative Analysis of Social Problems, Addison-Wesley, New York, 1970, 407-417.
- ACOCK, A.C. and MARTIN, J.D. 'The Undermeasurement Controversy: Should Ordinal Data Be Treated As Interval?' Sociology And Social Research, Vol. 58, No. 4., July 1974, 427-433.
- ADAMS, R.S. 'Analysing The Teacher's Role', Educational Research, 12, 1969-70, 121-127.
- ADAMS, R.S. 'Evaluating Teacher Education', South Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 1, 1, 1973, 49-53.
- ALLEN, E.A. 'Professional Training of Teachers: A Review of Research', Educational Research, 12 (2), 1963, 200-215.
- ANDERSON, D.S. 'The Development of Student-Teachers: A Comparative Study of Professional Socialization', Paper prepared for 1974 O.E.C.D. Conference on Teacher Policies, The Australian National University, September, 1973.
- ANDERSON, D.S. and WESTERN, J.S. 'Notes on a Study of Professional Socialization', Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology, 3, 1, 1967, 67-71.
- ANDERSON, D.S. and WESTERN, J.S. 'Professional Socialization' in Hunt, F.J. (ed.) Socialisation in Australia, Angus and Robertson, Sydney, 1972.
- ANDERSON, N. 'Scales and Statistics: Parametric and Nonparametric'. Psychological Bulletin, 1961, LVIII, 305-316.
- ANDRESKI, S. The Elements of Comparative Sociology, Weidenfeld and Nicholson, London, 1964.
- BABBIE, E.R. The Practice of Social Research, Wadsworth Publishing Co., Belmont, California, 1975.
- BACH, J.O. 'Practice Teaching Success in Relation to Other Measures of Teaching Ability', Journal of Experimental Education, 21, 1952, pp. 57-80.
- BAKAN, D. 'The Test of Significance in Psychological Research', Psychological Bulletin, 66, 1966, 423-37.
- BALES, R.F. and SLATER, P.E. 'Role Differentiation in Small Decision-Making Groups' in Parsons, T. and Bales, R.F. (eds.) Family, Socialization and Interaction Process, Routledge, London, 1955.
- BANTON, M. Roles: An Introduction to the Study of Social Relations, Tavistock Publications, London, 1955.

- BASS, B.M. Organizational Psychology, Allyn and Bacon, Boston, 1965.
- BATES, F.L. 'Position, Role and Status: A Reformulation of Concepts', Social Forces, 34, May 1956, 313-321.
- BATTERSBY, D. 'Situational Adjustment: The Case of the Beginning Teacher and the Asian University Student', Rescent, 4, 1, 1980, 5-13.
- BECKER, H.S. and GEER, B. 'The Fate of Idealism in Medical School', American Sociological Review, 23, 1, 1958, 50-56.
- BECKER, H.S. 'Notes on the Concept of Commitment', American Journal of Sociology, 66, 1, July 1960, 32-40.
- BERGER, P. (1963) Invitation To Sociology, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1966.
- BERRY, D. Central Ideas in Sociology: An Introduction, Constable, London, 1974.
- BERTRAND, A.L. Basic Sociology, Appleton-Century-Crofts, New York, 1967.
- BIBLE, B.L. and McCOMAS, J.D. 'Role consensus and teacher effectiveness', Social Forces, 42, 1963, 225-233.
- BIDDLE, B.J. 'Teacher Roles', in Ebel, R.L. Encyclopaedia of Educational Research (4th ed.), Macmillan, London, 1969, 1437-1446.
- BIDDLE, B.J. Role Theory: Expectations, Identities, and Behaviours, Academic Press, New York, 1980.
- BIDDLE, B.J., ROSENCRANZ, H.A. and RANKIN, E.F. Studies in the Role of the Public School Teacher, University of Missouri, Columbia, 1961.
- BIDDLE, B.J. et al., 'Shared Inaccuracies in the Role of the Teacher, in Biddle, B.J. and Thomas, E.J. (eds.) Role Theory: Concepts and Research, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1966.
- BIDDLE, B.J. and THOMAS, E.J. Role Theory: Concepts and Research, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1966.
- BIDDLE, B.J. 'Role conflicts perceived by teachers in four english-speaking countries', Comparative Education Review, 14, 1970, 30-44.
- BRAUDIE, L. 'Professional Autonomy and the Role of the Layman', Social Forces, 39 (4), 1961, pp. 297-301.
- BRIM, B.J. 'Attitude Changes in Teacher Education Students', The Journal of Educational Research, 59 (10), 1966, pp. 441-445.

- BROWN, B.B. The Relation of Experimentalism to Classroom Practice, Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1962.
- BROWN, R.B. and VICKERY, T.R. 'The Belief Gap in Teacher Education', The Journal of Teacher Education, 18, 4, Winter, 1967, 417-421.
- BURROUGHS, G.E.R. Design and Analysis in Educational Research, University of Birmingham School of Education, 1975 (2nd ed.).
- BUTCHER, H.J. 'The Attitudes of Student Teachers to Education: A Comparison with the Attitudes of Experienced Teachers and a Study of Changes During the Training Course', British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 4, 1965, 17-24.
- CALLIS, R. 'Change in Teacher-Pupil Attitudes Related to Training and Experience', Educational and Psychological Measurement, 10, 1950, 718-727.
- CALLIS, R. 'Change in Teacher-Pupil Attitudes Related to Training and Experience', Educational and Psychological Measurement, 10, 1950, 718-727.
- CALVERT, B. The Role of the Pupil, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1975.
- CAMPBELL, D.T. and STANLEY, J.C. Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research, Rand McNally and Co., Chicago, 1963.
- CARPENTER, F. 'Wanted: More Descriptive Research in Education', in Gephart, W.J. and Ingle, R.B. (eds.) Educational Research: Selected Readings, Charles Merrill, Columbus, Ohio, 1969, 215-221.
- CARROLL, B.J. 'Barren Ground? Training the Teacher', Times Educational Supplement, 27-10-61, 569.
- CARVER, R.P. 'The Case Against Statistical Significance Testing', Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 48, No. 3, August 1978, 378-399.
- CHAMBERS, P. 'Role Conflict as Functional: A Re-appraisal of the Tutor's Role in Teacher Training', Education for Teaching, Summer, 1972, pp. 41-47.
- CHARTERS, W.W. Jr. 'The Social Background of Teaching' in Gage, N.L. (ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching, Rand McNally and Co., Chicago, 1963.
- CHILD, D. The Essentials of Factor Analysis, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, London, 1970.
- COCHRAN, W.G. 'Some Methods for Strengthening the Common Chi-Square Tests', Biometrics, 10, 1954, 417-451.
- COHEN, L. 'Students' Perceptions of the School Practice Period', Research in Education, (Manchester), 2, November 1969, 52-58.

CONFORTI, J.M. 'The Socialization of Teachers: A Case Study', Theory Into Practice, XV, 5, December 1976, 352-59.

CONNELL, R.W. 'The Concept of Role and What To Do With It', Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology, 15, 3, November 1979, 7-17.

COOK, L.A. and COOK, E.F. A Sociological Approach to Education (2nd ed.), McGraw-Hill, New York, 1950.

COOK, W.W. et al., Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory Manual, The Psychological Corporation, New York, 1951.

COOLEY, C.H. Human Nature and Social Order, Scribner, New York, 1902.

COPE, E. 'Teacher Training and School Practice', Educational Research, 12 (2), 1969, 87-98.

COPE, E. School Experience in Teacher Education, University of Bristol, 1971.

CORRIGAN, D.C. and GARLAND, C.B. 'Role Analysis Applied to Internship Processer.' In Association for Student Teaching: Internships in Teacher Education, 47th Yearbook, Washington, D.C., N.E.A., 1968, p. 96.

CORWIN, R.G. 'Role Conceptions and Career Aspiration: A Study of Identity in Nursing', Sociological Quarterly, April, 1961, pp. 69-86.

COULSON, M. 'Role: A Redundant Concept in Sociology?' in Jackson, J.A. (ed.) Role, Cambridge University Press, London, 1972.

COULTER, F. The Socialization of Male, Beginning Teachers into the Teaching Profession, Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Monash University, Melbourne, 1971.

COULTER, Frank. 'Commitment to Teaching and Occupational Mobility Among Beginning Teachers', Australian Journal of Education, Vol. 16, No. 3, October 1972, 238-245.

COULTER, F. 'Discontinuities in the Transition from Student To Teacher', South Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 1, 1, 1973, 42-48.

COVERDALE, G.M. 'Some Determinants of Teacher Morale in Australia', Educational Research, 16, 1, November 1973, 34-39.

CRONBACH, L.J. and GLESER, G.C. 'Assessing Similarity Between Profiles', Psychological Bulletin, November, 1953, 456-473.

CRONBACH, L.J. and SNOW, R.E. Aptitudes and Instructional Methods: A Handbook for Research on Interactions, Irvington, New York, 1977.

DAHRENDORF, R. (1958) Homo Sociologicus, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1973.

- DAHRENDORF, R. (1968) 'Sociology and Human Nature: A Postscript to Homo Sociologicus', in Dahrendorf, R. Homo Sociologicus, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1973 (first published in Great Britain in 1968 in Dahrendorf, R. Essays in the Theory of Society, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1968).
- DAHRENDORF, R. Essays in the Theory of Society, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1970.
- DAY, P.H. 'Attitude Changes of Beginning Teachers After Initial Teaching Experience', The Journal of Teacher Education, 10, 1959, 326-328.
- D'CRUZ, J.V. and SHEEHAN, P.J. Renewal of Australian Schools, Advocate Press, Melbourne, 1975.
- DICKSON, G.E. 'The Crux of an Effective Off-Campus Student Teaching Program', Educational Administration and Supervision, 39, 1953, p. 143.
- DORNBUSCH, S.M. 'The Military Academy as an Assimilating Institution', Social Forces, Vol. 33, October 1954 - May 1955, pp. 316-321.
- DOYLE, L.A. 'A Study of Expectancies Which Elementary Teachers, School Administrators, Board Members and Parents have of the Elementary Teachers' Role', Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Michigan State University, 1956.
- DRABICK, L.W. 'Perceivers of the Teacher Role: The Teacher Educator', The Journal of Teacher Education, 18 (1), Spring, 1967, 51-57.
- DREEBEN, R. The Nature of Teaching: Schools and the Work of Teachers, Scott, Foresman and Co., Glenview, Illinois, 1970.
- DUNKIN, M.J. 'The Nature and Resolution of Role Conflicts Among Male Primary School Teachers', Sociology of Education, 45, Spring, 1972, 167-185.
- DURKHEIM, E. The Rules of Sociological Method, Free Press, New York, 1964.
- DUTTON, W. 'Attitude Change of Elementary School Student Teachers', Journal of Educational Research, LV, 1962, 380-82.
- EHRlich, H.J. et al., 'The Study of Role Conflict: Explorations in Methodology', Sociometry, 25, 1962, 85-97.
- EMMET, D. Rules, Roles and Relations, Macmillan, London, 1966.
- FERGUSON, G.A. Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education (4th ed.), McGraw-Hill, New York, 1976.
- FINLAYSON, D.S. and COHEN, L. 'The Teacher's Role: A Comparative Study of the Conceptions of College of Education Students and Head Teachers', The British Journal of Educational Psychology, 37 (1), February 1967, 22-31.

- FINN, J.D. A General Model for Multivariate Analysis, Holt Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1974.
- FISHBURN, C.E. 'Teacher Role Perception in the Secondary School', Journal of Teacher Education, 13, 1962, 55-59.
- FOSKETT, J.M. The Normative World of the Elementary School Teacher, University of Oregon Press, Eugene, Oregon, 1967 (a).
- FOSKETT, J.M. The Normative World of the Elementary School Principal, University of Oregon Press, Eugene, Oregon, 1967 (b).
- FOSKETT, J.M. Role Consensus: The Case of the Elementary School Teacher, University of Oregon Press, Eugene, Oregon, 1969.
- FRANCIS, R.I. The Role of the Neophyte Teacher Educator, Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Macquarie University School of Education, Sydney, 1977.
- GARFINKEL, H. Studies in Ethnomethodology, Prentice-Hall, New York, 1967.
- GARNER, J. and BING, M. 'The Elusiveness of Pygmalion and Differences in Teacher-Pupil Contacts', Interchange, 4, 1, 1973, 33-42.
- GEER, B. 'Occupational Commitment and the Teaching Profession', The School Review, 74, 1, 1966, 31-47.
- GETZELS, J.W. 'Conflict and Role Behaviour in the Educational Setting, in Charters, W.W. and Gage, N.L. (eds.), Readings in the Social Psychology of Education, Allyn and Bacon, Boston, 1963.
- GETZELS, J.W. and GUBA, E.G. 'The Structure of Roles and Role Conflict in the Teaching Situation', Journal of Educational Sociology, 29, 1955, 30-40.
- GETZELS, J. and GUBA, E.G. 'Social Behaviour and the Administrative Process', School Review, 65, 1957, 423-41.
- GIBSON, D.R. 'Professional Socialization: The Effects of a College Course Upon Role-Conceptions of Students in Teacher Training', Educational Research, 14, 3, June 1972, 213-219.
- GLASER, B.G. and STRAUSS, A.L. Status Passage, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1971.
- GLASS, G.V. and STANLEY, J.L. Statistical Methods in Education and Psychology, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1970.
- GOFFMAN, E. The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1959.
- GOFFMAN, E. 'Role Distance', in Goffman, E. Encounters, Bobbs-Merrill, New York, 1961.

- GOLD, D. 'Statistical Tests and Substantive Significance', The American Sociologist, 4, 1969, 42-46.
- GOSLIN, D.A. Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research, Rand McNally, Chicago, 1969.
- GOTTLIEB, D. 'Process of Socialization in American Graduate Schools', Social Forces, Vol. 40, Dec., 1961, pp. 124-131.
- GOULDNER, A.W. 'Cosmopolitans and Locals: Towards an Analysis of Latent Social Roles - 1' Administrative Science Quarterly, 2, December 1957, 281-306.
- GRACE, G.R. Role Conflict and the Teacher, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1972.
- GRIEGER, R.M. 'Pygmalion Revisited: A Loud Call for Caution', Interchange, 2, 4, 1971, 79-91.
- GRIEGER, R.M. and SAAVEDRA, P.J. 'One More Visitation: A Louder Call for Caution', Interchange, 3, 1, 1972, 91-93.
- GROSS, N., MASON, W.S. and McEACHERN, A.W. Explorations in Role Analysis, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1958.
- GROSS, N. 'The Sociology of Education' in Merton, R.K. et al. (eds.), Sociology Today, Basic Books, New York, 1959, pp. 128-152.
- GROSS, N. 'Some Contributions of Sociology to the Field of Education', Harvard Educational Review, 29, 1959a, 275-287.
- HAINES, A.C. 'Role Dilemmas in Student Teaching', Journal of Teacher Education, 8, 1957, p. 367.
- HAIR, J.F. Jr. et al., Multivariate Data Analysis, Petroleum Publishing Company, Tulsa, Oklahoma, 1979.
- HARGREAVES, D. Interpersonal Relations and Education, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1972.
- HARMAN, H.H. Modern Factor Analysis, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1970.
- HARRIS, R.J. A Primer of Multivariate Statistics, Academic Press, New York, 1975.
- HERMANN, E.F. and BRASKAMP, L.A. (eds.), Readings in Statistics for the Behavioural Sciences, Prentice Hall Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1970.
- HEWITSON, M. (ed.) Research into Teacher Education: The Practical Teaching Skills, Education Research and Development Committee Report No. 19, AGPS, Canberra, 1979.

HOLEMAN, R.L. 'Attitude Change of the Student Teacher: A Test of the ABX Model', Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Washington University, 1963.

HOROWITZ, I.L. 'Consensus, Conflict and Co-operation: A Sociological Inventory'. Social Forces, 41, 1962, 177-188.

HOROWITZ, M. 'Student-Teaching Experiences and Attitudes of Student Teachers', The Journal of Teacher Education, 19 (3), Fall, 1968, 317-323.

HOUSE, J.S. 'The Three Faces of Social Psychology', Sociometry, 40, 2, 1977, 161-177.

HOY, W.K. 'Organisational Socialisation: The Student Teacher and Pupil Control Ideology', Journal of Educational Research, 61, 1967, 153-155.

HOYLE, E. The Role of the Teacher, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1969.

HUGHES, Meredydd, G. 'Consensus and Conflict About The Role of The Secondary School Head', British Journal of Educational Studies, XXV, 1, February 1977, 32-49.

HUSSELL, I. and SMITHERS, A. 'Changes in the Educational Opinions of Student Teachers Associated with College Experience and School Practice', Research in Education, 11, May 1974, 43-49.

HYMAN, H.H. 'The Psychology of Status', Archives of Psychology, No. 269, 1942, 1-93.

JACKSON, J.A. Role, Cambridge University Press, London, 1972.

JENKINS, D.H. and LIPPITT, R. Interpersonal Perceptions of Teachers, Students, and Parents, National Education Association, Washington, D.C., 1951.

JONES, K.V. 'The Contexts of Role Conflict', Comparative Education Review, 14, 1970, 45-49.

JOYCE, B. 'Method and Methods in Teacher Education: Geist, Substance, and Form', The Journal of Teacher Education, 20 (4), Winter, 1969, 510-511.

KAHN, R.L. et al. Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity, Wiley, New York, 1964.

KATZ, F.M. and POOLE, M.E. 'Role Definition by University Students', Australian Journal of Education, 13, 1969, 63-70.

KAY, R.W. 'Occupational Commitment - Some Findings on Teachers in New Guinea', Papua New Guinea Journal of Education. Vol. 7, No. 1, February 1971, 61-73.

- KELLEY, H.H. 'Two Functions of Reference Groups' in Swanson, G.E. et al., Readings in Social Psychology, Holt Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1952.
- KELSALL, R.K. and KELSALL, H.M. The School Teacher in England and the United States, Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1968.
- KERLINGER, F.N. Foundations of Behavioural Research (2nd ed.), Holt Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1973.
- KERLINGER, F.N. Foundations of Behavioral Research, Holt, London, 1976 (2nd ed., paperback).
- KERR, S.T. 'Consensus for Change in the Role of the Learning Resources Specialist: Order and Position Differences', Sociology of Education, 51, 1978, 304-23.
- KING, R. and WATSON, K. (eds.), Parental Involvement in Australian Schools, The Hills Educational Study Group, Sydney, 1976.
- KLAPP, O.E. 'The concept of consensus and its importance', Sociology and Social Research, 41, 1957, 336-342.
- KOB, J. 'Definition of the Teacher's Role', in Halsey, A.H. et al., (eds.), Education, Economy and Society, The Free Press, New York, 1961.
- KOHOUT, F.J. Statistics for Social Scientists, Wiley, New York, 1974.
- KUHN, M.H. 'The Reference Group Reconsidered', Sociological Quarterly, 5, 1964, 6-21.
- LABOVITZ, S. 'The Assignment of Numbers to Rank Order Categories', American Sociological Review, 35: 515-524, 1970.
- LACEY, C. The Socialization of Teachers, Methuen, London, 1977.
- LAING, R.D. et al., Interpersonal Perception, Tavistock, London, 1966.
- LAING, R.D. The Politics of Experience and the Bird of Paradise, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1967.
- LAMB, P. The Student Teaching Process in Elementary Schools, Charles E. Merrill, Columbus, Ohio, 1965.
- LEGGATT, T. 'Teaching as a Profession', in Jackson, J.A. (ed.) Professions and Professionalization, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1970.
- LEIK, R.K. 'A measure of ordinal consensus', Pacific Sociological Review, 9, 1966, 85-90.

- LINDMAN, H.R. Analysis of Variance in Complex Experimental Designs, Freeman, San Francisco, 1974.
- LIPSCOMB, E.A. 'A Study of the Attitudes of Student Teachers In Elementary Education', The Journal of Educational Research, 60, 4, 1966, 159-163.
- LOMAX, D.E. 'A Review of British Research in Teacher Education', Review of Educational Research, 42 (3), Summer, 1972, 289-326.
- LORTIE, D.C. 'Laymen to Lawmen: Law School, Careers and Professional Socialization', Harvard Educational Review, 29 (4), 1959, pp. 352-369.
- LORTIE, D.C. School-Teacher: A Sociological Study, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1975.
- MANWILLER, L.V. 'Expectations Regarding Teachers', Journal of Experimental Education, 26, 1958, 315-354.
- MARTINS, H. 'Time and Theory in Sociology' in Rex, J. (ed.) Approaches to Sociology, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1974.
- MASON, W.S. The Beginning Teacher: Status and Career Orientations, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Final Report, Washington D.C., 1961.
- McARTHUR, J.T. 'What Does Teaching Do To Teachers?' Educational Administration Quarterly, 14, 3, Fall, 1978, 89-103.
- McCALL, G.J. and SIMMONS, J.L. Identities and Interactions, Free Press, New York, 1966.
- McGARVIE, G.A. 'Accountability', ACES Review, 5, 3, July, 1978, 3-7.
- McGUIRE, V., MYERS, R.B. and DURRANCE, C.L. Your Student Teaching in the Secondary School, Allyn and Bacon, Boston, 1959.
- McLEISH, J. Students' Attitudes and College Environments, Cambridge Institute of Education, Cambridge, 1970.
- McNAMARA, D. The Socialization of Female Student Teachers, Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Lancaster, 1972.
- MEAD, G.H. Mind, Self and Society, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1934.
- MENDENHALL, W. and RAMEY, M. Statistics for Psychology, Duxbury Press, North Scituate, Massachusetts, 1973.
- MERTON, R.K., READER, G.G. and KENDALL, P.L. (eds.) The Student Physician: Introductory Studies in the Sociology of Medical Education, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1957.
- MERTON, R.K. 'The Role-Set: Problems in Sociological Theory', British Journal of Sociology, Vol. 8, 1957a, 106-20.

MERTON, R.K. Social Theory and Social Structure, Free Press, Glencoe, 1968 (enlarged ed.)

MERTON, R.K. 'Insiders and Outsiders: A Chapter in the Sociology of Knowledge', in American Journal of Sociology, Varieties of Political Expression in Sociology, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1972.

MILES, R.H. 'Role-Set Configuration as a Predictor of Role Conflict and Ambiguity in Complex Organizations', Sociometry, 40, 1, March 1977, 21-34.

MINNS, W.A. 'Problems of the Beginning Teacher', Pivot, 1, 5, 1974, 18-19.

MITCHELL, J. 'Cons, Square-johns, and Rehabilitation', in Biddle, B.J. and Thomas, E.J. (eds.), Role Theory: Concepts and Research, Wiley, New York, 1966, pp. 207-212.

MOORE, W.E. and TUMIN, M.M. 'Some Social Functions of Ignorance', American Sociological Review, 14, 1949, 787-795.

MORRIS, B. and COCK, M. 'Theory and Practice', Trends in Education, 16, October 1969, 39-42.

MORRISH, I.V. The Sociology of Education: An Introduction, Allen and Unwin, London, 1972.

MORRISON, A. and McINTYRE, D. Teachers and Teaching, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1969.

MORRISON, A. and McINTYRE, D. 'Changes in Opinions About Education During the First Year of Teaching', British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 6, 1967, 161-163.

MORSE, W.C. 'Anxieties and Role Conflicts in an Interrelated Triangle', In Association for Student Teaching, The College Supervisor: Conflict and Challenge, 43rd Yearbook, Dubuque, Iowa: Brown, 1964.

MUSGROVE, F. and TAYLOR, P.H. 'Teachers' and Parents' Conception of the Teacher's Role', British Journal of Educational Psychology, 35, 1965, 171-178.

MUSGROVE, F. and TAYLOR, P.H. Society and the Teacher's Role, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1969.

NADEL, S.F. The Theory of Social Structure, Cohen and West, London, 1957.

NAEGELE, K.D. 'Clergymen, Teachers and Psychiatrists', Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, XXII, 1, February, 1956, 46-62.

NAEGELE, K.D. 'Superintendency Versus Superintendents: A Critical Essay', Harvard Educational Review, 30, 1960, 372-393.

NEWCOMB, T.M. Social Psychology, The Dryden Press, New York, 1951.

NEWCOMB, T.M. 'Attitude', in Gould, T. and Kolb, W.L. (eds.) A Dictionary of the Social Sciences, Tavistock, London, 1964.

NIE, N.H. et al., Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1975.

NOVICK, M.R. and JACKSON, P.H. Statistical Methods for Educational and Psychological Research, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1974.

NUNNALLY, J. 'The Place of Statistics in Psychology', in Herrmann, E.F. and Braskamp, L.A. (eds.) Readings in Statistics for the Behavioural Sciences, Prentice Hall, New Jersey, 1970.

OLIVER, R.A.C. and BUTCHER, H.J. 'Teachers' Attitudes to Education: the Structure of Educational Attitudes', British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, Vol. 1, 1962, 56-69.

OTTY, N. Learner Teacher, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1972.

PALMER, J.O. 'Expectations About Beginning Teachers', Pivot, Vol. 1, No. 5, 1974, pp. 14-16.

Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia, Senate Standing Committee on Education, Science and the Arts. Report on the Commonwealth's Role in Teacher Education, Commonwealth Government Printer, Canberra, February, 1972.

PARSONS, T. The Social System, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1951.

PARSONS, T. 'The Professions and Social Structure' in Essays in Sociological Theory (revised edition), Glencoe, Illinois, 1957, 34-49.

PARSONS, T. 'Role Conflict and the Genesis of Deviance', in Biddle, B.J. and Thomas, E.J. (eds.), Role Theory: Concepts and Research, Wiley, New York, 1966, pp. 275-276.

PEASE, J. 'Faculty Influence and Professional Participation of Doctoral Students' Sociological Inquiry, 37 (1), 1967, pp. 63-70.

PETRINOVICH, L. 'Weak Measurements vs. Strong Statistics: An Empirical Critique of S.S. Stevens' Prescriptions on Statistics'. Educational and Psychological Measurement, XXVI, 1966, 291-309.

PETRUSICH, M.M. 'Some Thoughts on Teacher Education', The Journal of Teacher Education, 20 (1), Spring, 1969, 49-50.

PFOHL, Stephen, J. 'Social Role Analysis: The Ethnomethodological Critique'. Sociology and Social Research, 59, 3, 243-265.

POPITZ, H. 'The Concept of Social Role as an Element of Sociological Theory', in Jackson, J.A., Role, Cambridge University Press, London, 1972.

PREISS, J.J. and EHRLICH, H.J. An Examination of Role Theory: The Case of the State Police, University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, 1966.

PRICE, J.L. Organizational Effectiveness: An Inventory of Propositions, Richard D. Irwin, Homewood, Illinois, 1968.

PRICE, R.D. 'The Influence of Supervising Teachers', Journal of Teacher Education, 12, 1961, 471-475.

QUARANTELLI, E.L. et al., 'Faculty and Student Perceptions in a Professional School', Sociology and Social Research, 49 (1), 1964, pp. 32-45.

RABINOWITZ, W. and ROSENBAUM. 'Teaching Experience and Teachers' Attitudes', Elementary School Journal, 60, 1960, 313-319.

RAMSAY, P.D.K. 'Vocational Commitment in Nursing and Teaching, Paper presented to the New Zealand Sociological Association Conference, Christchurch, November, 1977.

Report To The Commission on Advanced Education On Three Year Primary Teacher Education Programs (mimeo; from: Campbell, W.J., Philp, H.W.S. et al., 'The Study of Three Year Primary Teacher Education Programme' - S.T.E.P. Report to the Commission on Advanced Education) 1977.

Report of the National Inquiry Into Teacher Education, Canberra, Australian Government Publishing Service, August, 1980.

REITMAN, S.W. 'Teacher Role Strain: A Neglected Problem', The Journal of Teacher Education, 22 (2), Summer, 1971, 215-218.

RIDDLE, D.K. 'Anticipatory Socialization: An Aspect of Professional Role Adjustment', The Australian Journal of Higher Education, 4, 3, 1972, 228-234.

ROGERS, J.W. 'A Study of Role Consensus Using the Gamma Statistic', Sociological Quarterly, Autumn, 1969, 504-15.

ROSENTHAL, R. 'Pygmalion Revisited, Revisited: On a Loud and Careless Call for Caution', Interchange, 3, 1, 1972, 86-90.

ROSENTHAL, R. and JACOBSON, L. Pygmalion in the Classroom, Holt Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1968.

ROZEBOOM, W.W. 'The Fallacy of the Null Hypothesis Significance Test', Psychological Bulletin, 57, 1960, 416-28.

RYAN, K. (ed.) Teacher Education, The Seventy-fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education Part II, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1975.

SANDGREN, D.L. and SCHMIDT, L.G. 'Does Practice Teaching Change Attitudes Toward Teaching?', The Journal of Educational Research, 49 (9), May, 1956, 673-680.

- SANFORD, R.N. (ed.) The American College, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1962.
- SARBIN, T.R. 'Role: Psychological Aspects' in Sills, D.L. (ed.) International Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences (Vol. 13), The Macmillan Co. and The Free Press, New York, 1968.
- SARBIN, T.R. (1954) 'Role Theory' in Lindzey, G. (ed.) Handbook of Social Psychology (Vol. 1), Addison-Wesley, Cambridge, Mass., 1954.
- SARBIN, T.R. and ALLEN, V.L. 'Role Theory' in Lindzey, G. and Aronson, E. (eds.) The Handbook of Social Psychology (Vol. 1, 2nd ed.) Addison Wesley, Reading, 1968.
- SCHANK, R.L. 'A Study of a Community and its Groups and Institutions Conceived of as Behaviours of Individuals', Psychology Monographs, 43, 1932, 1-133.
- SCHUELER, H, GOLD, M.J., and MITZEL, H.E. 'The Use of Television in Teacher Training and for Improving Measures of Student Teaching Performance: Phase I - Improvement of Student Teaching', U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Hunter College, New York, 1962.
- SCOTT, O. and BRINKELEY, G. 'Attitude Changes of Student Teachers and the Validity of the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory', Journal of Educational Psychology, LI, 1960, 76-81.
- SHERIF, M. and HOVLAND, C.I. Social Judgement: Assimilation and Contrast Effects in Communication and Attitude Change, Yale University Press, New Haven, Connecticut, 1961.
- SHIBUTANI, T. 'Reference Groups and Social Control' in Rose, A.M. (ed.) Human Behaviour and Social Processes, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1962.
- SHIPMAN, M.D. 'Environmental Influences on Response to Questionnaires', The British Journal of Educational Psychology, 72 (1), February, 1967a, 54-57.
- SHIPMAN, M.D. 'Theory and Practice in the Education of Teachers', Educational Research, 9 (3), June, 1967b, 208-212.
- SHIPMAN, M. 'Education and College Culture', British Journal of Sociology, 18, 1967c, 425-34.
- SIEBER, S.D. and WILDER, D.E. 'Teaching Styles: Parental Preferences and Professional Role Definitions', Sociology of Education, Vol. 40, No. 4, 1967, pp. 302-315.
- SIEGEL, S. Nonparametric Statistics, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1956.

- SINCLAIR, R.A. 'Aspects of Role Perception of Student Teachers', Unpublished Litt.B. Thesis, University of New England, Armidale, 1975.
- SMITH, E.E. 'The Effects of Clear and Unclear Role Expectations on Group Productivity and Defensiveness', Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 55, 1957, 213-217.
- SORENSEN, G. 'What is Learned in Practice Teaching?', The Journal of Teacher Education, 18, 2, Summer, 1967,
- SPOLTON, L. 'D.H. Lawrence: Student and Teacher' British Journal of Educational Studies, 14 (3), 1965-66,
- STEELE, P.M. 'Changes in Attitude Amongst Training College Students Towards Education in Junior Schools', M.Ed. Thesis, University of Manchester Library, 1958.
- STEVENS, S.S. 'Mathematics, Measurement and Psychophysics', in Stevens, S.S. (ed.) Handbook of Experimental Psychology, Wiley, New York, 1951, 1-49.
- STEVENS, S.S. 'Measurement Statistics and the Schemapiric View', Science, 1968, 161, 849-856.
- STONES, E. and MORRIS, S. Teaching Practice: Problems and Perspectives, Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1972.
- STOUFFER, S.A. Social Research to Test Ideas, Free Press, New York, 1962.
- STREETS, G.R. 'Concepts of Teacher Role Among Student Teachers', Queensland Teachers' Journal, 74, 5, June, 1969, 172-177.
- STREETS, G.R. 'Career Commitment of Teacher Graduates', Administrators' Bulletin, 3, 1972, 1-4.
- STREETS, G.R. 'An Investigation into the Relationships Between Perception of Environmental Climate, Role Concepts and Role Conflict, and Teacher Career Commitment, of University and College Graduates', Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, University of Queensland, Department of Education, 1972b.
- STRYKER, S. 'Developments in "Two Social Psychologies": Toward an Appreciation of Mutual Relevance', Sociometry, 40, 2, 1977, 145-160.
- SULLIVAN, H.S. Conceptions of Modern Psychiatry, White Psychiatric Foundation, 1940.
- TAYLOR, J.K. and DALE, I.R. A Survey of Teachers in their First Year of Service, University of Bristol, Bristol, 1971.
- TAYLOR, W. 'The Changing Role of the Teacher', Paper presented at the International Conference on The Role of the Teacher in Educational Change. Berlin, October, 1968.

Teacher Education in Victoria; Interim Report of the Committee of the Victorian Enquiry into Teacher Education, Melbourne, Government Printer, February, 1980.

Teachers For Tomorrow: Continuity, Challenge and Change in Teacher Education in New South Wales. Report of the COmmittee to Examine Teacher Education in New South Wales, Sydney, Government Printer, November, 1980.

TOBY, J., 'Some Variables in Role Conflict Analysis', Social Forces, 30, 1952, 323-27.

THOMAS, D.J. 'Accountability in the Teaching Profession', South Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 7, Nos. 1 and 2, 1979, 10-17.

THOMAS, W.I. The Child in America, Knopf, New York, 1928.

TISHER, R.P., FYFIELD, J.A. and TAYLOR, S.M. Beginning to Teach, Vol. 1, Education Research and Development Committee Report No. 15, Monash University, 1978.

TRAVERS, R.M.W. (ed.) Second Handbook of Research on Teaching, Rand McNally and Co., Chicago, 1973.

TRENT, J.W. and COHEN, A.M. 'Research on Teaching in Higher Education' in Travers, R.M.W. (ed.), Second Handbook of Research on Teaching, Rand McNally, Chicago, 1973.

TURNER, R. 'Role Taking, Role Standpoint and Reference Group Behaviour', American Journal of Sociology, 61, 1956, 316-328.

TURNER, R.H. (1962) 'Role-taking: Process Versus Conformity', in Rose, A.M. (ed.) Human Behaviour and Social Processes: An Interactionist Approach, Houghton Mifflin, Boston.

TYLER, R.W. 'What is Statistical Significance?' Educational Research Bulletin, 10, 1931, 115-118.

URRY, J. 'Role Analysis and the Sociological Enterprise', Sociological Review, 18, 1970, 351-64.

VON NEUMANN, J. and MORGENSTERN, O. The Theory of Games and Economic Behaviour, (2nd ed.), Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1947.

WAGENSCHN, M. 'Reality Shock: A Study of Beginning Elementary School Teachers', Unpublished Master's Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1950.

WALKER, W.G. 'The Future Occupational Plans of a Sample of Beginning Teachers', Australian Journal of Higher Education, 1, 2, 1962, 66-74.

WALKER, W.G. 'Occupational Commitment in a Sample of Australian Teachers Five Years After Training', The Australian Journal of Higher Education, 3, 1, December, 1967, 20-32.

- WALKER, W.G. 'Current Issues in Education in Australia', Paper presented to the Conference in Educational Administration, Christchurch, New Zealand, 1976.
- WALLER, W. The Sociology of Teaching, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1932.
- WESTBY, D.L. 'The Career Experiences of the Symphony Musician' Social Forces, Vol. 38, March, 1960, pp. 223-230.
- WESTERN, J.S. and ANDERSON, D.S. 'Education and Professional Socialization', Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology, 4, 2, October 1968, 91-106.
- WESTWOOD, L.J. 'The Role of the Teacher - I', Educational Research, 9 (2), 1967(a), pp. 122-34.
- WESTWOOD, L.J. 'The Role of the Teacher - II', Educational Research, 10 (1), 1967(b), pp. 21-37.
- WHEELER, S. (1961) 'Role Conflict in Correctional Communities', in Cressey, D.R. (ed.) The Prison: Studies in Institutional Organization and Change, Holt, New York.
- WHITESIDE, M.T., BERNBAUM, G. and NOBLE, G. 'Aspirations, Reality Shock and Entry into Teaching', Sociological Review, 17, 3, 399-414.
- WILLOWER, D.J. 'The Teacher Subculture and Rites of Passage', Paper presented to American Educational Research Association, February, 1969.
- WILSON, B.R. 'The Teacher's Role: A Sociological Analysis', British Journal of Sociology, 13, 1, 15-32.
- WILSON, T.P. 'Critique of Ordinal Variables', Social Forces, 49, 1971, 432-444.
- WINCH, R.F. and CAMPBELL, D.T. 'Proof? No. Evidence? Yes. The Significance of Tests of Significance', The American Sociologist, 4, 1969, 140-43.
- WINER, B.J. Statistical Principles in Experimental Design. McGraw-Hill, New York, 1971.
- WINKLER, R.L. and HAYS, W.L. Statistics: Probability, Inference and Decision, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1975, 2nd edition.
- WISEMAN, S. and START, K.B. 'A Follow-up of Teachers Five Years After Completing Their Training', British Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXV, 3, November 1965, 342-361.
- WRIGHT, B.D. and TUSKA, S.A. 'Student and First Year Teachers' Attitudes Toward Self and Others', Co-operative Research Project No. 1503, University of Chicago, 1966.

WRIGHT, B.D. and TUSKA, S.A. 'From Dream to Life in the Psychology of Becoming a Teacher', The School Review, 76, 3, September, 1968, 253-293.

WRONG, D. 'The Oversocialized Conception of Man in Modern Sociology', The American Sociological Review, Vol. 26, 1961, pp. 183-192.

ADDENDUM

ADAMS, R.S. et al. Cited in Streets, G.R. 'Concepts of the Teacher Role Among Student Teachers', Unpublished B.Ed. thesis, University of Queensland, December, 1968, p. 31. (Note: Adams et al. cited by Streets and his role congruence inventory used by Streets but no specific bibliographical reference given.)

ANASTASI, A. Psychological Testing, (3rd ed.), Macmillan, New York, 1968.

ATKINSON, R. Orthodox Consensus and Radical Alternative, Heinemann, London, 1971.

BARKER LUNN, J.C. Streaming in the Primary School, National Foundation for Educational Research, Slough (U.K.), 1970.

COPE, E. 'Discussions With College and School Staff on the Subject of School Practice', Education For Teaching, 18, 1970, 30-37.

ENTWISTLE, N.J. et al., Preliminary Report to the Joseph Rowntree Memorial Trust (Vol. II): Aims and Objectives, University of Lancaster, Lancaster, 1971.

KAISER, H.F. 'Computer Program for Varimax Rotation in Factor Analysis', Educ. Psychol. Measurement, Vol. 19, 413-420, 1959.

OPPENHEIM, A.N. Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement, Heinemann, London, 1976.

TAYLOR, M.L. and PELLEGRIN, R.J. 'Professionalization: its Functions and Dysfunctions for the Life Insurance Occupation', Vol. 38, October 1959 - May 1960, 110-114.

WESTWOOD, L.J. 'Re-assessing the Role of the Head', Education For Teaching, 71, 1966, 65-74.

WHEELER, S. 'The Structure of formally organized socialization settings' in Brim, O.G. Jr. and Wheeler, S. Socialization After Childhood: Two Essays, Wiley and Sons, New York, 1966.