CHAPTER 5

THE INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a relatively brief description of the kinds of formal and informal contacts student teachers typically had with lecturers and teachers during training. It is felt that such information provides the minimum necessary background against which the data yielded by the four role norm inventories, the teaching style inventory and the remaining questionnaire and interview items might reasonably be interpreted.

Over the period of the investigation the researcher was employed as a lecturer in the College's Teacher Education Programme. In this capacity he taught the first and third-year student groups who are the subjects of the research, and was also substantially involved every semester in practice teaching supervision. This latter occupied never less than a quarter and, on occasions, up to half of the researcher's teaching load. The fact of such sustained contact with students meant that the researcher knew them well, and this facilitated incursions into the less formal aspects of student life at College where these appeared to be relevant to the attempt to characterise student/lecturer and student/teacher Thus it was, for example, that the researcher relationships. made an especial effort to attend student functions open to staff such as student club meetings, film nights, graduation balls and parties, sporting events, and the like.

There was 'hard' information too, to complement these impressions derived from the author's immersion in the informal student life of the College. The investigator was given generous access to the Schools Liaison Office Archives which contained a wealth of useful information compiled from surveys made by the Co-ordinator of Teaching Practice over the period of the research. The most relevant of these were (i) the 'Comments and Suggestions' sheets returned to the College by each co-operating teacher at the conclusion of practice teaching, (ii) a questionnaire sent in late 1974 to co-operating schools by the (then) Acting Director of Teacher Education in the College foreshadowing revision of the Primary Teacher Education Programme and requesting input from the schools, and (iii) feedback sheets from students about practice teaching experiences. Actual examples of these, with identification of schools and personnel obliterated, are given in Appendix 3 as an indication of the issues canvassed in these surveys and the concerns aired in the responses. Overwhelmingly, the schools responded seriously and in some detail to these requests by the College.

As well, the investigator regularly attended the frequently held meetings of the College's liaison officers chaired by the Co-ordinator of Teaching Practice. The accumulated minutes of these meetings together with the researcher's notes taken at the time provided a thoroughgoing resume of the College's practice teaching programme as viewed through the eyes of the liaison officer. As an additional check on the relative accuracy and objectivity of this account, drafts were read to and discussed with a number

of the most experienced liaison officers and the Co-ordinator of Teaching Practice so that the final version might reasonably approximate the reality of practice teaching as viewed by those lecturing staff involved at the time.

Finally, certain questions included in the background information section of the questionnaire yielded information about aspects of the communal life of the 1976 cohort of students. Primarily these questions dealt with the degree of student integration with the social life of the College, and details of residence. The responses to these questions are summarised as needed in the text that follows.

As a liaison officer on practice teaching the investigator visited dozens of the College's co-operating schools during the period 1974-1978. These ranged from the largest primary schools in Sydney's outer regions to the smallest country schools in the western areas of the state, and included both public (State) and private schools. Typically a one-day practice teaching run might involve visits to 5 or 6 students in 2 to 4 schools. A two-day run might take in up to a dozen students in five schools. At one point the investigator undertook a three-day run involving 6 schools In totality, this experience meant that the and 15 students. author met many co-operating teachers and supervised many students over the period of the study.

Before proceeding, it should be made clear that during the time the study was undertaken changes of significance were occurring in the College's practice teaching system. In the early-to-mid 1970's the College was persistently and sometimes severely criticised by schools because of its policy of having practice teaching in the fifth semester only, of a six semester course. During this time a number of lecturers were appointed to the Teacher Education Programme from the school system and quickly added their voice to the swelling criticism emanating from both teachers and students. It would be fair to say that there was a degree of incredulity even, that students who were training to become teachers were not given a substantial school experience until the final year of The arrival in 1975 of a new Director of a three year course. Teacher Education who was once a teacher in the public school system himself gave impetus to the movement for change and soon after modifications were made which considerably strengthened the practice teaching component of the Teacher Education Course. These changes, however, did not affect the 1976 cohort of students upon whom this study primarily focused.

5.2 THE COLLEGE

The College from which the student populations were drawn was Mitchell College of Advanced Education, situated on the outskirts of Bathurst in the Central Tablelands of New South Wales, Australia. It is an autonomous multi-purpose C.A.E. founded on 1st March, on the site of and superseding the former Bathurst Teachers' College. Mitchell C.A.E. achieved corporate status on 1st January, 1971. At the time of writing it had become the largest non-metropolitan college of advanced education in Australia.

5.3 THE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMME

At this point, an outline of the Teacher Education Programme is given to make clear the contacts students had with teachers in the College's co-operating schools. The following, therefore, is a semester-by-semester description of the observation and practice teaching aspects of each stage of the six semester (three year) Teacher Education Programme.

- Stage I: Informal contact with schools and youth organisations in Bathurst (for example: teacher aide work, sports coaching, helping with school clubs). This was encouraged but not compulsory.
- Stage II: No formal contact with schools; micro teaching in peer groups.
- Stage III: Students gave 'basic' lessons in local schools as part of their Education course. On average, students would actually give only about 3 lessons per semester, the rest of the time being spent in observation and planning. The lessons given would typically be of less than one hour's duration and would be supervised by either or both lecturer and class teacher.
- Stage IV: Students again worked in local schools as above but were expected to attempt more complex lesson plans. On average, about 2-3 lessons would be given during the semester.
- Stage V: <u>PRACTICE TEACHING.</u> This was the first sustained contact with schools since entering College. The system was: two block sessions of 3 to 4 weeks method workshops alternating with two sessions of five weeks' practice. The sequence was: workshops - practice teaching - workshops - practice teaching.
- Stage VI: No formally required contact with schools unless, in exceptional circumstances, it was deemed to be necessary for an individual. Some electives did however build in a modest practice component.

In summary, the practical teaching component of the three year course amounted to ten weeks in schools in fifth semester (third year) and the giving of approximately half a dozen isolated lessons over the second year in College. As well, informal contacts were verbally encouraged by the Schools Liaison Office and, at times, various College Departments would organise the occasional demonstration lesson at the (then) Bathurst Demonstration School.

5.4 PRACTICE TEACHING: STUDENT/SUPERVISOR RELATIONSHIPS

Though, ostensibly, the College and School assumed joint responsibility for student supervision, the co-operating teacher upon whose class the student practised became the de facto supervisor by virtue of the fact that he or she was in a position to witness and evaluate all of the student's performance whereas the liaison officer from the College got to see only part of that The teacher was expected to supervise the student performance. closely, writing daily comments on the student's lesson plans and checking the development of teaching skills against a detailed list of significant objectives provided by the College. In this respect however the reality invariably fell short of the ideal in the dozens of schools visited by the researcher in his role of liaison officer. While some teachers would jot down a pertinent comment for most 'substantial' lessons, others would write something at the end of each day, or once or twice a week, or not at all, unless specifically asked to do so by either student or lecturer. Students often complained to their College supervisors that they were not getting enough feedback - verbal or written - about their lessons. Mostly this could be rectified by the lecturer tactfully suggesting that students needed such guidance, but by then the practice was often half over. Comments of other liaison officers confirmed that these practices were endemic.

The virtually unanimous opinion of the College liaison officers was that co-operating teachers often did not thoroughly read the practice teaching material sent out by the Schools Liaison Office. For their part, teachers invariably complained about the amount they had to read and, in particular, about the long check-list of skills which they tended to see as jargon-ridden. A common observation was that no student could possibly be expected to teach the number, range and variety of lessons which would enable the checklist to be completed. The end result of this was a compromise in which the precise details of supervision were <u>negotiated</u> by lecturer and teacher on the understanding that the essential paperwork would be filled in by the end of the practice teaching session.

The quality of supervision varied greatly - from detailed scrutiny to virtual neglect. Perhaps the bitterest of all the complaints made by students concerned instances of being left on their own for long periods with oftentimes difficult classes and with little help. This appeared to be particularly so where the student was assigned to the class of a teacher in a position with extra duties such as Deputy Principal; in such cases though the student was expected, on average, to prepare in detail for one $l\frac{1}{2} - 2$ hour session per day, he/she might be left to 'look after' the class for another part of the day without prior warning. Some teachers in fact held that this 'sink or swim' approach was a useful experience for students.

On the whole however, the evidence in its totality (the investigator's own extensive observations, student feedback sheets, documents concerning teacher supervision of students, the views of other liaison officers - and so on) pointed to the fact that most teachers supervised most students reasonably closely most of the time, providing some degree of verbal feedback to students, though not much in the way of day-to-day written evaluation. A major, recurring complaint of co-operating teachers was that the College's liaison officers spent nothing like the time needed in observing students teaching lessons to be able to do other than rely upon the teacher's evaluation of the student's progress. There was much truth in this. To begin with, liaison officers only visited each school once per week and, even then, mostly for a short period. This was because the liaison officer would, typically, visit several schools in the day and often have to travel some distance between schools located in different towns. Indeed. this was a source of embarrassment to most liaison officers them-It was often made clear by them at post-practice meetings selves. that a way should be found to spend more time actually seeing There was a pervasive feeling that the College students' lessons. had too little control over the kinds of classroom practitioners it was producing.

Another complaint voiced frequently by the schools - again with justification - was that some liaison officers were neither motivated nor equipped to do their supervisory job properly. A comment often made was that liaison officers should, ideally, have had some prior experience of schools as teachers. The Coordinator of Teaching Practice acknowledged the validity of these observations but could only point out that Heads of Departments determined who would be on practice teaching and this sometimes meant that lecturers who openly avowed little interest in or experience with the job were sent out to the schools to complete their teaching load.

For their part lecturers not uncommonly saw teachers as rather uninspiring role models, as overly concerned with rote learning and 'basic' methods, as unable to give the right kind of feedback to students, and, most seriously, as occasionally given to leaving the student for long periods without supervision. Other minor complaints sometimes made by lecturers about teachers were that teachers expected students even on first practice to be able to do almost every kind of lesson, that they sometimes wanted to be too 'friendly' with students, and, at the opposite pole, were occasionally 'jealous' of students' success with the pupils.

Notwithstanding these differences between the priorities and opinions of lecturers and teachers, there were a number of strong points of agreement. It was universally agreed that students should be punctual, present themselves cleanly and tidily, and thoroughly prepare their work. It was also agreed that students must try to establish and maintain reasonable classroom discipline. More tacitly, it was expected that students should behave as 'guests' in the host school and, while co-operating to the fullest in the general life of the school as a 'member of staff', not forget that they were 'juniors' who had much to learn and were not to take liberties.

Students, on the whole, were very appreciative of any practical help given by either supervising teacher or liaison officer. Their major complaints related to being left alone when they needed someone to be in the classroon, lack of specific feedback about lessons given, and lack of specific detail about what they were supposed to teach. They also complained frequently about how authoritarian and whole-group oriented their co-operating teachers were, and how traditional were their methods. The point was often made that discovery-type lessons were indeed a rarity and that there was a heavy preoccupation with rote drills and 'bread and butter' lessons. A few students turned these complaints back on their lecturers, arguing that their in-college preparation had been inadequate for practice teaching.

An indication of how the students in the 1976 group felt, retrospectively, about their in-college preparation is provided by considering the responses to three statements included in the first section of their questionnaire. These statements concerned the relevance of College work to their future occupation as teacher, their satisfaction with College courses, and feelings of identification with the teaching profession (see questions 45, 46 and 48 of the background information section of the Teacher Training Project Questionnaire – Appendix 1). The responses in their raw form are to be found in Appendix 12 in columns 46, 47 and 49 of the computer sheets used to record the data. In brief, these responses showed that while there was a fair degree of satisfaction amongst the students with their training (including practice teaching) <u>in toto</u>, there was a degree of dissatisfaction with College course work and a feeling amongst a majority that they were not yet teachers even though they were then only a few weeks away from joining the profession.

The main trend to emerge in a three-way cross classification of the responses was that of relatively high satisfaction with relevance of College work as a whole coupled with a lesser degree of satisfaction with College courses and strongish disagreement with the notion of identification with the profession. This trend accounted for about one third of all combinations. Another pattern, accounting for over 15% of all combinations, was that of relatively high satisfaction with both College work generally and College courses, but a low degree of identification with teaching. The only other trend was one of relatively high satisfaction with both College work and courses and a strongish feeling of identification with teaching. This accounted for about one sixth (16.5%) of all response combinations.

On the whole, the information these questions yielded appear to confirm impressions that, for many students, practice teaching had been something of a reality shock and had made them ponder upon the nature of their training. As has been mentioned, and as subsequent data summaries help confirm, there was something of a clamour during those days for more and earlier practice teaching and a more 'practical' orientation in course work. It was as

if practice teaching had served to alert students to how unprepared they were for their career proper. Certainly the investigator heard many remarks by students to this effect.

Related to these views were certain criticisms about liaison officers recurrently made by students. While a few lecturers tended to be feared because they were seen as too demanding, visits by liaison officers appeared generally to be welcomed. However, a near-universal complaint was that when liaison officers did manage to come - and this was seldom more than once a week - it was not for long enough to be of much benefit. Students sometimes expressed the view that they would have liked the liaison officer to give the occasional demonstration lesson or similar practical help. Quite often too, students complained that, as regards teaching methods, they felt inadequately prepared for practice teaching once they got into the classroom.

Despite (or perhaps because of) these recurring criticisms of their school and college supervisors, there was very strong support for more practice teaching amongst the 1976 cohort of students. This is revealed in responses to questions 39 and 40 of the Teacher Training Project Questionnaire (see Appendix 1 for the questions, and Appendix 12, columns 40 and 41 of the computer sheets for the raw responses). Nearly four fifths of the 1976 cohort thought that teaching practice should receive most emphasis during the extra time available if the training course were to be increased in length by one term (question 39). On the other hand, three quarters of the group thought that in such circumstances the academic study of education should receive less emphasis (question 40).

These responses signified a strong preference in the 1976 group for practice teaching and method work over theory. This finding is confirmed in the group's responses to other questions dealing with students' views of what a college of education should be and do. The students were given four statements about the role of a College of Education and asked to indicate the importance of each on a three point scale (see Appendix 1: questions 41 to 44 inclusive in the T.T.P.Q., and Appendix 12: columns 42 to 45 of the computer sheets for the raw data). They rated as most important that a college should be concerned with the relevance of learning to the real world. Overwhelmingly they saw as least important that a college be concerned with learning for its own sake. Overall. the responses to these questions strongly confirmed the impressions derived from observation - that students perceived a gap between the theory and practice of teaching, and themselves showed a heavy bias toward practice.

In summary, the substantive reality of student/supervisor relationships in the context of practice teaching could be outlined thus:

- * Most supervision was actually done by the co-operating teacher even though the College's Schools Liaison Office was, on paper, responsible for student evaluation.
- * The quality of this supervision varied from close scrutiny to virtual neglect. Most students were guided with reasonable care and integrated adequately with staff. There were frequent complaints by students, however, about lack of proper feedback from the supervising teacher.

- * Teachers <u>and</u> students perceived liaison officers as not being active enough in supervision mainly because of the infrequency and brevity of school visits.
- * Students <u>and</u> supervising teachers were strongly critical that students' first practice experience came in the final training year. The consensus was for more and earlier practice. Students were practice-oriented and perceived practice and theory as integrated.

5.5 INFORMAL STUDENT/LECTURER CONTACTS

By 1975 there were five on-campus Halls of Residence run by tutors who were academics. A majority of students (77%) <u>began</u> their student lives where, compared with (say) a typical metropolitan or non-residential institution, close relationships with staff were the norm since resident tutors were involved in counselling, helping with academic work, and organising student social life. Overall, 55% of students lived in residence.

Briefly, responses to questions 7, 34, 35 and 36 of the T.T.P.Q. (see Appendix I and columns 8, 35, 36, and 37 of the computer recording sheets in Appendix 12) yielded substantial information about the 1976 cohort concerning residential matters, degree of on-campus involvement, and closeness of relationships with lecturers. For example, about 60% of students felt they could discuss a problem such as being in financial difficulties with at least one or two staff members, and this proportion extended to over 85% when the problem was a less personal one such as discussing future career plans. Cross-tabular analysis revealed that this willingness to confide in lecturers was not diminished by, for instance, students' intention to spend more than a third of their weekends off campus. <u>In all, such data revealed that student/</u><u>lecturer relationships over the period of the study could be character-ised as relatively warm and close.</u>

CHAPTER 6

RESULTS: THE ROLE NORM INVENTORY DATA - 1976 (MITCHELL)

6.1 INTRODUCTION

In view of the number of analyses made on the large mass of data generated, the procedure adopted will be to present in detail the results of the various relevant comparisons for the first role sector of the inventory - Role Sector 1: Acting Toward Pupils, as a means of establishing the <u>modus operandi</u>. The results for the other three role sectors will then be summarised as briefly as is commensurate with clear exposition to avoid for the reader the tedium of having to plough needlessly through repetitious analyses. Underlining has been used throughout to assist in the assimilation of a large amount of information.

6.2 ROLE SECTOR 1: ACTING TOWARD PUPILS

Table 6.1 presents the mean response scores and standard deviations for all of the 1976 groups including the responses of the 6th semester student group to all four inventories for the role sector, Acting Toward Pupils. Since, as Table 6.1 shows, the multivariate test of equality of mean vectors for all of the data for this sector was statistically significant (F = 13.79, p < .0001), the univariate F-tests were in turn examined for statistical significance to ascertain those role norms where relevant post hoc comparisons could be made. The table indicates that 14 of the 15 variables in this sector showed statistically significant differences. As previously explained, the rigorous Scheffer method of making multiple comparisons following a significant

TABLE 6.1

MEAN RESPONSE SCORES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR ALL 1976 GROUPS: ROLE SECTOR 1 - ACTING TOWARDS PUPILS

				N NHO	State				6	PECTA	TIONS		NORM	ATTR	IBUTE		DOWNS TOT	ATTRIE	SUTED	- INI	c	
DOL F ADDM		ZND	9	H	ECTUR	ÆRS	TEACH	ERS	2N	Q	611-	-	ZNE		бтн		Sto		бтн	VARIATE	LESS	
	×	S	×	S	×	S	×	S	ıх	s.	ıx	S	ix	S	IX		S	IX	s	VALUES	THAN	
1. give homework regularly	2.04	.87	2.86	. 79	2.87	.89	2.42	.94 2	.08	.92 2	.86	95 2.	03 1.	04 3.	04 1.0	07 1.7	2. 6.	5 2.11	.83	22.4338	1000.	
2. make and carefully follow detailed lesson plans	2.35	67.	3.17	.82	2.80	.76 2	2.63	.87 2	.40	.96 2	.96 1.	05 1.	47	83 1.	68	99 2.1	6. 9	2 2.97	.93	35.4329	.0001	
 deprive a pupil of priv- ileges as a form of punishment 	2.69	1.07	2.81	86	3.33 1	8	.56 1	. 00 2	.92 1	.00 2	.57	97 2.	66 1.	10 2.	97 1.	17 2.2	2 .8	3 2.25	8 8.	8.6967	.000	
 give pupils a great deal of rote learning in basic subjects 	3.20	1.35	3.71	56.	3.87	. 18 2	.80	. 17 3	1.16 1	. 29 3.	45 1.	06 3.	02 1.	39 3.	5. 66	98 2.5	1 1.1	1 2.49	. 98	22.5256	.000	
 evaluate work of pupils on Dasis of individual improve- ment rather than by comparing them with other children 	1.42	.72	1.20	. 59	.40	1 22.	.34	. 65 1	.57	.94 1.	.67	87 1.	79 1.	11 1.	30	77 2.1	0 1.0	6.2.41	1.02	27.3746	.000	
 give greater attention to the mo able than to the less able students 	4.56	. 75	4.51	.78	11.1	66.	.17	. 98 4	. 37	84 4	. 35	86 4.	02 1.	12 4.	45	97 3.8	4 1.1	2 3.73	.98	8.6323	.0001	
$\overline{7}$. use extra academic work as one form of punishment	3.49	1.10	4.38	.78	19.	59.	1.18	. 03 3	.45 1	.08 4	.14 1.	02 3.	26 1.	17 4.	17 1.1	11 2.6	6 1.0	4 2.89	76.	45.6081	.0001	
8. experiment with new teaching techniques	1.78	.88	1.70	.76	.38	.61 1	.63	.68 1	.70	.81 1.	98	91 1.	47	75 1.4	8. 6	34 2.1	5 .8	7 2.69	56.	26.0204	.0001	
 permit each pupil to follow his own educational interests most of the time 	2.93	.92	2.70	8.		. 92	1.21	.97 3	10.	.98 3.	.01	90 2.	68 1.	07 1.	. 08	18 3.2	3.8	3 3.26	. 92	25.1552	.0001	
10.smoke in situations where a pupil might see them	3.99	1.17	3.86	86.	3.87	8	.02	. 95 4	.30 1	.05 4	.15 1.	22 4.	03 1.	13 3.	08	32 3.8	3 .9	7 3.90	.80	2.3908	.0110	
<pre>11.devote most of their time to working with individual pupils or small groups</pre>	2.65	66.	2.33	.64	04.	.78 2	. 50	. 82 2	.77 1	.01 2.	47	72 2.	42 1.	04 1.	. 17	12 2.9	5.9	9 2.88	8	16.2535	t000°	
12.use corporal punishment as a disciplinary measure	3.98	1.00	4.02	.87	.24	.83 3	.45 1	.01 4	60.	.96 4.	.07	97 3.	97 1.	04 4 .	36 .8	35 3.3	16. 0	8 2.99	1.01	24,8144	1000'	
<pre>13.encourage pupils to dis- cuss various religious beliefs in the classroom</pre>	3.00	1.09	3.11	1.15 2	38	3	1.13 1	. 17 3	. 16 1	.25 3.	29 1.	22 3.	22 1.	14 3.4	15 1.2	21 3.5	¢.	3.92	8.	9.1420	.0001	
14 express their own polit- Ical views in the classroom	3.65	1.24	4.10	1.00 3	3.47 1	.20	.28 1	.07 3	. 85 1	. 19 4.	14 1.	09 3.	81 1.	084.	16 1.0	1 4.0	2.9	0 4.35	.68	8.0458	.0001	
<u>15</u> .encourage pupils to question the opinions held by the teacher	2.07	1.10	2.11	. 95	69.1	.93 2	.48 1	. 13 2	.41 1	.23 2.	.27 1.	05.2.	63 1.	28 2.	26 1.2	21 3.2	2 1.2	7 3.77	16.	24.5848	1000.	
F - STATIS	STIC R	OR MU	LTIVAR	IATE 1	TEST O	F EQU	MUTY	OF M	TEAN VI	ECTOR	5 = 13	.7917	DF	= 13	5/1129	96.798	A.	<0.0	100		-	

F value was employed as this allowed any number of comparisons without affecting the chosen alpha level. Moreover, as Ferguson (1976: 296) observes, no special problems arise because of unequal group sizes using the Scheffe test.

While the data from Table 1.1 allowed for 45 possible pairwise comparisons $(\frac{10!}{2! (10 - 2)!})$ less than half of these were relevant to the concerns of the research. The comparisons and the purposes for which they were made were as follows:

- (a) each student group's norms (R.N.I.1) with their expectations
 (R.N.I.2) to ascertain the degree to which the students
 foresaw any future modification of their ideal role concepts
 in the actual teaching situation;
- (b) each students group's own norms with, in turn, their two sets of attributed norms (R.N.I.'s 3 and 4) - to determine how close the students saw themselves as being to lecturers and to teachers in respect of the four teacher role relationships;
- (c) for each student group the norms they attributed to lecturers
 (R.N.I.3) with those they attributed to teachers (R.N.I.4)
 to obtain a picture of how congruent in role orientation these significant others were seen as being;
- (d) the actual norms of lecturers and teachers to see how close they really were;
- (e) each student group's attributed norms with the actual norms of lecturers and teachers - to determine how accurately the students perceived the views of these significant others;

- (f) each student group's own norms with, in turn, the lecturers' and teachers' own norms - to discover the degree to which students were actually in accord with their significant others;
- (g) the two student groups' own norms with each other, then their expectations, and then the norms they attributed firstly to lecturers and secondly to teachers - to ascertain the differences between the groups in respect of their own and attributed views.

In terms of the principal components analysis of the 1976 data, the 6th semester students' own norms for this role sector appear to be characterised overall by a pupil-centred progressiveness and a concomitant lack of a teacher-centred, traditional, authoritarian orientation. It can be seen from Table 6.1 that, with varying degrees of intensity, approval for the propositions contained in role norms 11, 9, 5, 8, and 15 was expressed by the group. The first three of these variables were the statistically significant contributors to principal component 3 for this sector (pupil-centred teaching behaviour), while variables 5, 8 and 15 were the positively loaded major contributors to the factor labelled 'progressive teaching behaviour'. As well, for this latter component, the group was strongly against giving greater attention to the more able than to the less able pupils (role norm 6) which is the one strongly negatively loaded variable contributing to the factor. The items primarily making up the first principal component (traditional authoritarian behaviour) for

this sector were, in order of their contribution to the variance of the factor, norms 12, 3, 1, 4, and 7, and it can be seen that in respect of 12 (corporal punishment) and 7 (academic work as punishment) strong disapproval was registered, moderate disapproval for 4 (rote learning) and only the mildest of approval for 3 (deprive a pupil of privileges...) and 1 (give homework...).

Similarly, the items contributing chiefly to the second factor (freedom of expression) were 13, 14, and 15, and the students' responses to these ranged from approval for 15 (encourage pupils to question teacher opinions) through the faintest of disapproval for role norm 13 (encourage the discussion of religious beliefs) to strong disapproval for 14 (teacher expressing own political views in class). <u>In all, on a broad progressive/</u> <u>traditional dimension the 6th semester students' view of their</u> <u>own position could be located on the progressive side of such</u> <u>a scale.</u>

Comparison of the group's own norms (what should be done) with their own expectations (what <u>would</u> be done when they commenced teaching) revealed only one item where the means showed a statistically significant difference. This was item 5 (evaluating pupils on an individual basis); the difference was one of intensity, with somewhat less approval being manifested for the expectation than for the norm. However, in both cases very strong approval was shown so, in real terms, the modification of the norm by the expectation could scarcely be seen as other than minimal. <u>In respect of the classroom role then, the students' expectations for their future behaviour were virtually identical to their</u> ideal concepts of behaviour.

When the students' own norms were compared with the norms they attributed to lecturers, four statistically significant differences were found. These were for items 2, 9, 11 and 12. Not surprisingly perhaps, lecturers were attributed with holding far more approval for making and carefully following detailed lesson plans (role norm 2). As well, they were seen as being more in favour of permitting pupils to follow their own educational interests (item 9) and devoting most time to working with individuals or small groups (item 11). These last were differences of degree rather than direction, as was that on item 12 (using corporal punishment...) where the students saw lecturers as being even more strongly opposed to this than they themselves were. In all, apart from role norm 2, the students saw lecturers as holding views very much the same as their own, though being rather more pupil-centred in orientation. If anything then, lecturers were held by the students to be even more progressive in their overall view of the classroom role than the students saw themselves as being.

A very different picture emerges when the norms the students attributed to teachers were compared with the students' own norms. No less than 12 items of the 15 yielded statistically significant differences. These are summarised in Table 6.2.

Five of these differences are directional, i.e. on opposite sides of the '3' middle category. They were for role norms 4, 7, 9, 12, and 15, and signify very distinct differences in role perception: the average difference between the students' own norms and the attributed norms for these items was 1.18, - more

TABLE 6.2

COMPARISON OF 6TH SEMESTER (1976) STUDENTS' OWN NORMS WITH THOSE THEY ATTRIBUTED TO TEACHERS FOR STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT ROLE NORMS (p < .01)

ROLE SECTOR 1: ACTING TOWARD PUPILS

		STUD O' NO	ENTS' WN RMS	NORI ATTR TEACI	MS IB. HERS	OMECA	TEACHERS
	ROLE NORM	X	S	X	S	OMEGA SQUARED	AS
7.	academic work as pun- ishment	4.38	.78	2.89	.97	.366	Î
4.	rote learning in the basics	3.71	.95	2.49	.98	.271	MODE
12.	corporal punish- ment	4.02	.87	2.99	1.01	.235	APPROVING
6.	greater attention to more able than less able	4.51	.78	3.73	.98	.159	THAN STUDENTS
1.	give regular homework	2.86	.79	2.11	.83	.144	
3.	deprive of privileges as punishment	2.81	.98	2.25	.86	.073	
15.	encourage pupils to question teacher- held opinions	2.11	.95	3.77	.97	.384	1
5.	evaluate pupils on individual basis rather than compare •••	1.20	.59	2.41	1.02	.348	
8.	experiment with new teaching techniques	1.70	.76	2.69	.95	.245	LESS
11.	devote most time to individuals/small groups	2.33	.64	2.88	.84	.120	APPROVING
13.	encourage pupils to discuss various religious beliefs	3.11	1.15	3.92	.84	.115	
9.	permit pupils to follow their own educational interests most of the time	2.70	.82	3.26	.92	.098	

than a whole category on the five point scale. Indeeed the average difference per role norm between the two sets of norms over the twelve items (0.96), approached a whole response category. Relating this to the factor analysis, the table makes clear then that <u>the students perceived teachers to be much less progressive</u>, <u>democratic and pupil-centred</u>, and a good deal more traditional, <u>authoritarian and formal than the students saw themselves as</u> <u>being</u>. This however was a comparative view and to put it into proper perspective it was necessary to determine how the group saw the teachers in respect of the classroom role in absolute terms by simply examining the students' attributed norms on their own.

The view held of teachers by the student group is not unequivocally that of the stereotype of the "traditional" teacher though it does tend toward that. Teachers are seen as holding degrees of approval varying from quite strong to very faint for role norms 1 (regular homework...), 2 (lesson plans), 3 (depriving a pupil of privileges...), 4 (rote learning), and 7 (academic work as punishment). Similarly, varying degrees of approval are seen to be held for items 9 (permitting pupils to follow their own educational interests), 13 (encouraging discussion of religious beliefs) and 15 (encouraging pupils to question teacher opinions). Against this must be balanced the moderate approval teachers are perceived to hold for role norms 5 (evaluating pupils on an individual basis...) and 8 (experimenting with new teaching techniques), the mild approval for role norm 11 (devoting most time to working with individuals/small groups) and the disapproval for role norm 6 (giving greater attention to the more able than the less able). <u>Overall then, teachers were seen as fairly</u> traditional but not without concern for the individual pupil and by no means closed to new ideas.

Further analysis was done by determining the difference in mean response scores role norm by role norm between inventories and then averaging these differences for the role. This gives a measure of the overall differences for the classroom role between the various perspectives of the students, providing a useful summary of the trends in the data discussed so far. Table 6.3 presents this information:

TABLE 6.3

MEAN DIFFERENCE PER ROLE NORM BETWEEN STUDENTS' OWN AND ATTRIBUTED VIEWS: 6TH SEMESTER 1976: ACTING TOWARD PUPILS

OWN NORMS VS OWN EXPECTATIONS	OWN NORMS VS NORMS ATTRIBUTED TO LECTURERS	OWN NORMS VS NORMS ATTRIBUTED TO TEACHERS	NORMS ATTRIBUTED TO LECTURERS VS NORMS ATTRIBUTED TO TEACHERS
0.202	0.334	0.807	0.991

Thus it is that, for the classroom role, whereas there was not much difference on average between the students' own norms and their expectations, and between the students' norms and those they see lecturers as holding, there was a considerable difference - almost a whole response category - between their own norms and those they attributed to teachers. Taken as a measure of the perceived distance between themselves and the significant others of their role-set, it is clear that the students of this group saw themselves as much 'closer' to lecturers than to teachers for the classroom role. Moreover, as the comparison in Table 6.3 between the norms attributed to lecturers and to teachers shows, they perceive those primarily responsible for their professional education as being even further apart (on average, a full response category) than they saw themselves and teachers as being. This perceived gap between lecturers and teachers will be discussed later in relation to the actual distance between the two groups.

Comparison of the actual norms of lecturers and of teachers with the norms attributed to each of them by the students yielded a measure of the accuracy with which the students perceived the views of these significant others. Table 6.4 shows those items that emerged as statistically significant (p < .01) when the students' attributed norms were compared with the lecturers' actual views for the classroom role sector.

The table shows that there were statistically significant differences for 7 of the 15 role norms. For the two items concerning pupil expression of views (13 and 15) and for role norm 14 relating to teacher-expression of political views in the classroom, the lecturers are attributed with substantially more conservative views than they reported for themselves. The difference for role norm 13 is directional, with students attributing moderate

TABLE 6.4

COMPARISON OF LECTURERS' OWN NORMS WITH THOSE ATTRIBUTED TO THEM BY 6TH SEMESTER STUDENTS FOR STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT ITEMS (p < .01): ROLE SECTOR 1: ACTING TOWARD PUPILS

	ROLE NORM	LECTUI OWI NORI	RERS' N MS	STUD ATT NO	ENTS' RIB. RMS	OMECA	LECTURERS
		X	s	X	S	SQUARED	AS
13.	encourage discuss- ion of religious beliefs	2.38	.94	3.45	1.21	.181	LESS
14.	express own polit- ical views in class- room	3.47	1.20	4.16	1.01	.093	APPROVING THAN
15.	encourage pupils to question teacher opinions	1.69	.92	2.26	1.21	.061	THEY ARE
7.	academic work as punishment	4.64	.65	4.17	1.11	.054	
9.	permit pupils follow own educat- ional interests	2.80	.92	1.80	.78	.268	Î
2.	make and care- fully follow detailed lesson plans	2.80	.76	1.89	.99	.197	MORE I APPROVING
11.	devote most time to individuals/small groups	2.40	.78	1.71	.72	.178	

disapproval whereas the lecturers themselves showed quite firm approval for this norm (encouraging the discussion of religious beliefs...). For items 14 and 15 the students were correct in attributing disapproval and approval respectively, but misperceived the strength with which these views were held.

On the other hand, for role norms 9 and 11 which concern the individualisation of instruction, while lecturers were correctly seen as approving, they were wrongly seen as being a good deal more For role norm 7 although the students so than they in fact were. correctly saw lecturers as disapproving (of using academic work as a form of punishment), they underestimated just how strongly lecturers felt about this. Again, for role norm 2, although the direction of lecturers' views was correctly perceived, the difference in intensity was marked, with lecturers being much less concerned about the matter (making and carefully following detailed lesson plans) than the students thought they were. Relating all of this to the framework derived from the factor analysis, lecturers were misperceived by the 6th semester group as more pupil-centred (9 and 11) and, perhaps formal (2) than they were, and rather less democratic (13, 14, 15).

Despite these misperceptions - which were predominantly misjudgements of degree (only one item showing a directional difference) - it can be concluded that the picture the 6th semester students held of lecturers in respect of the classroom role was basically accurate. The students saw lecturers as fundamentally progressive in orientation, and analysis of the lecturers' own views along established lines amply confirms this. Table 6.5 compares the norms attributed to teachers by the 6th semester students with the teachers' own norms:

TABLE 6.5

COMPARISON OF TEACHERS' OWN NORMS WITH THOSE ATTRIBUTED TO THEM BY 6TH SEMESTER STUDENTS FOR STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT ITEMS (p < .01); ROLE SECTOR 1: ACTING TOWARD PUPILS

		STUD ATT NO	ENTS' RIB. RMS	TEAC O NO	HERS' WN RMS	OMECA	TEACHERS
	KOLE NORM	X	S	X	S	SQUARED	AS
5.	evaluate pupils on individ. basis rather than compare	2.41	1.02	1.34	.65	.363	\uparrow
8.	experiment with new teaching techniques	2.69	.95	1.63	.68	.351	
15.	encourage pupils to question teacher opinions	3.77	.97	2.48	1.13	.255	LESS APPROVING
13.	encourage pupils discuss various religious beliefs	3.92	.84	3.13	1.71	.109	THAN THEY
11.	devote most time to individuals/small groups	2.88	.84	2.50	.82	.048	ARE
2.	make and carefully follow detailed lesson plans	2.97	.93	2.63	.87	.037	
7.	academic work as punishment	2.89	.97	4.18	1.03	.284	\uparrow
12.	corporal punish- ment	2.99	1.01	3.45	1.01	.050	
6.	greater attention to more able than less able	3.73	.98	4.17	.98	.048	MORE
1.	give homework regu- larly	2.11	.83	2.42	.94	.027	
3.	deprive of privileges as punishment	2.25	.86	2.56	1.00	.025	

Statistically significant differences at well beyond the .01 level were found for 11 of the 15 items of this role sector. Examination of these reveals that the students consistently attributed more conservative norms to teachers than teachers actually The only exception to the pattern of attribution of greater held. conservatism was, perhaps, for role norm 2 where teachers reported themselves as being somewhat more in favour of making and carefully following detailed lesson plans than the students saw them as Teachers were seen as holding rather traditional, formal being. and authoritarian views - in some instances very much more so than they reported themselves as holding. Analysis of items such as role norm 5 (evaluate on individual basis...), 7 (academic work as punishment), 8 (experiment with new teaching techniques), 13 (encouraging discussion of religious beliefs), 15 (encouraging pupils to question teacher opinions) and perhaps 12 (...corporal punishment) suggest gross misperception of teacher-held views. In the case of three of these role norms (7, 12 and 15) the differerences were directional and in the case of another three (5, 8, 15), exceeded a full response category. Relating this once more to the descriptive framework yielded by the principal components analysis, teachers were incorrectly seen as less progressive than they actually were (5, 8, 15, 6), less democratic (15, 13) and less pupil-centred (5, 11), and more traditional and authoritarian (7, 12, 13).

The picture of teachers that emerged from their own reported views did not wholly conform to the 'traditional' stereotype. Whereas they were moderately in favour of giving regular homework

(role norm 1), following detailed lesson plans (2), and depriving pupils of privileges (3), were mildly in favour of rote learning (4) and mildly against both permitting pupils to follow their own educational interests most of the time (9) and discussing religious beliefs (13), they did strongly approve of evaluation on an individual basis (5) and of experimenting with new teaching techniques (8), moderately approved of devoting most of their time to individuals or small groups (11) and encouraging the questioning of teacher opinions (15), were moderately against corporal punishment (12), and very strongly disapproved of both using academic work as punishment (7) and of giving greater attention to more able rather than less able pupils (6). That is, by their own estimation, teachers tended to hold views about relationships with pupils in the classroom setting that were only moderately traditional overall, with elements of a more progressive orientation.

The difference in the students' perception of lecturers vis a vis teachers in respect of the classroom role is best conveyed by directly comparing the norms they (the students) attributed to each, i.e. Role Norm Inventories 3 versus 4.

Referring back to Table 6.1, analysis showed that for 13 of the 15 role norms that make up the classroom role sector there were statistically significant differences at, mostly, well beyond the .01 level. Most of these differences were substantial, 6 of them being directional. The average difference per role norm was 1.121 - more than a whole category on the five point scale. Indeed these data signify that when the students contemplated

the views of lecturers and teachers they perceived two distinctly different - at times opposed - views of the classroom role. For example, they saw lecturers as approving of role norm 15 (questioning teacher-held opinions) and teachers as disapproving; they saw lecturers as against rote learning (item 4) and teachers as moderately for this; they saw lecturers as strongly against using academic work as punishment (item 7) and teachers as mildly approving of this. Similarly, whereas lecturers were seen as very strongly against corporal punishment (item 12) and strongly in favour of permitting pupils to follow their own educational interests most of the time (9), teachers were seen as being equivocal about the former and basically against the latter. Other large perceived differences which confirm the stereotyped view along progressive - traditional lines that students appeared to hold of these significant others are to be found in role norms 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8 and 11. For role norm 13 the difference is only moderate but also confirms the trend. When compared with teachers then, lecturers were seen by 6th semester students as less punitive and authoritarian (role norms 3, 7 and 12), more pupil-centred and democratic (5, 9, 11, 13, 15), and more progressive and less traditional (1, 4, 6, 8).

When the lecturers' own norms were compared with the teachers' own norms this view held by students was only partially confirmed as Table 6.6 shows.

TABLE 6.6

COMPARISON OF LECTURERS' AND TEACHERS' OWN NORMS FOR STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT ITEMS (p < .01): ACTING TOWARD PUPILS

		LECT O' NO	URERS' WN RMS	TEAC OV NOI	CHERS VN RMS		
	ROLE NORM	X	s	X	S	OMEGA SQUARED	LECTURERS
4.	rote learning in the basics	3.87	1.18	2.80	1.17	.172	1
12.	corporal punishment	4.24	.83	3.45	1.01	.138	LESS
3.	deprive pupil of privileges as punish- ment	3.33	1.02	2.56	1.00	.129	APPROVING
1.	give homework regu- larly	2.87	.89	2.42	.94	.054	TEACHERS
7.	extra academic work as punishment	4.64	.65	4.18	1.03	.052	
14.	express own political views in classroom	3.47	1.20	4.28	1.07	.126	Î
15.	encourage pupils to question teacher opinions	1.69	.92	2.48	1.13	.112	MORE
13.	encourage pupils to discuss various religious beliefs	2.38	.94	3.13	1.17	.096	APPROVING
9.	permit pupils to follow own educat- ional interests	2.80	.92	3.21	.97	.042	

.

Analysis of the nature and pattern of the differences in Table 6.6 points clearly to the conclusion that teachers held views which were less progressive than those held by lecturers. Four of the nine differences are directional, and all of the items confirm that on a progressive - traditional scale teachers' views were on the traditional side of those held by lecturers: they reported themselves as being more authoritarian (12, 3, 7), formal and traditional (1, 4), and less democratic (13, 14, 15) and pupil-centred (9). This is not to say that in their expressed views on the classroom role teachers could be regarded as conforming to some crude 'traditional' stereotype for they were moderately opposed to corporal punishment (role norm 12), they were quite strongly against using academic work as punishment (7), and they did only mildly approve of a great deal of rote learning in the basics for pupils (4). The differences between lecturers and teachers were not merely a minor matter of emphasis though: four role norms show the two groups as being on opposite sides of the mid-point of the 5-point scale, and the average difference per role norm for the items in Table 6.6 is a substantial 0.700, while over the whole sector it aproximates half a scale point (0.473).However, whereas these figures do appear to signify a real difference between lecturer- and teacher-held views about classroom relationships with pupils, the two groups were not nearly as divergent in their views as the 6th semester students thought they were. The students were correct in perceiving teachers as more traditional than lecturers (or lecturers as more progressive than teachers) but they overestimated both the degree and the extent to which this was so.

Finally, referring back again to Table 6.1, comparisons were made between the norms held by the 6th semester group and those actually held by lecturers and teachers. The first such comparison was between the students' own norms and the lecturers' own norms. There were four statistically significant differences. Lecturers showed more approval for role norms 6 (greater attention to more able than less able pupils), 13 (encourage pupils discuss religious beliefs) and 14 (express own political views...), and less approval for role norm 3 (deprive pupils of privileges...). The average difference per role norm for these four items was 0.570, so, to this degree lecturers could be said to have been more progressive than the students though perhaps not quite so egalitarian (role norm 6). For the entire role sector the mean difference perrole norm was only 0.295, thus further emphasising the relative closeness of the views held by the two groups for the classroom Moreover, when it is recalled that the mean difference role. per role norm between the students' own norms and those they attributed to lecturers for the sector was 0.337, it can be seen that this actual closeness of viewpoint was also perceived by There was only one role norm where the actual the student group. difference between the two groups was compounded by the perceived difference. This was for item 13 (encourage pupils to discuss religious beliefs...); here the students mildly disapproved of the proposition and thought lecturers were even more disapproving, whereas, in fact the lecturers gave moderately strong approval to it. Summarising all of this then, it can be said that students saw themselves as being close to lecturers in their views about the classroom role and were, in fact, close.

Next, the students' own norms were compared with the teachers' own norms. Seven statistically significant differences were found. Teachers were much more approving than students of giving pupils a great deal of rote learning in the basics (role norm 4) and rather more approving of giving regular homework (1), following detailed lesson plans (2), corporal punishment (12) and giving greater attention to more able than to less able pupils (6). They were less approving of permitting pupils to follow their own educational interests (9) and of encouraging pupils to question teacher opinions (15). That is, teachers reported themselves as being somewhat more formal, traditional and authoritarian, and less democratic than students reported themselves as being. The mean difference per role norm for the seven items above was 0.506, while the difference over the whole sector was 0.319. These statistics usefully approximate the moderate degree to which teachers could be regarded as less progressive overall than students. In the case of every one of the seven role norms the students correctly predicted the direction of the difference between themselves and teachers but, except for role norm 2, invariably overestimated the degree of difference. For the entire role sector the mean difference per role norm of 0.319 for the actual difference between students and teachers, and 0.803 for the perceived difference clearly indicates the degree of this overestimation. Summing up, whereas the 6th semester students saw themselves as being very different from teachers in their views about classroom relationships with pupils, in fact they were much closer than they thought.

The responses of the 2nd semester group to the four role norm inventories were analysed in the same way and below is a somewhat briefer presentation of these results. Subsequent analyses for the three other role sectors are presented in even more abbreviated fashion.

Firstly, the 2nd semester groups' own norms can be characterised as:

- (i) <u>moderately pupil-centred</u> (role norm 5: very strong approval; role norm 11: moderate approval; item 9: faint approval);
- (ii) <u>tending toward democratic</u> (role norm 15: firm approval;
 13: permissive. However, like semester 6, disapproval for role norm 14; note also very strong disapproval for role norm 6 suggesting a strong anti-elitist position);
- (iii) in some respects, <u>rather formal</u> in approach (approval for role norms 1 and 2);
- (iv) in other respects, very progressive and open in orientation (very strong approval for role norms 5 and 8; very strong disapproval for role norm 6; mild disapproval for role norm 4);
- (v) <u>relatively non-authoritarian</u>, and discriminating about punishment (against corporal punishment item 12, and somewhat disapproving of using academic work as punishment item 7, but moderately in favour of depriving pupils of privileges item 3).

In sum, the group tends to be progressive in the norms it holds for itself.

Comparison of the students' own norms with their own expectations for this role sector produced no statistically significant differences at all. Thus it was that their future expectations were virtually perfectly congruent with their ideal conception of the teacher role. That is, <u>idealism was found to be high amongst</u> <u>2nd semester students.</u>

The five statistically significant differences that were found between the students' own norms and those they attributed to lecturers are given in Table 6.7. It can be seen from this that to varying degrees lecturers are perceived as holding views that are not quite so progressive overall as those students hold for themselves.

TABLE 6.7

STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT (p < 0.1) DIFFERENCES BETWEEN STUDENTS' OWN NORMS AND THOSE THEY ATTRIBUTED TO LECTURERS: 2ND SEMESTER 1976: ACTING TOWARD PUPILS

ROLE NORM	STUDI OI NOI	ENTS ' √N RMS	NORN ATTRII TO LECTUI	MS BUTED RERS	OMEGA SQUARED	LECTURERS PERCEIVED AS
	X	S	X	S		
2	2.35	.79	1.45	.82	.213	MODE
6	4.56	.75	4.03	1.12	.068	
8	1.79	.92	1.45	.74	.037	
15	2.07	1.11	2.63	1.29	.048	LESS
5	1.42	.72	1.79	1.14	.035	APPROVING
Lecturers were seen as more formal perhaps (role norm 2), as even more open to new ideas (8) and as rather less egalitarian, democratic and pupil-centred (6, 15, 5). However, as the omega squared values indicate, these differences are slight. For the whole role the mean difference per role norm was a mere 0.271 which does not suggest that the students perceived considerable distance between their own views for this role sector and the views they thought lecturers held.

As was the case for the 6th semester group however, a rather different pattern emerges from a comparison of the 2nd semester students' own norms with those they attributed to teachers. The nine statistically significant differences for the classroom role sector are presented in Table 6.8.

TABLE 6.8

STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT (p < .01) DIFFERENCES BETWEEN STUDENTS' OWN NORMS AND THOSE THEY ATTRIBUTED TO TEACHERS: 2ND SEMESTER 1976: ACTING TOWARD PUPILS

ROLE NORM	STUDE Ow NOF	ENTS ' IN RMS	NORN ATTRIE TO LECTUE	4S BUTED RERS	OMEGA SQUARED	TEACHERS PERCEIVED AS
	X	S	X	S		
6	4.56	.75	3.81	1.18	.123	\uparrow
7	3.50	1.11	2.68	1.08	.120	MODE
12	3.98	1.00	2.32	1.00	.098	
4	3.20	1.35	2.47	1.15	.073	APPROVING
3	2.69	1.07	2.24	.88	.048	
15	2.07	1.11	3.25	1.29	.187	\square
5	1.42	.72	2.06	1.08	.098	LESS
13	3.00	1.09	3.52	1.01	.050	APPROVING
8	1.79	.92	2.11	.89	.035	

Compared with their own views, students saw teachers as holding views about the classroom role that are more traditional and authoritarian (3, 4, 7, 8, 12) and less democratic and pupilcentred (5, 6, 13, 15). That is, overall, they saw teachers as less progressive. This is not to say that teachers were seen as wholly traditionally oriented for they were attributed with views that are moderately pupil-centred. However, they were seen as tending toward the authoritarian (role norms 3, 7) despite being attributed with mild opposition to corporal punishment (12). Concomitantly, they were seen as somewhat autocratic (13, 15). There were three directional differences (4, 7, 15) and an average difference per role norm of 0.674 was found for the 9 items where there were statistically significant differences. For the whole sector the mean difference was 0.510. Taken in all, it can be concluded that the 2nd semester group perceived teachers' views about this role sector to be moderately different from and, in some cases, incongruent with its own views.

Comparison of the norms attributed by the students to lecturers with those attributed to teachers showed, as in the case of the 6th semester group, that these two important role-set members were seen as holding different views about the classroom role. In brief, on a progressive - traditional scale teachers were seen as less progressive than lecturers. Statistically significant differences were found for 10 of the 15 role norms. Lecturers were perceived as being more pupil-centred (11, 9, 5), more democratic (15) and open to new ideas (8), and less traditional and authoritarian (3, 4, 7, 12). The only apparent exception to this trend was for role norm 2 where, not surprisingly, lecturers were seen as more approving of making and carefully following detailed lesson plans. The mean difference per role norm for the statistically significant items was 0.562 compared with 0.449 for the entire sector, these statistics indicating the moderate gap between lecturers and teachers that was perceived by the 2nd semester group.

To ascertain the accuracy of the group's perceptions, firstly the norms the students attributed to lecturers were compared with the lecturers' actual norms. Table 6.9 reports the statistically significant differences that were found, once again ordered according to the magnitude of the effect using omega squared.

TABLE 6.9

STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT (p < .01) DIFFERENCES BETWEEN LECTURERS' OWN NORMS AND THOSE ATTRIBUTED TO THEM BY 2ND SEMESTER (1976) STUDENTS: ACTING TOWARD PUPILS

ROLE NORM	LECTU OV NOF	JRERS' VN RMS	STUDI ATTR NOI	ENTS' IBUTED RMS	OMEGA SQUARED	LECTURERS PERCEIVED AS
	X	S	X	S		
2	2.80	.76	1.45	.82	.417	\uparrow
7	4.64	.65	3.28	1.17	.303	MORE APPROVING
1	2.87	.98	2.02	1.04	.153	THAN
4	3.87	1.18	3.02	1.40	.091	THEY
3	3.33	1.02	2.65	1.11	.091	ARE
13	2.38	.94	3.25	1.14	.141	LESS
15	1.69	.92	2.63	1.29	.134	APPROVING

The table reveals errors in perception of considerable magnitude. Insofar as the group perceived the views lecturers held to be more authoritarian (role norms 3, 7), more formal and traditional in approach (1, 2, 4) and less democratic (13, 15) then they saw lecturers as less progressive overall than lecturers reported themselves as being. The mean difference per role norm for

the items in Table 6.9 was 0.986 - nearly a full response category. Add to this the facts that role norms 3 and 13 revealed directional differences and that the average difference per role norm for the whole role sector was 0.559, and the conclusion to be drawn is that the 2nd semester group held only a partially correct picture of lecturers' views.

When the norms attributed to teachers by the group were compared with the teachers' actual norms the errors in perception were even more numerous and in some cases almost as great. Table 6.10 reports these data:

TABLE 6.10

STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT (p < .01) DIFFERENCES BETWEEN TEACHERS' OWN NORMS AND THOSE ATTRIBUTED TO THEM BY 2ND SEMESTER (1976) STUDENTS: ACTING TOWARD PUPILS

ROLE NORM	TEAC O' NO	HERS' WN RMS	NOR ATTRI TO TE	MS BUTED ACHERS	OMEGA SQUARED	TEACHERS PERCEIVED AS
	X	S	X	s		
7	4.18	1.03	2.68	1.08	.341	
1	2.42	.94	1.81	.83	.096	MORE
2	2.63	.87	2.20	.98	.057	APPROVING
6	4.17	.98	3.81	1.18	.030	THAN
3	2.56	1.00	2.24	.88	.027	THEY
4	2.80	1.17	2.47	1.15	.019	ARE
14	4.28	1.07	4.01	.94	.017	
5	1.34	.65	2.06	1.08	.200	
8	1.63	.68	2.11	.89	.104	APPROVING
15	2.48	1.13	3.25	1.29	.101	THAN
11	2.50	.82	2.93	1.01	.059	THEY I ARE
13	3.13	1.17	3.52	1.01	.028	

Again, the pattern is clear. Teachers were attributed with holding views about the classroom role that are more traditional (4) formal (1, 2) and authoritarian (3, 7), and less democratic (13, 15), pupil-centred (5, 11) and, generally, less progressive (5, 6, 8, 15) than they reported themselves as holding. Apart from role norms 7 (academic work as punishment) and, perhaps 5 (evaluate on basis of individual improvement) the differences were either moderate or trivial. There were only two directional differences (7 and 15) and the mean differences per role norm for the statistically significant items and for the whole role sector were, respectively, 0.553 and 0.468 - far less in the case of the statistically different role norms than that found That is, the 2nd semester students only erred for lecturers. to a relatively minor degree in the views they attributed to teachers for the role Acting Toward Pupils.

Finally the students' own norms were compared first with the actual norms of lecturers and then with those of teachers. When the students' views were compared with lecturers 8 statistically significant differences emerged. These were for role norms 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8 and 13 with only role norm 3 showing a directional difference. The students were found to be more formal and traditional (1, 2, 4) a good deal more authoritarian (3, 7), less democratic (13), and, though rather less open to new approaches (8), less willing to give greater attention to the able students (6). The mean difference per role norm for these 8 items was 0.664 compared with a moderate 0.443 for the whole sector.

The comparison of the students' own norms with those of the teachers yielded 9 statistically significant differences. These were for role norms 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 12, 14 and 15, of which role norms 4 and 9 showed directional differences. No clear trend emerged overall. The students were, if anything, a little more formal (1, 2) and democratic (14, 15) and a shade more pupil-centred (9) but, whereas they were more approving of corporal punishment (12), they were also a little less approving of rote learning (4) and of giving greater attention to the more able students (6). The differences ranged from moderate to minor in degree. The mean difference per role norm for the statistically significant items was only a modest 0.443 while for the whole role sector it was a mere 0.311. In terms of educational significance some of the differences were so small that they appear to be of trivial import and, overall, it seems reasonable to draw the conclusion that there existed only moderate differences between the 2nd semester students and teachers for the role sector Acting Toward Pupils.

Of particular interest were those role norms where an error in perception of the views of the significant other was compounded by its being wrong in direction when compared with the reality of the significant others' view. There was one such error over the whole role sector for each of the comparisons between the students' own and attributed norms, and the actual norms of the significant others. Lecturers were seen as being a good deal more in favour of making and carefully following detailed lesson plans (role norm 2) than the students were themselves, when in fact the lecturers were rather less in favour of doing so than the students. Teachers were seen as being much more in favour of using extra academic work as punishment (role norm 7) than students but were much less so. Such errors may constitute serious misperceptions. For example the gap between what the 2nd semester students thought teachers thought about using extra academic work as punishment and what teachers actually did think was 1.52 points on the fivepoint scale.

In order to discover where the differences and similarities between the two students groups lay, comparisons were made between their own norms, their expectations and their attributed norms. These are briefly summarised below.

For the role Acting Toward Pupils statistically significant differences were found for role norms 1, 2, 4, 7, 11 and 14. Referring back to Table 6.1 it can be seen that the views of the 2nd semester students tended to be relatively more formal (1, 2) traditional (4) and authoritarian (7) than those held by 6th semester students and not quite so pupil-centred (11). They were however less against the expression of political views in the classroom (14). The mean difference per role norm for these items was a sizeable 0.635 while for the whole sector it was only 0.322. There were no directional differences and so <u>the conclusion might be drawn</u> that for this role sector the 6th semester students were, to <u>a moderate degree, more progressive than 2nd semester in their</u> <u>ideal conceptions of the teacher role.</u>

Though following a similar pattern, the differences between the expectations of the two groups were, if anything, of even lesser magnitude as is reflected in the mean difference per role norm of 0.493 for the 6 statistically significant items and a mere 0.273 for the entire sector. The six role norms where differences were found were items 1, 2, 3, 7, 8 and 11. Again it would appear that the 2nd semester students were rather more formal (1, 2) in their expectations for their future relationships with pupils and slightly less pupil-centred in orientation (11). However. whereas they were a good deal less unlikely to use academic work as punishment (7), they were a little less likely to deprive a pupil of privileges as a form of punishment (3). Also, they were to the mildest degree more likely to experiment with new teaching techniques. Overall then it would seem that the differences between the two student groups in the expectations held for their future classroom behaviour were relatively slight, with the 6th semester group being perhaps more progressive in orientation.

There were 12 statistically significant differences between the groups when the norms they attributed to lecturers were compared. Consistently, lecturers were seen as less progressive by 2nd semester students than by 6th. Lecturers were seen as formal (1, 2) and a good deal more so than 6th saw them as being, more authoritarian (3, 7, 12), less pupil-centred (5, 9, 11), rather less democratic (15) though slightly more approving of the expression of political views (14), much more traditional (4) and more approving of giving greater attention to more able pupils (6). The mean difference per role norm was 0.603 for these items and 0.516, or a little more than half a response category, for the whole role sector. Summing up, there was a clear trend for lecturers to be seen as more progressive by 6th semester students than by 2nd.

Against this, there were only 6 statistically significant differences for the classroom role sector when the norms attributed to teachers by each student group were compared. These were for role norms 1, 2, 4, 8 and 15. It is difficult to discern a clear pattern overall from this. Whereas the 2nd semester group saw teachers as more formal (1, 2) than 6th, they also saw them as rather more progressive in other respects (5, 8, 15). The mean difference per role norm for these 5 norms was a moderate 0.506 but for the entire role was a relatively insignificant 0.274so it is perhaps reasonable to conclude that for this role sector there was not much difference between the groups in their attribution of norms to teachers, with the 6th semester group tending to see teachers as holding views that, though a modicum less formal, were somewhat less progressive in other respects than 2nd semester students saw them as holding.

Table 6.11 provides one simple summary of the overall difference between the 2nd and 6th semester groups for the classroom role by showing the mean difference per role norm between the groups' responses to each of the four inventories:

TABLE 6.11

MEAN DIFFERENCE PER ROLE NORM BETWEEN 2ND AND 6TH SEMESTER STUDENTS' OWN AND ATTRIBUTED VIEWS: ACTING TOWARD PUPILS

_	ROLE NORM INVENTORY	MEAN DIFFERENCE PER ROLE NORM
1.	Own Norms	0.322
2.	Own expectations	0.273
3.	Norms attributed to lecturers	0.516
4.	Norms attributed to teachers	0.274

Though the <u>specific</u> differences between the groups have been discussed in detail, Table 6.11 shows clearly that <u>the greatest</u> <u>overall difference between the groups lay in their perception</u> <u>of the views of lecturers</u>. Apart from this, the overall role sector differences were relatively modest. However, Table 6.12 below showing for each group the mean difference per role norm for the numerous other role sector comparisons discussed previously serves to summarise and clarify other important differences between the two student groups.

The table emphasises, <u>inter alia</u>, that both groups are closer to teachers in the views they hold overall for this role (2nd: 0.311; 6th: 0.327) than they think they are (0.519 and 0.803 respectively). However, whereas the gap between reality and perceived reality is modest in the case of the 2nd semester students (0.208), it is marked for the 6th semester group (0.476).

TABLE 6.12

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN 2ND AND 6TH SEMESTER STUDENTS IN THE MEAN DIFFERENCE PER ROLE NORM FOR VARIOUS COMPARISONS: ACTING TOWARD PUPILS

	2ND	6TH
Own norms vs own expectations	0.143	0.202
Own norms vs norms attributed to lecturers	0.268	0.334
Own norms vs lecturers' own norms	0.443	0.294
Norms attributed to lecturers vs lecturers' own norms	0.555	0.449
Own norms vs norms attributed to teachers	0.513	0.807
Own norms vs teachers' own norms	0.311	0.325
Norms attributed to teachers vs teachers' own norms	0.472	0.552
Norms attributed to lecturers vs norms attributed to teachers*	0.448	0.991

* The actual difference between lecturers' and teachers' own norms for the role sector was 0.473 per role norm.

It can be seen also that there is 'error' amounting to 0.552 per role norm over the whole role sector between what the 6th semester group <u>thought</u> teachers' views were and what were <u>actually</u> teachers' views. Moreover, while there is a substantial disparity in the difference between the 6th semester students' and the teachers' actual norms (0.327), and the difference the students perceived (0.807), this disparity is minimal (0.337 vs 0.290) when the same comparisons are made for the group vis a vis lecturers.

Nonetheless, in respect of lecturers, the degree of error measured by comparing the norms attributed to lecturers with their actual norms, while not as large as that for teachers, is still a sizeable 0.449. The overall difference in the 6th semester students' perceptions of lecturers and teachers is underscored by comparing the average distance between the lecturers' and teachers' own norms, which was 0.473 per role norm, with the perceived distance shown in Table 6.12 (0.991). Whereas the actual distance is by no means small, the perceived gap is very much larger and highlights the fact that this student teacher group erroneously lecturers and teachers as holding considerably different saw - in some cases even divergent - views about pupil-teacher relationships; the reality was a much less substantial overall difference.

Making the same comparisons for the 2nd semester students it can be seen that:

- (i) whilst they are not so close to lecturers in their overall views for the classroom role (0.443) as they think they are (0.268), they are actually closer to teachers (0.311) than they see themselves as being (0.513).
- (ii) there is sizeable error in their perceptions of the views of lecturers especially (0.555), and of teachers (0.472).
- (iii) the magnitude of the gap they perceive between lecturers' views and teachers' views (0.448) is approximately correct (0.473) and, when the mean response scores are inspected, is substantially accurate in direction.

(iv) the average difference per role norm over the whole sector ranges from relatively insignificant for the distance between the group's own norms and own expectations (0.143), through moderate for the actual disparities (0.311, 0.443) between themselves and their significant others, to sizeable (e.g. 0.555) for the perceived differences; for the 6th semester students this range is from mild – again for the distance between the group's own norms and expectations (0.202) through barely moderate for the actual differences (0.294, 0.325), to sizeable (e.g. 0.549) and then to very large (0.807), (0.991) for the perceived gap between either themselves and a significant other or both groups of significant others.

6.2.1 SUMMARY: ROLE SECTOR 1

The results of the foregoing analyses can be summarised in terms of a broad progressive-traditional framework, given that these oftentimes loosely used terms are understood here to mean degrees of formality, authoritarianism, pupil-centredness, democraticness and so on, in the context of teacher behaviour toward pupils. Within these limitations it was found that:

1. In their norms held for the role sector Acting Toward Pupils, lecturers were the most progressive in orientation and teachers the least. The 6th semester group's norms were very close to those held by lecturers while the norms held by 2nd semester students were generally closer to teachers than to lecturers. Though the gap between lecturers and teachers was substantial for those norms where differences occurred, the teachers as a group could not be characterised as conforming to any stereotype of the 'traditional' teacher but, rather, held views that were moderately progressive.

2. The 6th semester group attributed norms to lecturers that generally were even more progressive than the students' own but, compared with the lecturers actual norms, misperceived them as being more pupil-centred, more formal and less democratic than they were. Despite these errors of degree, the group's perceptions of lecturers' views were reasonably accurate overall.

By contrast, this group perceived teachers to hold very much less progressive norms than the students' own for this role sector. However, whereas teachers <u>were</u> less progressive than the students, they were much closer to the students' views than the students thought. Related to this was the fact that the 6th semester group saw lecturers and teachers as being very different in the norms each group held for this role sector. In fact, while there were substantial differences between lecturers and teachers, and while the students' estimates of the differences were mostly in the correct direction, lecturers and teachers were, relative to each other, very much less different than the students thought.

3. The most notable difference between 2nd and 6th semester students was that the former saw lecturers as a good deal less progressive than did the latter. While the 2nd semester students more accurately perceived the <u>degree</u> of difference between lecturers and teachers than did 6th semester, they were nonetheless erroneous in their perception of both. They were less wrong than 6th semester about teachers but rather less accurate than 6th about lecturers.

6.3 ROLE SECTOR 2: ACTING TOWARD COLLEAGUES

The mean response scores and standard deviations for both student groups' responses to the four inventories and for the lecturers' and teachers' own norms for the role sector Acting Toward Colleagues are presented in Table 6.13. The multivariate test of equality of mean vectors for this sector was statistically significant and follow-up univariate F-tests yielded statistically significant differences (p < .01) for all 10 role norms making up the sector. Analyses such as those described for Role Sector 1 were carried out for the numerous relevant comparisons and are summarised below, drawing upon the descriptors derived from the factor analysis.

The 6th semester group's own norms reflected a moderate professionally activist orientation (role norms 17, 24), a strongish degree of professional dedication and altruism (16, 20, 21, 25) and a well developed sense of professional responsibility (18, 21, 22, 23, 25). There were only 2 statistically significant differences between the students' own norms and expectations. These were minor differences of degree for role norms 19 (other teachers as friends...) and 23 (discuss serious personal problems with principal). The mean difference per role norm of 0.242 for the sector fairly indicates the <u>minimal difference overall</u> <u>between the group's ideal conception of behaviour vis a vis colleag-</u> ues and their expectations for their future behaviour. TABLE 6.13

MEAN RESPONSE SCORES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR ALL 1976 GROUPS: ROLE SECTOR 2 - ACTING TOWARDS COLLEAGUES

				NHO	NORMS					0	N		BOX	LIN S	RIBU	Ē.	NON	S ATT	RIBUT	Ð	1101		0
	2	2	9	H	LECTU	RERS	TEAG	S.		2	م	Ē			6	E	R I		61	T _I	ARIATE	P	
KOLE NOW	ix	S	×	S	×	S	ix	S	iX	s	IX	S	×	s	×	S	IX	S.	IX	s	VALUES	NAHT	
16. devote time outside regular teaching duties to school affairs without additional pay.	2.16	.92	2.22	.81	1.89	1.01	2.27	1.00	2.21	8.	2.32	<u>.</u>	1.65	.92	88	.81	54	. 15 2	49	93	10.0551	.0001	
17. take up active membership in a teachers' professional organisation.	2.53	.74	2.57	.68	1.87	.81	2.42	п.	2.64	8	2.86	1.07	73	.83	16.	. 73 2	.22	.94	.36	. 85	18.6483	.0001	
18. use surnames like 'Miss Smith' when addressing other teachers in front of pupils.	2.10	1.11	1.97	86.	2.56	1.01	1.92	1.00	2.02	1.06	2.07	1.13	. 78	.03	. 89	. 00	.80	. 88 1	.68	64	3.7952	.000	
19. include other teachers in their circle of close friends	2.63	.63	2.70	.62	2.84	.42	2.79	.61	2.40	.83	2.43	74	.32	.93 2	. 53	.66	.23	.80 2.	.33	.66	15.2743	.000	
20. continue to take further professional courses as long as they continue to teach.	2.10	.78	2.14	.73	1.78	.85	2.03	67.	2.20	.87	2.42	1.0	. 70	. 79 1	.80	. 88	.58	.70 2.	99	82	15.9365	.0001	
 insist upon extra pay for duties, like coaching a team, that require extra time. 	3.86	1.02	4.02	.85	3.69	1.02	3.80	1.0	4.07	1.00	8.	.83	.69	.20 3	. 77	.06	.35 1	.04	. 32	98	8, 6953	.0001	
22. make or receive personal telephone calls while at school.	3.56	. 80	3.41	.73	2.98	8	3.31	16.	3.48	16.	3.19	.97	.92	.97 3	48	. 79 3	.32	.91 3.	. 24	.87	6.5000	.0001	
23. discuss serious personal problems with the principal	3.07	.98	3.36	8.	2.84	30.	2.89	6	3.41	26.	3.8	8	88	. 18 3	.10	.98 3	.161	.01 3.	. 55	- 61	15.1956	.0001	
24. join a teacher organisation such as the N.S.W. T.F.	2.35	.86	2.25	.81	2.38	1.03	2.26	.8	2.32	.93	5.08	8	.76	28	88	8	. 90	86 2	8	.85	7.1548	1000.	
25. engage in part time work during term time.	3.63	.80	3.72	.74	3.73	. 78	3.74	6.	3.8	8	3.8	16.	1 16.1	. 10 4	.03	.85 3	.57 1	.01 3.	78	1 8	2.5866	. 0059	
F - STA	ATISTIC	B	MULTI	VIPIL	TE TE	ST OF	EQUA	LIT	10	N NE	CTORS	80 #	145	10	6/06	878.5	488	× d	1000				_

When the students' own norms were compared with those they attributed to lecturers statistically significant differences were found for role norms 16, 17, 20 and 24. For all of these students attributed more approval to lecturers than the students reported for themselves. Lecturers were thus seen as even more professionally activist (17, 24) and dedicated (16, 20) if anything than the 6th semester students saw themselves as being. The mean difference per role norm between the students' own and attributed norms for these 4 items was 0.483, with a perceived mean difference of 0.307 for the whole sector.

Comparison of the students' attributed norms with the actual norms of the lecturers also yielded 4 statistically significant differences - on role norms 18, 22, 24 and 19 (in order of magnitude according to the obtained omega squared values). Lecturers were erroneously seen as more formal than they reported themselves as being (18), rather less responsible in one particular respect (22), and a little more professionally politically involved (24) and clannish (19). The direction of other differences which approached statistical significance at p < .01 (role norms 25, 16) did not however support the notion of any trend toward lecturers being seen as less professionally responsible than they were. While the mean difference per role norm for these 4 items was 0.500, the more modest 0.291 for the sector points to the <u>relative congru</u>ence between the attributed and actual norms overall.

Again, there were 4 statistically significant differences when the students' own norms were compared with the lecturers' own. To a moderate degree students were less professionally politically activist (17) and formal (18), less approving of making or receiving telephone calls at school (27) and less willing to discuss serious personal problems with the principal (23). For these differences the mean difference per role norm was 0.560 and, for the whole sector a moderate 0.354. Once more, inspection of the direction of the differences (in absolute terms) made apparent that there was no discernible trend in these data. In brief, the differences appeared to be item-specific and, over the whole sector, 6th semester students could be regarded as relatively close to lecturers in their views about teacher-

colleague relationships.

There were 3 statistically significant differences between the students' own norms and those they attributed to teachers. The students saw teachers as a good deal more mercenary (21) as rather less altruistic (20) and as more clannish (19). Inspection of the direction of mean differences for those items approaching the accepted level of statistical significance suggested a faint trend toward perception of teachers as rather less professionally responsible and dedicated than students saw themselves as being. The mean difference per role norm for the 3 statistically significant items of 0.530 when considered with the 0.303 for the whole role sector suggests that <u>any overall difference in the views</u> <u>6th semester students perceived teachers to hold were a relatively</u> <u>moderate matter of degree.</u> Such was not entirely the case when the teachers' actual norms were compared with those attributed by the students. There were 6 statistically significant differences. Teachers were, in fact, less formal (18) and clannish (19), more professionally responsible and dedicated (20, 21), more approving of discussing personal problems with the principal (23), and a little less professionally politically activist (24). The mean difference per role norm for these items was a moderate 0.455, compared with 0.312 for the sector. <u>To some small degree, teachers differed</u> <u>from the image held of them by 6th semester students for this role</u> <u>sector.</u>

The only item for which a statistically significant difference was found when the students' and teachers' own norms were compared was role norm 23 (discuss serious personal problems with the principal) for which teachers showed mild approval and students moderate disapproval. The negligible difference between the groups for this role sector is reflected in the mean differnce per role norm of only 0.127. <u>Thus the moderate differences</u> <u>perceived by the 6th semester student group to be between themselves</u> <u>and teachers were largely illusory.</u>

The extent to which lecturers and teachers were seen by 6th semester students to differ in their views about role relationships with colleagues is made clear when the norms attributed to each by the students were compared. There were five statistically significant differences - for role norms 16, 17, 20, 21 and 23. Lecturers were seen as a good deal more dedicated (16, 20 21), somewhat more professionally activist in orientation (17), and perhaps somewhat more reticent professionally (23). For these five items the mean difference per role norms was a sizeable 0.604 while for the entire sector it was 0.406.

There were however only two statistically significant differences between the lecturers' and teachers' actual norms, and a mean difference per role norm of only 0.249. While lecturers did report themselves as rather more activist (17) than did teachers and a little less formal (18), there was no difference in the degree of professional dedication between the two groups. <u>Summing up then</u>, <u>6th semester students misperceived that teachers were less profess-</u> <u>ionally dedicated and responsible than lecturers and, while they</u> <u>did correctly perceive other differences, they overestimated</u> <u>the degree to which these were so.</u>

Analysis of the 2nd semester group's responses revealed markedly similar patterns to those described above. Their own norms were very much the same as the 6th semester group's, that is, moderately professionally politically activist in orientation (17, 24), professionally responsible in extra curricular and related matters (22, 25, 23, 21, 18) and professionally dedicated and altruistic (16, 20). There were no statistically significant differences between the 2nd and 6th semester groups and the mean difference per role norm was a minimal 0.113.

There was only one statistically significant difference between the 2nd semester group's own norms and own expectations. This was for role norm 23 (discuss serious personal problems with the principal) and, as for 6th semester, was a minor matter of degree. Again, the mean difference per role norm was minimal - 0.144. <u>That is, idealism was high amongst 2nd semester students</u> with respect to teacher-colleague role relationships.

There were 6 statistically significant differences between the students' own norms and those they attributed to lecturers who were seen, as 6th semester saw them, as more professionally politically active (17, 24) responsible (19, 22) and altruistic (16, 20). The moderate distance the students perceived to be between themselves and lecturers is reflected in the mean difference per role norm of 0.495 for these 6 norms and of 0.393 for the sector.

Despite a mean difference per role for the whole sector of a modest 0.354, there were a number of notable misperceptions of views of lecturers when the actual norms of lecturers were compared with those attributed to them by the 2nd semester group. Whereas lecturers were seen by students as being more approving than they (the students) were themselves of role norms 18 (use surnames...) and 19 (include other teachers in circle of friends), lecturers in fact gave less approval to these propositions, and whereas lecturers were seen as less approving than students of making or receiving telephone calls at school (22), they were actually Also, while students thought lecturers were more much more so. approving than they themselves were about joining a teacher organisation (24), lecturers showed about the same level of approval as students for this. The average difference per role norm for these 4 items was a substantial 0.715.

In actuality there were only 2 statistically significant differences between the students' and lecturers' norms. Lecturers were more approving than students of taking up active membership in a teachers' professional organisation (17) and making/receiving

personal telephone calls at school (22). The mean difference per role norm of 0.303 indicates that <u>lecturers and students were</u> <u>really closer in the norms they held than the 2nd semester students</u> <u>thought they were.</u>

Once again it might be noted that perceptual errors can be compounded by attributing approval or disapproval in the wrong direction relative to one's own position. For example, the 2nd semester group thought lecturers were <u>less</u> approving of making/receiving telephone calls at school than they, the students, were. This difference (.36) was statistically significant. However, lecturers showed more approval for this behaviour than did the students and this difference (.58) was also statistically significant. Thus an error in the wrong direction was reflected in a wide gap (.36 + .58 = .94) between the lecturers' actual view about this norm and the view they were thought to hold.

Though this kind of combination of errors was not found in the student teacher/teacher comparisons, there were nonetheless numerous other errors of perception. There were 5 statistically significant differences between the students' own and their attrib-The mean difference per role norm for these was uted norms. a moderate 0.428 compared with 0.321 for the sector. Teachers were seen as being more enamoured of professional political action (17, 24), and as rather less professionally responsible (20, 21) than the students reported themselves as being. This latter tendency was confirmed by considering other role norms such as 16 and 22 which approximated the very rigorous .01 significance criterion for the Scheffe test. Teachers were also seen as holding more approval than did the students for role norm 19 (include other teachers...as friends).

There were 6 statistically significant differences between the norms attributed by the group to teachers and the teachers' actual norms. Though teachers reported themselves as professionally active (17, 24) in orientation they were less so than students thought. As well, the teachers saw themselves as more professionally dedicated (20, 21) and responsible (23) than students saw them as being and, while the teacher group gave mild approval to role norm 19, they were much less approving than the students considered them to be. Overall the mean difference per role norm for these six items of 0.400 and the 0.297 for the sector points to the moderate nature of the misjudgements.

There were in fact no statistically significant differences between the students' and teachers' own norms for the role sector Acting Toward Colleagues, the mean difference per role norm of a mere 0.132 signalling the closeness of the two groups. <u>In summary</u> <u>therefore it can be said that in respect of role relationships</u> <u>with colleagues, students saw numerous differences between them-</u> <u>selves and teachers which did not exist.</u>

When the norms attributed by 2nd semester to lecturers were compared with those attributed to teachers, <u>a pattern similar</u> to that found for 6th semester students was revealed. Lecturers were seen as more professionally dedicated (16, 20), more active in the professional political sense (17) and rather more professionally responsible (22). However, as stated, when the actual norms of lecturers and teachers were compared, the students were only correct in seeing lecturers as more professionally politically active (17) than teachers.

6.3.1 SUMMARY: ROLE SECTOR 2

- 1. Both student groups reported themselves as being moderately activist professionally, and professionally dedicated and responsible. Both groups were idealistic in that they considered they would in fact behave much as they thought they ought to behave in respect of role relationships with colleagues when they began teaching.
- 2. There was a tendency for lecturers to be seen by both student groups as more professionally activist, dedicated and responsible than the students saw themselves as being, and teachers less so. Whilst, generally, the students were relatively accurate about lecturers (6th semester more so than 2nd) they misperceived teachers' views to a moderate degree in that teachers reported themselves as more professionally dedicated and responsible than students saw them as being (and just as dedicated and responsible as the students themselves).
- 3. Both groups of students accurately perceived that lecturers were rather more professionally politically activist in orientation that teachers and somewhat less formal about relationships with colleagues, though they overestimated the degree to which this was so. They misperceived that teachers were less professionally dedicated than lecturers for there was no difference, in degree of dedication between the two.

6.4 ROLE SECTOR 3: ACTING TOWARD PARENTS

Table 6.14 presents the responses of all groups to Role Sector 3, 'Acting Toward Pupils'. The statistically significant multivariate F was followed by the same <u>post hoc</u> contrasts in all ten variables as has been described before since, in the case of each variable, the univariate F-tests were statistically significant. The results of these analyses are summarised in terms of the principal components analysis for the sector using descriptors such as 'co-operativeness', 'distance' and 'formality'. This role sector, together with the role 'Acting Toward Pupils', yielded some of the more notable differences found for the inventory so the procedure will be to present some of these findings in detailed tabular form and then to summarise the rest of the results.

In their projected relationships with parents 6th semester's own norms were marked by co-operativeness (strong approval for role norms 33, 32, 34 and 31), a strong sense of professional distance in matters considered to be chiefly in the pedagogical domain (30, 29, 35 and, to some degree, 28) and a relative lack of formality in respect of parents' rights (moderate disapproval for role norm 27, mild disapproval for 26). The only modification to their ideal concepts for this role sector was for role norm 28 (visit every pupils's home), an unrealistic proposition any way in the Australian context where this is not a tradition. That is then, there was scarcely any difference between the group's norms and their future expectations as is reflected in the mean difference In summary, 6th semester students per role norm of only 0.174. wished to be open and co-operative with parents except in matters pertaining strictly to professional concerns, and were idealistic in respect of teacher-parent role relationships.

TABLE 6.14

MEAN RESPONSE SCORES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR ALL 1976 GROUPS: ROLE SECTOR 3 : ACTING TOWARDS PARENTS.

		;																				
			0	N NMC	SMAC			_	<u>ព</u>	(TBCT)	VTIONS		NON F	MS AT 0 LEC	TRIBU	ē.,	BON		IN THE LEVEL	ē.,	-IND	Ч
MACON STICON	Ţ,	P	61	モ	LECT	JRERS	TEAC	ERS	2	72	61	جر ا	5	<u>ب</u> ح	6t	-F-			Ę.	<u>ج</u>	VARIATE	IHMN
	×	s	'×	S	×	S	·×	s	'×	s	×	s	'×	s	'×	s	×	S	אי	s	VALUES	
<u>26</u> . accept the judgement of parents when there is dis- agreement about the needs of the child.	3.12	.76	3.10	.70	2.84	.52	2.99	.81	3.20	.80	3.09	.86	3.18	1.09	3.17	66.	3.46	. 90	3.35	16.	5.0247	1000.
<u>27</u> . insist that parents contact them only after obtaining permission from the principal.	3.66	1.17	3.63	1.23	3.29	1.18	2.96	1.29	3.87	1.01	3.65	1.21	3.10	1.29	3.05	1.16	2.97	1.06	2.71	1.06	12.6036	1000.
<pre>28. visit every pupil's home at the beginning of the school year.</pre>	3.74	1.00	3.23	66.	3.04	1.00	3.69	1.11	3.89	1.08	3.86	1.04	3.32	1.02	2.69	1.10	3.84	1.06	3.65	8.	14.0370	.0001
29. discuss with parents the child's scores on standardized attainment tests.	2.98	1.28	3.22	1.14	2.78	1.15	3.19	1.33	3.14	1.31	3.52	1.10	3.07	1.15	3.57	1.12	3.10	1.14	3.60	66.	3.9257	1000.
<u>30</u> . tell a parent the tested I.Q. of his child.	3.96	1.06	4.22	1.02	4.07	1.03	4.31	1.04	4.06	1.10	4.43	.86	3.77	1.23	4.46	11.	3.84	1.15	4.16	68.	6.2574	.000
<u>31</u> . attend parent-teacher association meetings.	1.74	.82	1.73	.66	1.91	.87	2.07	67.	1.88	.80	1.93	.76	1.69	8.	1.48	.65	2.16	.85	2.17	.93	9.7759	1000.
<u>32</u> . encourage parents to visit the classroom at any time.	2.60	1.32	1.96	16.	2.02	.92	2.24	1.20	2.68	1.35	2.02	66.	2.43	1.21	1.60	.89	2.93	1.11	3.04	1.03	15.7337	.000
<u>33</u> . contact parents whenever any problem arises about their children.	2.07	1.01	2.13	1.03	2.27	66.	1.79	.90	2.32	1.06	2.31	1.02	2.19	1.11	2.09	.95	2.54	1.03	2.81	16.	16.7962	1000.
34. attempt to find out what, in the home situation, may contribute to the misbehaviour of the child.	1.70	.83	1.67	.68	1.67	06.	1.42	.62	1.73	.75	1.76	11.	1.64	.84	1.48	. 63	2.12	96.	2.25	ш.	20.8748	1000
<u>35</u> . discuss freely with parents the weaknesses of other teachers	4.76	.63	4.92	.45	4.71	.63	4.89	.60	4.74	.79	4.96	.20	4.74	.65	4.96	. 25	4.62	.83	4.73	.64	4.2992	1000.
F-STATISTIC FO	R MULTI	IVARI	ATE I	EST (JF EQU	MLIT	OF N	(EAN V	/ECTOF	5 = S	1.1846	D.F	"	.86/00	78.548	8 8	20. ng	01				

There were only 2 statistically significant differences between the students' own norms and these they attributed to lecturers. The students saw lecturers as more approving of role norms 27 (insist parents contact them via the principal) and 28 (visit pupil's homes). Careful examination of those role norms approaching statistical significance (e.g. role norms 32, p. = 0.0106; 31, p = 0.022; 29, p = 0.025) together with the direction of mean differences for all items showed that the statistically significant role norms were pointers to a possible trend whereby lecturers were seen as even more co-operative in their relationship with parents than students saw themselves as being (principal component 1), slightly more formal in dealing with matters involving parents rights (principal component 2), and a little more guarded about matters thought to be the exclusive domain of teachers (principal component 2). It is emphasised that these were only faint trends, given the evidence. However, the direction of the mean differences on every role norm except one (where the difference was a miniscule 0.07) supported this view, and it is this pattern The mean difference which suggests the existence of a trend. per role norm of 0.266 over the sector indicates the overall difference between the 6th semester students' own norms and those they saw teachers as holding to be modest.

By contrast, when the lecturers' actual norms were compared with those attributed to them the possible trend reported above was completely reversed. Statistically significant differences were found for role norms 29 (discuss with parents...scores on standardized tests), 31 (attend P & C meetings) and 35 (discuss other teachers weaknesses). Taken with the evidence of those

role norms approximating the accepted significance level (e.g. 30, p = .013; 32, p = .011) and the fact that on every role norm the actual direction of the mean differences was opposite to that in the trend discussed above, and it can be seen that, in fact, lecturers were a little less co-operative on orientation than the students thought, less insistent on formality in certain dealings with parents, and less guarded in respect of those matters considered to be exclusively or primarily the concern of teachers. The mean differences for role norm of .357 for the sector and .490 for the statistically significant differences suggest a moderate gap between the students' notions of lecturers' views and the actual views of the latter.

There was even less distance between the 6th semester students' and lecturers' own norms than was thought by the students. The only statistically significant difference was for role norm 35 and this was a relatively trivial matter of degree. The mean difference per role norm of only 0.197 for the sector indicates how close the two groups were in the norms held for primary teachers' relationships with parents.

Once more, a different picture presents itself with the teacher comparisons. There were 7 statistically significant differences between the students' own norms and those they attributed to teachers, and sizeable mean differences per role norm of 0.502 for the sector and 0.617 for the 7 differences, the details of which are presented in Table 6.15.

TABLE 6.15

STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES (p < .01) BETWEEN STUDENTS' OWN NORMS AND THOSE THEY ATTRIBUTED TO TEACHERS: 6TH SEMESTER 1976 ACTING TOWARD PARENTS

	ROLE NORM	STUD ON NO	ENTS' WN RMS	NOI ATTI TEAC	RMS RIB. FO CHERS	011701	TEACHERS
		X	S	X	s	OMEGA SQUARED	AS
32.	encourage parents to visit the classroom at any time	1.96	.91	3.04	1.03	.242	
34.	attempt to find out what, in the home situation, may con- tribute to the mis- behaviour of the child	1.67	.68	2.25	.77	.150	
33.	contact parents when- ever any problem arises about their children	2.13	1.03	2.81	.91	.109	LESS APPROVING
31.	attend parent-teacher association meetings	1.73	.66	2.17	.93	.083	
28.	visit every pupil's home at the beginn- ing of the school year	3.23	.99	3.65	.89	.040	
27.	insist that parents contact them only via the principal	3.65	1.23	2.71	1.06	.132	MOPF
35.	discuss freely with parents the weak- nesses of other teachers	4.92	.45	4.73	.64	.046	APPROVING

The clear trend to emerge from Table 6.16 is that the students perceived teachers to be decidedly less desirous of co-operative contact with parents than they themselves were (role norms 32, 34, 33, 31, 28). As well, teachers were seen as tending toward more formality in respect of parents' access to them (27).

The students were mistaken in respect of a number of their perceptions however, as Table 6.16 makes clear:

TABLE 6.16

STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES (p < .01) BETWEEN TEACHERS' OWN NORMS AND THOSE ATTRIBUTED TO THEM BY 6TH SEMESTER (1976) STUDENTS : ACTING TOWARD PARENTS

	ROLE NORM	NORN ATTR TC TEACI	MS IB. D HERS	TEACH OV NOI	HERS' VN RMS	OMEGA	TEACHERS
		X	s	X	S	SQUARED	AS
34.	attempt to find out what, in the home sit- uation, may contribute tomisbehaviour	2.25	.77	1.42	.62	.297	
33.	contact parents when- ever any problem arises about their children	2.81	.81	1.79	.90	.242	
32.	encourage the parents to visit the classroom at any time	3.04	1.03	2.24	1.20	.104	MORE APPROVING
26.	acceptjudgement of parents whendisa- greement aboutthe child	3.35	.91	2.99	.81	.046	
29.	discuss with parents the child's scores on standardized attain- ment tests	3.60	.99	3.19	1.33	.025	

Role norms 34, 33 and 32 show that the teachers saw themselves as very much more co-operative in their relationships with parents than students saw them as being. As well there is some slight evidence that they did not see themselves as quite so formal in respect of parents' rights (26), and quite so professionally distant in respect of strictly pedagogical matters (29). The substantial nature of the misperception of teachers' views in respect of this role is shown in the mean difference per role norm of 0.684 for the above 5 items and 0.412 from the whole sector.

Comparison of the actual norms of each group shows that 2 of these errors were compounded. These were for role norm 33, the item contributing most to principal component 1 for this sector, and role norm 34, also a significant contributor. For role norm 33 (contact parents when any problem arises about their children) the students themselves showed solid approval $(\overline{X} =$ 2.13) but attributed to teachers much less approval ($\overline{X} = 2.81$) whereas in fact the teachers showed not less, but more approval $(\overline{X} = 1.79)$, each of the pairwise comparisons being statistically The same occurred for role norm 34 (attempt to significant. find out what, in the home situation, contributes to misbehaviour...). The students $(\overline{X} = 1.67)$ attributed to teachers a good deal less approval for this norm (\overline{X} = 2.25), whereas teachers actually showed even more approval than did students ($\overline{X} = 1.42$). There were statistically significant differences on 3 other role norms (27,28, 31) and for the 5 differences the mean difference per role norm was 0.412 compared with 0.260 for the sector. In all, there

was no evidence to suggest that teachers' own norms were characterised by any lesser degree of co-operativeness than those of the students though there were fluctuations from role norm to role norm. However, since role norm 27 was the major contributor to principal component 3 it is possible that the difference between the means signifies that teachers tended toward more formality in respect of certain rights of parents, especially since the difference between means on role norm 26 (the other contributor to this component) approached the acceptable significance level and was in the same direction of more approval. <u>Summing up, while there</u> were differences between the 6th semester students' and teachers' own norms for this role sector these differences were neither as numerous nor as marked as the students believed.

That lecturers and teachers were seen by the 6th semester group as holding different views for the role sector 'Acting Toward Parents' becomes even more evident when the norms attributed to each by the students are compared. There were 7 statistically significant differences for which the mean difference per role norm was a very substantial 0.736. Whereas teachers were seen as holding views about teacher-parent relationships that were mildly co-operative, they were seen as very much less so than lecturers who were attributed with much more approval on each of the role norms making up principal component 1 for this sector (33, 32, 34, 31, 28). There were also mild differences of degree for role norms 27 (insist parents contact teachers via the principal), and 35 (discuss...with parents other teachers' weaknesses) where lecturers were seen as giving less approval to these propositions than teachers. For the whole role sector the mean difference per role norm of 0.566 indicates the substantial nature of the perceived gap between the views of lecturers and teachers.

The real gap between lecturers and teachers was much less pronounced. When the actual norms of each were compared there were only 2 statistically significant differences. These were for role norm 28 (visit pupils' home) where teachers showed a good deal less approval than lecturers who were themselves slightly on the disapproving side of the 3 mid-point on the 5 point scale, and role norms 33 (contact parents concerning problems about their children) where, quite contrary to the students' perceptions, teachers were rather more approving than lecturers.

Inspection of the direction of mean differences for all items and those norms for which the mean differences approached the accepted significance level (e.g. 29, p = .042; 34, p. = .011) revealed only one possible trend and that was toward teachers, perhaps more so than lecturers, wishing to maintain professional distance from parents on matters seen to be very much in the professional domain (standardised tests, I.Q.'s). However the evidence for this was not strong. For the role norms contributing to principal component I there was no discernible pattern, the teachers showing more approval than lecturers on some items and The actual gap between the two groups for the less on others. whole sector was amoderate .307 per role norm. When the 6th semester students' perceptions of the distance between lecturers and teachers was considered against the reality of the actual gap there were not only large misjudgements of degree (e.g. on role norms 32, especially, and 31) but also instances where the misperceptions were exacerbated directionally. Of these, two showed statistically significant differences for all pairwise comparisons.

They were for role norms 33 (contact parents re problems...) and 34 (home situation contributing to misbehaviour...) where, in both cases, teachers were seen by students as very much less approving than lecturers but were in fact more so.

The 2nd semester students' own norms for this role sector differed from those held by 6th only in a tendency to be less inclined toward co-operating with parents. The group showed less approval for role norms 28 (visit pupils' homes) and 32 (encourage parents to visit the classroom). The only other statistically significant difference – for role norm 35 (discuss with parents other teachers' weaknesses) – can be disregarded since both groups very strongly opposed the proposition. The mean difference per role norm over this role sector of .196 between the two student groups shows how similar in orientation their views were.

There were no statistically significant differences between the 2nd semester groups' norms and expectations, the means difference per role norm of only .122 pointing to the <u>high level of idealism</u> for this role sector.

The 2nd semester students saw very little difference between themselves and lecturers who were perceived as being more approving of role norms 27 (parents contact teachers via principal) and 28 (visit pupils' homes). Again, the mean difference per role norm of only 0.174 shows how little students thought there was between their own and lecturers' views.

In this respect <u>the students were relatively accurate</u> for there were only 2 statistically significant differences between the students' and lecturers' own norms. These were for role norms 28 (visit pupils' homes) and 32 (encourage parents to visit the classroom) where lecturers showed much more approval than did students in each case. The mean difference per role norm of 0.269 shows that overall the gap between the students' and lecturers' own norms for this sector was rather narrow. Moreover, the students accurately estimated the lecturers views for, when the latter group's actual norms were compared with these attributed to them there were no statistically significant differences and a mean difference per role norm of only 0.217.

The 2nd semester group did perceive differences between themselves and teachers. There were 4 statistically significant differences between the students' own norms and those they attributed to teachers who were ascribed with views about parent-teacher relationships that were less co-operative in orientation than the students' own (less approval attributed for role norms 31, 33 and 34) and more formal in respect of parents' rights (more approval attributed for role norms 27 and also for 26 which, though not actually reaching the accepted significance level, did show a probability of 0.15 and so is taken as confirming the trend).

There were notable inaccuracies in the 2nd semester students' attribution of views for this role sector to teachers as Table 6.17 shows.
TABLE 6.17 STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ($p \lt.01$) BETWEEN TEACHERS' OWN NORMS AND THOSE ATTRIBUTED TO THEM BY 2ND SEMESTER (1976): ACTING TOWARD PARENTS

ROLE NORM	NORI ATTR TC TEACI	MS IB. D HERS	TEACH OV NOH	HERS' VN RMS	OMEGA	TEACHERS
	X	S	X	S	SQUARED	ACTUALLY WERE
34.	2.09	.96	1.42	.62	.203	↑ MORE
33.	2.56	1.06	1.79	.90	.147	APPROVING
32.	2.95	1.14	2.24	1.20	.083	
26.	3.44	.94	2.99	.81	.071	
30.	3.82	1.18	4.31	1.04	.050	↑ LESS
35.	4.62	.88	4.89	.60	.042	APPROVING

From Table 6.17 it can be seen that teachers actually were more approving of co-operative relationships with parents than students perceived them as being (34, 33, 32). The other differerences are of no great magnitude and seen to be item-specific rather than part of any trend. The mean difference per role norm of 0.367, approximation though it is, once more gives a reasonable indication of the moderate error in perception overall for this sector.

The actual gap between the 2nd semester students and teachers can be gauged from the fact that there were 7 statistically significant differences. Contrary to the students' beliefs about teachers' views in relation to their own for this role sector, teachers reported themselves as more co-operative than students in their orientation to parent-teacher relationships (more approval for role norms 32, 33, 34, though 31 goes against this trend) whereas students had seen them as being less so. As well, teachers tended to be even more desirous than students of keeping their professional distance from parents in respect of certain matters (role norms 30, 35), and gave much more approval to role norm 27 (insist on parental contact via the principal). Apart from this last however, <u>the differences between 2nd semester and teachers</u> were modest ones of degree as is indicated in the mean difference per role norm of 0.282 for the sector.

There were 5 statistically significant differences between the norms 2nd semester attributed to teachers and those attributed These were for the 5 role norms contributing to lecturers. to principal component 1, i.e. 33, 32, 34, 31 and 28. In each case teachers were seen as less approving than lecturers; that is, though desirous of co-operative relationships with parents, not so approving of this are lecturers. As has been discussed in the context of the 6th semester contrasts, the actual differences between lecturers and teachers did not support such a perceived there were only 2 statistically significant differjudgement: ences which show that while teachers were more disapproving than lecturers of visiting pupils' homes (role norm 28) they were more approving of contacting parents when problems arise with children Further, the direction of mean differences for those (33). role norms approaching the accepted statistical significance level reveals no pattern.

Finally, comparisons were made between the responses of the two student groups to this role sector. As discussed, when each group's own norms were compared there were only 2 statistically significant differences and a small overall gap between the two groups for the sector. Similarly, when their own expectations were compared there were again only 2 statistically significant differences, with 6th semester students seeing themselves as even less likely than 2nd to tell a parent the tested I.Q. of his child (role norm 31), and even more likely to encourage parents to visit the classroom at any time (role norm 32). When the norms approaching statistical significance (e.g. 29 and 35; p < .05), and the direction and magnitude of absolute differences between the means for all norms were analysed, only one trend was discernible: 6th semester students saw themselves as even more likely than did 2nd to keep their professional distance from parents over issues seen to be "teachers' business" viz., role norms 30 (tell parents I.Q. of child), 29 (discuss with parents standardized test scores) and 35 (discuss with parents the weaknesses of other teachers) - the three main contributors to principal component 2. Overall therefore, differences between the norms and expectations of 6th semester and 2nd semester students in respect of teacher-parent role relationships were few in number and moderate in degree.

When the norms each group attributed to lecturers were compared, there were 5 statistically significant differences and a mean difference per role norm of 0.574 for these items (0.340 for the entire sector). The 6th semester students attributed to lecturers views for teacher-parent relationships characterised by more co-operativeness (much more approval for role norms 32, and 28, and also more for role norm 31 which was statistically significant at p < .05), and a greater inclination toward keeping professional distance from parents over purely pedagogical concerns (less approval for role norm 30, 29 and 35) than did 2nd semester students. <u>That is, there were marked differences between 6th</u> and 2nd semester students in respect of norms attributed to lecturers for the teacher-parent role setor.

By contrast, there was only 1 statistically significant difference between the norms attributed to teachers by each student group. This was for role norm 29 (standardized attainment tests) where teachers were seen by 6th as more disapproving than by 2nd. The only other role norm to aproach statistical significance was item 30 (tell parent I.Q.'s) at p = .034 and here again 2nd semester saw teachers as being less disapproving than did 6th. For this role sector therefore it seems reasonable to suggest that the difference between the groups lay in a tendency for 6th semester students to attribute views to teachers that, compared with the 2nd semester group, were more in favour of maintaining professional distance between themselves and parents over certain 'professional' concerns.

6.4.1 SUMMARY: ROLE SECTOR 3

 Both student teacher groups' own norms were characterised by a strong sense of professional co-operativeness in role relationships with parents, a relative lack of formality with respect to parents' rights and, at the same time,

an insistence on preserving professional distance in respect of matters that were seen primarily as the business of teachers only. These tendencies were slightly stronger for 6th semester than for 2nd.

- Both student groups foresaw minimal adjustments to their ideal role concepts when they began teaching.
- 3. While 2nd semester students perceived little difference between themselves and lecturers, 6th semester saw lecturers as even more co-operative with parents than the students themselves, but rather more formal in respect of parents' rights and more guarded about matters pedagogical. Lecturers however, were less so in all these respects. There were virtually no actual differences between lecturers and 6th semester for this role sector though lecturers reported themselves as even more co-operative with parents than did 2nd semester students.
- 4. Both groups of students saw teachers as less wont to cooperate with parents than the students themselves, and tending to more formality and distance in other role relationships. This trend was more apparent in the 6th semester group. However, teachers reported themselves as muchmore cooperative in professional relationships with parents than students thought they were, and not quite so formal and distant. Moreover, in actual fact, teachers were no less co-operative vis à vis parents than were 6th semester and

more so than 2nd semester, though they did tend toward more formality in respect of certain parental rights and, compared with 2nd, were a little more desirous of preserving professional distance about internal teacher concerns.

5. Both the 2nd and 6th semester groups - especially the latter - saw teachers as much less willing to co-operate with parents than lecturers, and more formal and inclined to preserve professional distance. This constituted a serious misperception since the actual differences between lecturers and teachers were very moderate, with teachers perhaps tending only to be more in favour of maintaining professional distance about what would very likely be seen as strictly teacher concerns.

6.5 ROLE SECTOR 4: ACTING TOWARD COMMUNITY

The mean response scores and standard deviations for all four groups to Role Sector 4, 'Acting Toward Community' are presented in Table 6.18. Again, the multivariate F was statistically significant (p < .0001) as were the univariate F-tests on each of the ten variables, thus permitting the <u>post hoc</u> Scheffe['] contrasts described for the preceding role sectors to be made.

The principal components analysis provided a framework within which each group's responses in respect of teacher-community relationships might reasonably be described by terms such as 'supportiveness' (P.C. 1), 'independence' (P.C. 2) and 'correctness' (P.C. 3). Using these descriptors, the 6th semester group's responses could be said to be mildly supportive toward the community (slight levels of approval for role norms 38, 42, 40 and unequivocal about 39, 37), relatively independent in respect of behaviour such as serving alcohol at home and visiting a hotel for a drink (moderate approval given to these role norms, i.e. norms 44 and 45), and adequately 'correct' in respect of their public image (moderate approval for role norms 36 and, to a lesser degree 41 and a good deal of disapproval for 43).

The 4 statistically significant differences between the norms and expectations suggest some expected shift in their future behaviour toward a less supportive attitude toward the community (less likely to attend church than they think they ought - role norm 39, and less likely to be active in a community youth group

TABLE 6.18

MEAN RESPONSE SCORES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR ALL 1976 GROUPS: ROLE SECTOR 4: ACTING TOWARDS COMMUNITY.

			ð	ion noi	SIN				EXP	OWN	SNOI		NORMS TO 1	ATTR	LBUTE		TOP TO	ATTRI	BUTED ERS	- INU	д.	
ROLE NORM	2nd	P	6t}		ECTUR	ERS 1	TEACHE	RS	2nd		6th		2nd		6th		2nd		6th	VARIA	THAN	
	·×	s	۰×	s	×	s	·×	s	.×	s	<u>×</u> ،		×'	s		-s	×-	× -	N	VALUE		
36. exercise great caution in expressing views outside of class- rcom on controversial issues because of their position.	2.81	1.29	2.50 1	17	.42 1	. 29 2	.64 1	.23 2	.94 1	.31 2	.66 1.	.26 2	.36 1	25 2.	14 1.	10 2	48 1.	06 2.4	41 1.1	5 5.9648	.0001	<u>, </u>
31. live within the neighbour- nood of the school.	2.93	. 60	3.05	.79 ŝ	.93	. 39 2	66.	. 85 2	.88	.75 2.	. 76.	.89 2	.64	74 2.	74	94 2	. 82	63 2.5	.7. 06	3 3.0345	.0014	
38. be active in at least one community youth group (e.g., Sunday School, Scouting, Youth Group).	2.83	.76	2.73	.57 2	.73	. 62 2	.70	.67 2	.72	.89 3.	. 60.	.96 2	.21	78 2.	46	65 2	. 72	70 2	.9. 6/	3 10.0413	1000.	
39. attend church regularly	3.06	.76	3.00	.48 3	.13	. 50 2	.79	.69 3	.29 1	.14 3.	48 1.	.33 2	.85	65 3.	. 20	38 3.	06	40 2.9	92 .4(0 12.7634	1000.	1
40. spend an 8 hour day at school.	2.80	.88	2.89	.60 3	00.	. 85 2	.92	. 89 2	06.	.82 3.	.00	92 2	41 1.	01 2.	49	75 3.	0 4	91 2.9	94 .8	6.2689	1000.	
41. remember that a stricter standard of conduct in the community applies to them because they are teachers.	2.74 1	1.12	2.74 1	.03 2	69.	. 92 2	.43 1	.10 2	1 16.	.31 2.	81 1.	.17 2	.17 1.	00 2.	23	90 2.	61	96 2	.8.	6.0614	1000.	r
42. patronize locally-owned businesses and services.	2.80	; 69 .	2.90	.57 2	.93	. 33 2	.62	.70 2	.79	.83 2.	.75	79 2	.62	77 2.	75	63 2.	87	58 2.7	75 .6(3.6767	1000.	r
43. make political speeches	3.86	.86 3	3.92	.84	.07	.75 3	.51	.91 4	.05	.88 4.	43	88 3	. 76	96 3.	96	89 3.	69 .8	32 3.9	96 .8	17.4976	1000.	
44. serve alcoholic drinks in their own house.	2.48	.90 2	2.50	.87 2	69.	.70 2	.72	. 77 2	.16 1	.101.	95 1.	22 2	. 73	81 2.	71 .	65 2.	63	74 2.6	56 .61	5 12.0808	1000.	
45. visit a public house.	2.63	.95 2	2.52	.89 2	.76	.65 2	.77	. 80 2	.44 1	.18 2.	32 1.	31 2	. 80	94 2.	88	58 2.	74 .8	30 2.8	31 .6	5 4.654:	.000	
F-STATISTI	C FOR M	NLTN	/AR I A I	TE TES	T OF	EQUAL	0 YTI	f nea	N VEC.	TORS =	. 6.81	152).F.	5/06 :	878.5	3488	P < 0	.000				

- 38), and a more independent stance in one respect (higher level of approval for role norm 44), but more caution about matters of public propriety (43). The mean difference per role norm of 0.267 for the sector however <u>does not suggest any marked modifi-</u> cation of future behaviour by 6th semester overall.

The 6th semester students tended to see lecturers as, if anything, more supportive of the community than they themselves were. More approval was attributed for role norms 40 and 38 and also for 37 (live within the school neighbourhood) which at p = .011 approximates the accepted significance level. They also appeared to see lecturers as more approving of a 'correct' public stance toward the community. More approval was attributed for role norm 41 (remember...a stricter standard of conduct applies ...) and also for 36 (exercise great caution in expressing means... on controversial issues) if in the case of the latter, a probability level of .03 is accepted. As well, somewhat less approval was attributed to lecturers for role norm 45 (visit a public house).

In perceiving lecturers' views about the teacher in the community as being characterised by a cautious correctness, the students erred. Comparison of the students' attributed norms with the lecturers' actual norms yielded 4 statistically significant differences, 3 of which were for the role norms making up principal component 3 for this sector – 'Correct Community Behaviour'. Lecturers were in fact very much less approving than students thought of role norm 36 (exercise great caution in expressing views...on controversial issues) and noticeably less so for role norm 41 (remember that a stricter standard of conduct applies...), as well as much more approving of 43 (make political speeches). Additionally whereas the students saw lecturers as moderately favouring spending an 8 hour day at school (40), lecturers were equivocal about this. The mean difference per role norm of 0.785 for these four differences and of 0.403 for the sector conveys the magnitude of the misperception.

There were only 2 statistically significant differences between the actual norms of the students and lecturers. These differences were, however, substantial (mean difference per role norm of 0.885 for the two). Again they were for role norms 36 and 43 showing <u>lecturers as holding views that compared with students, were very much less cautious about what constitutes</u> <u>correct behaviour for primary teachers in their role relationships with the community.</u>

There were no differences between the students' own norms and those they attributed to teachers and a very small 0.143 mean difference per role norm for the sector. That is, the 6th semester students perceived teachers as holding views for this role sector essentially the same as their own. The accuracy of these perceptions became apparent when only one statistically significant difference was found between the students' attributed norms and the actual norms of teachers. This was for role norm 43 (make political speeches) where, though showing moderate disapproval, teachers were not as disapproving as students thought. The mean difference per role norm of a mere 0.129 fairly reflects the accuracy of the students' perceptions of teachers' views for this cluster of role relationships.

There were however 5 statistically significant differences between the students' and teachers' own norms. All of these were relatively minor differences of degree as is suggested by a mean difference per role norm of only 0.194 for the sector. There was a slight tendency for teachers to be less approving of an independent stance vis a vis the community (role norms 44, 45) and, concomitantly perhaps, to be a little more supportive (39, 42). Also, they were rather less disapproving than students of a primary teacher making political speeches (43). <u>In sum then, the actual</u> <u>differences between 6th semester students and teachers for teacher-</u> community role relationships, thoughnumerous were only minor in degree.

The 6th semester students saw very little difference between the views held by lecturers and teachers for this role sector. When the norms attributed to each were compared there were only 2 statistically significant differences (for role norms 38 and 40) which suggested that lecturers were seen as perhaps more supportive toward the community than teachers. This was not at all borne out though when the lecturers' and teachers' actual norms were compared, with a mean difference per role norm of merely 0.158 for the attributed norms comparison. There were tendencies for teachers to be more approving of 'correct' community behaviour (much more approval for role norm 36 and less approval for role norm 43) and, in contrast with the students' perception, more supportive toward the community (39, 42). That is, the moderate differences between lecturers and teachers in respect of teachercommunity role relationships were not those erroneously perceived to exist by 6th semester students.

Since there were no statistically significant differences between the 2nd and 6th semester groups' own norms, the former's own views for this role sector can be described in the same terms as for the 6th semester group. That is, they tended to be mildly supportive of the community, moderately approving of 'correct' standards of behaviour, and moderately independent in respect of the private behaviours that constitute role norms 44 and 45. The miniscule mean difference per role norm of 0.097 between the two groups' views for this sector mirrors the fact of their close similarity. <u>Essentially then, 6th and 2nd semester's own norms</u> for teacher-community role relationships were the same.

The 2nd semester group, unlike 6th, did not modify their ideal views when anticipating their future behaviour. There were no statistically significant differences between their norms and expectations, and a mean difference per role norm of only 0.150. That is, idealism was high amongst 2nd semester students.

However they did see differences between their own views and those they perceived lecturers as holding. Lecturers were seen as more approving of correct public behaviour (36, 41) and more supportive of the community (37, 38, 40). The mean difference per role norm was 0.464 for these 5 statistically significant differences and 0.323 for the sector.

That the 2nd semester students were in error in their views about the norms lecturers held is made apparent in Table 6.19 which shows the statistically significant differences between the students attributed norms and those actually held by lecturers.

TABLE 6.19

STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES (p < .01) BETWEEN LECTURERS' OWN NORMS AND THOSE ATTRIBUTED TO THEM BY 2ND SEMESTER (1976) STUDENTS: ACTING TOWARD COMMUNITY

	NOI ATTI T(LECTI	RMS RIB. D URERS	LECTU OV NOI	JRERS' ∛N RMS	OMECA	LECTURERS
KOLE NORM	X	s	X	s	SQUARED	AS
36. exercise great caution in expression of views on controversial issues	2.36	1.25	2.42	1.29	.153	
38. be active incommun- ity youth group	2.21	.78	2.73	.62	.118	
40. spend an 8 hour day at school	2.41	1.01	3.00	.85	.088	MORE
<pre>41. remembera stricter standard of conduct applies because they are teachers</pre>	2.17	1.00	2.69	.92	.068	APPROVING
42. patronize locally- owned businesses and services	2.62	.77	2.93	.33	.052	
39. attend church regularly	2.85	.65	3.13	.50	.052	\downarrow
43. make political speeches	3.76	.96	3.07	.75	.129	LESS APPROVING

Lecturers were, in actuality, much less approving than students thought they were of primary teachers assuming a cautious, low-profile public position in respect of role norms 36, 45 and 41 (principal component 3). Moreover, though lecturers were mildly supportive of the community in the norms they held, they were less so than the student group thought (38, 40, 42, 39). Overall, the degree of error is mirrored in the mean differences for role norm of 0.567 for the 7 items in Table 6.19 and 0.434 for the sector. There were 2 statistically significant differences between the students' and lecturers' own norms and these (role norms 36 and 43) showed that lecturers were indeed less approving of a low public profile for the primary teacher concerning the expression of views about matters that might be controversial. Apart from these decided differences (mean difference per role norm of 0.700 for the two) the views of lecturers and students were, in the statistical sense, identical for this sector, the mean difference per role norm of 0.229 indicating the closeness of the groups in absolute terms. <u>In summary, 2nd semester erroneously saw lecturers</u> <u>as more cautious and more community supportive than they were;</u> moreover, lecturers were less cautious than the students themselves.

The students saw no differences between themselves and teachers for this role sector as is indicated by the mean difference per role norm of only 0.142 and, basically, they were correct. When their attributed norms were compared with teachers' actual norms there were only 2 minor differences of degree (role norms 39 and 42) which, if anything, merely hinted at a minimally more supportive attitude toward the community by teachers than students thought. Again, the mean difference per role norm for the sector of 0.147 fairly reflects the accuracy of the students' perceptions.

Once again, though there were 3 statistically significant differences between the students' and teachers' own norms they were relatively minor differences and form no pattern. Teachers were a little more approving than students of regular church attendance (39), a little less disapproving of making political

speeches (43) and a little less approving of serving alcohol in their homes (44). The mean difference per role norm of 0.197 for the 10 norms comprising this role sector shows how little, on average, the differences were in absolute terms. <u>In essence</u> <u>then, there were no differences of substance between 2nd semester</u> students and teachers for the role 'Acting Toward Community'.

When the 2nd semester students' attributed norms for the lecturer and teacher groups were compared a pattern did clearly emerge; lecturers were seen as more supportive of the community than teachers (more approval attributed to lecturers for role norms 38, 40, 41 and 42 - all contributors to principal component 1). However when the actual norms of lecturers and teachers were compared, there was only 1 statistically significant difference for these 4 norms and that was in the opposite direction to that predicted by the students, with lecturers being rather less approving than teachers of patronizing local businesses (42). Confirming this trend in the opposite direction was the difference found also for role norm 39 (attend church regularly) for which teachers There were 2 other differences - for showed more approval. role norms 36 and 43 - which showed that lecturers were a good deal less approving than teachers of the primary teacher adopting a cautious attitude in respect of public comment. To sum up then, lecturers were seen as more supportive of the community than teachers by 2nd semester, whereas they were less so. Also, lecturers were in fact less cautious about matters of public propriety affecting teachers than the teacher group but this was not perceived by the students.

Finally, comparisons were made between the expectations for their future behaviour (Role Norm Inventory 2) of each student group and their attributed norms (R.N.I.'s 3 and 4). The one pattern that did emerge from these analyses was that there was very little to distinguish the two students groups on any of these comparisons. There were 2 statistically significant differences between the groups' expectations with 6th semester anticipating less likelihood than did 2nd of being active in a community youth group (38), and even less likelihood than 2nd of making political speeches (43). If the directional difference between the group means for role norm 36 (exercise great caution in expressing views on controversial issues...) which approaches the accepted significance level, is considered together with the evidence of role norm 43 it is a possibility that the 6th semester group saw themselves as more likely to adopt a 'correct' stance in respect of their public position (principal component 3) than did 2nd but the trend, if it exists, is a faint one and the mean difference per role norm of 0.188 for the whole sector indicates the similarity in overall viewpoint of the two student groups.

There was even less difference between the groups when their attributed norms were compared. There was only one statistically significant difference between the norms each group attributed to lecturers, with 2nd semester seeing lecturers as a little more approving than did 6th of the primary teacher being active in a community youth group (38). The mean difference per role norm was a minimal 0.131 for this role sector and, for the comparison between the norms each group attributed to teachers a negligible 0.118. There were no statistically significant differences for this comparison.