

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PUPIL
CONTROL IDEOLOGY AND SUBJECT
FACULTIES IN ACT GOVERNMENT
HIGH SCHOOLS.

by

IAN MYERS

A Field Study Report submitted in partial
fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree
of Master of Education in the Canberra College
of Advanced Education.

JULY 1985.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to establish that a relationship existed between teacher Pupil Control Ideology (PCI) and membership of a practical subject faculty or of a humanities subject faculty in ACT government high schools. It was hypothesized that teachers in practical subject faculties and teachers of practical subjects would be custodial in their PCI. Teachers in humanities subject faculties and teachers of humanities subjects would be humanistic in their PCI. A subsidiary purpose was to replicate earlier research findings of a relationship between PCI and years of teaching, sex, position in the school administration, and type of school.

The PCI Form was administered to a population sample of 116 teachers from five high schools in the Belconnen area of Canberra. The results were subjected to t-test and one-way analysis of variance. Statistically significant relationships were observed between PCI and teacher variables of subject faculty, subject taught, and sex of teacher. Earlier findings for other variables were not replicated.

The direction of findings was surprising. Teachers in practical subject faculties and of practical subjects were more humanistic than humanities faculty and subject teachers. Female teachers were more custodial than male teachers. An analysis of variance showed no interaction effect between variables sex and faculty, and sex and subject taught. More research on possible causes of the relationships, such as student attitude to subject, and teacher sense of achievement, is needed before the findings can have practical application.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank Dr. Laurie Kendall for his support, encouragement and guidance as my supervisor during this field study, and for introducing me to statistical techniques appropriate to educational research.

I extend my thanks to the past Principal of Ginninderra High School, Mr. Alan Casimir, for his co-operation and advice, and to the staffs of Ginninderra High, Charnwood High, Belconnen High, Canberra High and Melba High who co-operated in completing the field study survey, as their returns formed the data base for this Report.

Special appreciation is expressed to Sandra Griffin for her support, encouragement and practical assistance which were so important during the process of preparing this Report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
LIST OF TABLES	vii
Ch. 1 THE PROBLEM	1
Introduction	2
Background to the Problem	5
Statement of the Problem	8
Purpose of the Study	8
Theoretical Framework	9
Statistical Hypotheses	11
Definitions	14
Ch. 2 REVIEW OF RELATED THEORY AND RESEARCH	18
Introduction	19
Development of Research into PCI	20
Themes in Research on PCI	23
A. Organisations and PCI	24
B. Teachers and PCI	26
C. Personal Qualities and PCI	29
D. Principals and PCI	31
E. Students and PCI	32
F. Trends in the Study of PCI	32
G. Summary of Review	35
Issues for Research	36

	<u>Page</u>
Ch. 3	METHODOLOGY 39
	Introduction 40
	The Research Design 41
	Delineation of Research Design 42
	Population 44
	Instrumentation 48
	Field Procedures 50
	The Survey Form 52
	Data Collection and Recording 55
Ch. 4	THE RESULTS 70
	Introduction 71
	Main Results 73
	Results for School 4 82
	Summary of Statistical Values for Population Sample for Five Variables 86
Ch. 5	DISCUSSION, INTERPRETATION, IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE STUDIES 87
	Introduction 88
	Discussion of Findings 89
	A. The Hypotheses 89
	B. Findings for School 4 92
	C. Analysis of Variance 92

	<u>Page</u>
Interpretation of Findings	93
A. Faculty and Subject Taught	93
B. Sex of Teacher	97
C. Replication Studies	98
Methodological Limitations	100
A. Sampling Procedures	100
B. Instrumentation	102
C. Data Collection	102
D. Data Analysis	104
E. The Ex Post Facto Research Design	105
Other Explanations of Observed Results	106
Implications	106
 BIBLIOGRAPHY	 108
 APPENDIX I. Letters Seeking Approval to Conduct the Survey.	 119
APPENDIX II. Analysis of Variance for Independent Variables Faculty, Subject, and Sex of Teacher.	120

LIST OF TABLES

1.	RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE BY FACULTY/ BAND/SCHOOL	46
2.	RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE BY MAJOR TEACHING AREA AND SCHOOL	47
3.	EIGENVALUES IN FACTOR ANALYSIS	49
4.	SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESPONSES	51
5.	CODED RESPONSES TO SURVEY FORM QUESTIONS	56
6.	CODING OF MAJOR TEACHING AREAS - (TEACHING SUBJECTS)	58
7.	CODING OF SUBJECT FACULTIES	59
8.	LIST OF CASES BY NUMBER, FACULTY, SUBJECT CODE AND PCI SCORE	60
9.	INFORMATION ON VARIABLES - SCHOOL 1	63
10.	INFORMATION ON VARIABLES - SCHOOL 2	64
11.	INFORMATION ON VARIABLES - SCHOOL 3	65
12.	INFORMATION ON VARIABLES - SCHOOL 4	66
13.	INFORMATION ON VARIABLES - SCHOOL 5	68
14.	SUMMARY OF INFORMATION ON VARIABLES OF CASES FOR SCHOOLS 1 TO 5	69
15.	T-TEST - VARIABLE : PRACTICAL FACULTIES BY VARIABLE : HUMANITIES FACULTIES	73

	<u>Page</u>
16. T-TEST - VARIABLE : PRACTICAL SUBJECTS BY VARIABLE : HUMANITIES SUBJECTS	74
17. T-TEST - VARIABLE : LOWEST THRU 4 YEARS OF TEACHING BY VARIABLE : 5 THRU HIGHEST YEARS OF TEACHING	75
18. ONEWAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE - VARIABLE : PCI BY VARIABLE : YEARS OF TEACHING AS THREE GROUPS (0 to 4; 5 to 9; 10 or more years)	76
19. T-TEST - VARIABLE : AGE (lowest thru 29) BY VARIABLE : AGE (30 thru highest)	77
20. ONEWAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE - VARIABLE : PCI BY VARIABLE : BAND 1, 2, 3, AND 4	78
21. T-TEST VARIABLE : SEX (male) BY VARIABLE: SEX (female)	80
22. ONEWAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE - VARIABLE : PCI BY VARIABLE : SCHOOL 1, 2, 3, 4 AND 5	81
23. SCHOOL 4 : T-TEST FOR HYPOTHESIS 1 VARIABLE : PRACTICAL FACULTIES BY VARIABLE : HUMANITIES FACULTIES	82
24. SCHOOL 4 : T-TEST FOR HYPOTHESIS 2 VARIABLE : PRACTICAL SUBJECTS BY VARIABLE : HUMANITIES SUBJECTS	82

	<u>Page</u>
25. SCHOOL 4 : T-TEST FOR HYPOTHESIS 3 VARIABLE : LOWEST THRU 4 YEARS OF TEACHING BY VARIABLE : 5 THRU HIGHEST YEARS OF TEACHING	83
26. SCHOOL 4 : ONEWAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR HYPOTHESIS 4. VARIABLE : PCI BY VARIABLE : YEARS OF TEACHING AS THREE GROUPS (0 to 4; 5 to 9; 10 or more years)	83
27. SCHOOL 4 : T-TEST FOR HYPOTHESIS 5 VARIABLE : AGE (lowest thru 29) BY VARIABLE : AGE (30 thru highest)	84
28. SCHOOL 4 : ONEWAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR HYPOTHESES 6, 7, 8 AND 9 - VARIABLE : PCI BY VARIABLE : BAND 1, 2, 3 AND 4	85
29. SCHOOL 4 : T-TEST FOR HYPOTHESIS 10 - VARIABLE : SEX (male) BY VARIABLE : SEX (female)	85
30. STATISTICAL VALUES FOR FIVE VARIABLES	86

CHAPTER 1

THE PROBLEM

INTRODUCTION

Pupil control is a continuing concern of high school teachers. Their working day is permeated by organisational, structural and educational constraints on the children in their charge - constraints imposed in the interests of education. A curious feature of pupil control is the universal reference to it as discipline. Discipline is the accepted community code word for this significant element in the culture of the school.

It is useful to distinguish between discipline and pupil control. The Encyclopedia of Education (1971) states that discipline can include all techniques a teacher uses to increase the proportion of school-appropriate behaviours. Willower et al (1967) developed the concept of pupil control from the assumption that control, as an essential element of group life, implies requirements for, and restraints upon behaviour. They proposed a typology of control ideology in the form of a bi-polar continuum of custodial and humanistic orientations toward pupil control. In these terms, discipline concerns methods of control, and pupil control is about attitudes to discipline.

The necessity for control in schools is argued by Shipman (1975) on the ground of the school's role as an agent of society charged with organising the acquisition by each generation of the accumulated knowledge and cultural values of society. The school shares the task of socialization with family and friends, the local community, the churches, employers, the mass media and other influential groups. The complexity of society allows overlap among the differing sets of group values. Conflict is created if and when each group tries to impose its values on the school. If the school imposes its own values on its pupils, it may clash with these groups. The school's solution to the problem of tensions arising from this divergence of views is to set up its own culture. A significant element of this culture is pupil control.

The teacher's concern for pupil control expresses itself at first hand in the classroom, in the minute by minute, day by day contacts with students. However, the teacher acts in the classroom on the basis of principles and practice drawn from two sources: professional training, and consultation with colleagues using his and their experience. Within these

multiple settings the teacher continually returns to a key concern: control of students. The teacher dreads to hear the dismissive statement by a student: "Sir/Miss can't control us".

Many ACT high schools and colleges are organised on a faculty or subject department basis. Groups of four to eight or more teachers share staff rooms placed strategically around the school. A teacher will see most often everyday colleagues who have common goals, use similar teaching methods, may have taught the same students, and have a generally similar educational view. There will be common faculty policies on marking, use of resources, excursions, assessment - and discipline. Common policy on classroom discipline is a natural result of a faculty organisation. In these small groups, agreement on standards of behaviour which will achieve common goals is a normal event.

It is at this point that the outline of a problem appears. If there is agreement on discipline, that is, methods of pupil control, will it follow that there is agreement on attitudes to pupil control? Do teachers in a given faculty have similar attitudes? Is there a significant variance between faculties as to their pupil control ideologies? If such variance exists, can it be explained by the teaching methods, goals, work areas and outlook peculiar to each faculty?

Pupil Control Ideology (PCI) has been used as an investigative tool in broad studies of schools and school systems, such as comparing experienced with inexperienced teachers, and teachers with administrators. This field study has a narrower focus: to discover the prevailing Pupil Control Ideology within A.C.T. government high schools of the discrete work groups known as faculties.

BACKGROUND TO THE PROBLEM

The problem arose from reflecting on discipline and PCI at one Canberra high school, Ginninderra High. The 1977 School Evaluation showed a need for further evaluation and action concerning discipline (GHS 1977). Discipline was a topic at staff meetings from 1979 on, and an important issue for staff during 1981 (Myers 1982). Administrative efforts to improve student behaviour in 1981 and 1982 included: placing senior teachers in the playground as support for Band 1 teachers; changing the lunch pass system; preparing and publishing in the School Handbook a set of guidelines for student behaviour; having a reporting system on difficult students using differently coloured cards; and increasing the number of student suspensions.

Staff concern was shared by the school community, who gave their support to pupil-free planning conferences in 1984 and 1985. In 1984 the theme was Discipline and Relationships; in 1985 it was Negotiating Skills.

A curious feature of staff meetings and faculty surveys in 1981 was that members of some faculties made no contributions at all. Yet staff meeting records for this period (Myers 1982) confirm that staff saw control of students as one of their role functions. This concern remained, as a staff meeting in Term One 1983 named student behaviour as one of the major educational issues at the school (researcher participated). The lack of response from some faculties in 1981 suggested the existence of important differences of opinion among staff on the question of student discipline.

The division of school curricula into discrete subjects of study, and the grouping of subjects into subject departments or faculties, are old practices in ACT secondary schools. Faculties are headed by a Senior Teacher supervising staff whose numbers vary either with the relative popularity of that set of subjects or with the priority given it by school policy. Some subjects develop physical skills in students by use of bulky, potentially dangerous equipment. Other subjects use materials and equipment that demonstrate their special concepts. Both types are usually taught in

purpose-built teaching areas and have their own rules for safety and sensible use of the area.

Other subjects are taught in conventional classrooms and rely on books and writing materials for the most part. Movement in and use of these rooms is not nearly so confined by safety considerations. Teaching focuses on development of intellectual skills and concepts which can be expressed verbally or on paper. The two groups of subjects are usually referred to as practical or humanities subjects according to their aims, methods of teaching, and work areas.

Although some of their subject and faculty names differ, government high schools in the Belconnen area of the ACT have remarkably similar subject groupings. The reasons for this are the widespread community acceptance of a subject pattern of curriculum, and the hierarchical structure of the Commonwealth Teaching Service, in which Band 2 Senior Teachers are appointed to supervise Band 1 teachers in subject departments.

The contrast between practical and humanities subjects offered a way of delineating those differences in teacher attitudes to student discipline which appeared to exist at Ginninderra High. Establishing the PCI of

faculty teachers could show significant variation between staff in practical or humanities faculties. Faculty teachers of practical subjects would tend toward a custodial PCI. Faculty teachers of humanities would tend to be humanistic in their PCI. An underlying assumption is that teaching practical subjects requires a stronger form of control than teaching humanities subjects. These differences should also appear in surveys of faculty staff in other high schools.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The problem is to show that the Pupil Control Ideology of ACT government high school teachers is related to their membership of subject faculties.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of the study is to establish that the PCI of ACT government high school teachers in practical subject faculties tends to be custodial while the PCI of teachers in humanities faculties tends to be humanistic. A supporting purpose is to establish the relationship between teacher PCI and subject faculties in one selected high school.

A subsidiary purpose of the study is to replicate earlier research findings that there is a relationship between PCI and years of teaching experience, sex, hierarchical position in the school administration, and type of school. The intention is to show that this series of relationships is found in ACT government high schools.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

ASSUMPTION 1: Society requires controls on the behaviour of its members.

Postulate 1: The high school is an agent of society in imposing controls upon the behaviour of its pupil clients.

Postulate 2: High school teaching requires control activities with pupils.

ASSUMPTION 2: High schools aim to impart value systems drawn from society.

Postulate 1: There are overlapping sets of values held by groups in society.

Postulate 2: High schools face conflict in mediating conflicting value claims by interested groups within society.

Postulate 3: High school teachers have differing values concerning pupil control.

ASSUMPTION 3: ACT government high schools impart values and knowledge through faculties with which specific teachers and subject disciplines are identified.

Postulate 1: Subjects can be classed as practical or humanities according to their teaching areas, aims and content.

Postulate 2: Teachers in each subject faculty will have similar outlooks on pupil control.

Postulate 3: Teachers in practical subject faculties will have stricter views on pupil control than teachers in humanities subject faculties.

PROPOSITION 1: A custodial PCI is related to teaching in a practical subject faculty.

PROPOSITION 2: A humanistic PCI is related to teaching in a humanities subject faculty.

PROPOSITION 3: Teachers with fewer years of teaching are less custodial than those with more years of teaching.

PROPOSITION 4: Teachers become more custodial as their number of years of teaching increases.

PROPOSITION 5: Older teachers are more custodial than younger teachers.

PROPOSITION 6: Male teachers are more custodial than female teachers.

PROPOSITION 7: Band 1 teachers are more custodial than teachers in school administration positions.

PROPOSITION 8: Teachers in traditional space high schools are more custodial than those in flexible space high schools.

STATISTICAL HYPOTHESES

Hypothesis 1

There is no statistically significant difference between the scores of teachers in practical subject faculties on the PCI Form and the scores of teachers in humanities subject faculties on the PCI Form at the 0.05 level of significance.

Hypothesis 2

There is no statistically significant difference between the scores of teachers of practical subjects on the PCI Form and the scores of teachers of humanities subjects on the PCI Form at the 0.05 level of significance.

Hypothesis 3

There is no statistically significant difference between the scores of teachers with from 0 to 4 years of teaching experience on the PCI Form and the scores of teachers with 5 or more years of teaching experience on the PCI Form at the 0.05 level of significance.

Hypothesis 4

There is no statistically significant difference between the scores of teachers with from 0 to 4 years of teaching experience on the PCI Form and the scores of teachers with from 5 to 9 years of teaching experience on the PCI Form and the scores of teachers with 10 or more years of teaching experience on the PCI Form at the 0.05 level of significance.

Hypothesis 5

There is no statistically significant difference between the scores of teachers of up to 29 years of age and the scores of teachers of 30 years of age or older at the 0.05 level of significance.

Hypothesis 6

There is no statistically significant difference between the scores of Band 1 teachers on the PCI Form and the scores of Band 2 teachers on the PCI Form at the 0.05 level of significance.

Hypothesis 7

There is no statistically significant difference between the scores of Band 1 teachers on the PCI Form and the scores of Band 3 teachers on the PCI Form at the 0.05 level of significance.

Hypothesis 8

There is no statistically significant difference between the scores of Band 1 teachers on the PCI Form and the scores of Band 4 teachers on the PCI Form at the 0.05 level of significance.

Hypothesis 9

There is no statistically significant difference between the scores of Band 1 teachers on the PCI Form and the scores of all other Band levels of teachers on the PCI Form at the 0.05 level of significance.

Hypothesis 10

There is no statistically significant difference between the scores of male teachers on the PCI Form and the scores of female teachers on the PCI Form at the 0.05 level of significance.

Hypothesis 11

There is no statistically significant difference between the scores of teachers on the PCI Form for each high school surveyed at the 0.05 level of significance.

DEFINITIONS

BAND 1: Teacher responsible for learning programs undertaken by particular classes.

BAND 2: Senior Teacher responsible for administering subject faculty or areas of school curriculum, or procedures that affect the whole school, with reduced teaching load.

BAND 3: Assistant Principal Education Officer responsible for supervising the staff, students or the operation of the school curriculum, and for procedures affecting each of these three in the school organisation, with small teaching load.

BAND 4: Principal Education Officer responsible for supervising the administration and operations of the whole school and for its contacts with the community and the ACT Schools Office, with no teaching load.

CUSTODIAL: Concern with maintaining order among school students by punishing behaviour judged unsuitable and keeping teacher-student relations on an impersonal, moralistic level.

DISCIPLINE: All the techniques a teacher uses to increase the proportion of school-appropriate behaviours.

FACULTY: Group of teachers who offer related areas of study in the form of courses or subjects to students and have common curriculum goals.

HIGH SCHOOL: Organisation offering four year education program to students aged from 11-12 to 15-16 years.

HUMANISTIC: Concerned with fostering self-discipline in students through promoting personal relationships, friendship, respect and a sense of responsibility for one's actions.

HUMANITIES: Areas of study intended to promote expression of thought and feelings, and to promote learning, understanding and control of the environment, and participation in society.

PRACTICAL SUBJECTS: Areas of study developing: specific manual or psychomotor skills and appropriate mental outlooks; attitudes of scientific inquiry and uses of scientific methods; and ways these skills, methods and outlooks can be applied.

PUPIL: School student.

PUPIL CONTROL: Concept implying requirements for and restraints upon behaviour of school students in order to achieve the aims of the school.

PUPIL CONTROL
IDEOLOGY (PCI): Bi-polar continuum of custodial and humanistic orientations toward pupil control.

SUBJECT: Division of area of study with its own aims, objectives, content and methods of inquiry. Labelled as Major Teaching Area for Questionnaire.

SUBJECT
DEPARTMENT: See Faculty.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED THEORY AND RESEARCH

INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the results of a search for and a review of the available publications on Pupil Control Ideology. Resources used included ERIC, CIJE, the British and Australian Education Indexes, the Anstel National Lending Service, the Interlibrary Loan Service of tertiary institutions, and the Education Information Service of the O'Connell Education Centre, which is a resource centre for A.C.T. teachers run by the A.C.T. Schools Authority.

The Review has these aims: to show the origins of PCI and its use in social inquiry within schools; to make comparisons between North American and Australian studies in PCI; to point out issues arising from the literature and guidelines for the research in this field study. The starting point is that PCI makes use of a control typology: it is used to establish the position of the teacher within the dominant culture of the school. PCI is about the place of pupil control when the school is viewed as a social construct.

The Review is in three parts. The first focuses on the origins of PCI and its use as a research tool. The original PCI hypothesis, and the device of the PCI Form, came from the work of Donald J. Willower in the United

States in the 1960's on the nature and causes of social behaviour in educational institutions. He felt that pupil control was an integrating element in social relations in schools; he and others worked to identify its features and tease out its implications.

Since the publication of The School and Pupil Control Ideology in 1967 a definite pattern of research into pupil control has appeared. The second part is concerned with this pattern, in which several themes or lines of research may be detected. The third part looks at issues and guidelines for research in this field study.

DEVELOPMENT OF RESEARCH INTO PCI

The concept of control as an essential part of school culture is based on the nature of the school as a social system. Social systems require order, and order requires control. Certain institutions in society have the responsibility for developing social control. These include the church, the school, and the family (Shipman 1975). However, they may develop control in different ways.

Willower (1963, 1965) identified pupil control as a significant feature of the culture of the school as a social system. Pupil control problems were a major part of teacher/teacher and teacher/administrator relationships.

For instance, teachers regarded as weak on pupil control had lower status among their colleagues. The importance of control arose from the position of schools in a special category of organisation including prisons and public mental hospitals, which had no control over client selection, and whose clients had no choice about taking part (Carlson 1964). Willower found it reasonable to accept that control is central in these organisations.

Willower, Eidell and Hoy (1967) adapted a control typology used by Gilbert and Levinson (1967) in the study of the control ideology of staff towards patients in mental hospitals.

Willower et al noted that the two extremes of the typology, custodialism and humanism, were ideal types not necessarily found in such form in real experience. They adapted the typology to public schools, and outlined two models of schools. The rigidly traditional school was a model for a custodial orientation to pupil control. Its prime concern was the maintenance of order, and students were viewed as lacking in discipline and responsibility.

Their behaviour was judged in a moralising way and punishments were used as a means of controlling them. Students were at the bottom of the school hierarchy of status and authority. Communication and power flows were downward; students had to accept decisions without question; teacher relations with students were to be as impersonal as possible.

In contrast, a school with a humanistic orientation to pupil control was a community where learning occurred through interaction and experience and taking part in worthwhile activity. Teachers fostered self-discipline in students through close personal relationships and the positive aspects of friendship and respect. Two-way communication and a democratic climate existed in classrooms. Teacher and students were willing to act for themselves and be responsible for their actions.

Custodialism and humanism were terms used by Willower et al in reference to teacher attitudes to pupil control. They found that teachers were more custodial in their control ideology than principals or counsellors. Secondary school teachers and principals were more custodial than those in elementary schools. Experienced teachers were more custodial than less experienced teachers. Closed minded teachers as measured on Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale (1960) were more custodial than open minded educators.

Willower et al felt the grounds for conflict, suggested by the differing results for each group of educators, were more apparent than real. In public schools overt conflict was reduced because of the dominance of task and organisation structure. For some individuals there would be, however, an increase in personal tension. With these comments the researchers were hinting at the many variables in school culture which help stifle conflict.

THEMES IN RESEARCH ON PCI

Research on PCI shows several curious features. One is that nearly half the published articles available through the resources mentioned in the Introduction, were made available in the three years 1969 to 1971. Since 1971 research on PCI has been published infrequently. Another feature is the geographical location of the research: most of it has been done in the U.S.A., with some articles reporting on research in Canada and Australia. D.J. Willower has contributed in whole or part to about one quarter of all published articles. But the most interesting feature of the material on PCI is the themes which recur.

An important theme is the personal qualities of teachers as these relate to PCI. A related theme is the way

teacher roles and PCI interrelate: teachers are studied in their various guises as professionals, counsellors, student and beginner teachers, and at varying levels of experience. Two similar themes focus on educational organisations, and on schools as one form of this organisation. Some articles have been comparative studies of PCI research in the United States, Canada and the ACT, Australia.

This brief scan indicates that PCI is seen as a research tool in developing greater understanding of both the role models teachers adopt, and of their place as persons in an educational organisation.

A : Organisations and PCI

D.J. Willower has made a more significant contribution to developing and applying the PCI concept than any other researcher. In his 1963 study of the school as an organisational type, he looked at the sources of resistance to change, and the forms this resistance might take. He felt the key element in resistance to change in schools was concern with pupil control: the fear that change and a more permissive climate would undermine the controls set up over the unselected clients of the public school.

In 1965 he published general comments on control in schools based on an earlier study of a junior high school (Willower and Jones 1963). He said control was both functional and dysfunctional: it returned short-term gains but did not pay off in the long run. New teachers were socialized by older teachers' behaviour norms, and their ideals faded. Tensions thus created among staff were released by venting feelings about students in the privacy of the teachers' room. Willower considered that the study of pupil control would help integrate many issues basic to educational administration.

Jones (1969) linked custodialism in the PCI of teachers with a highly bureaucratic, authority - and punishment - centred style in schools. He found no link between PCI and size of school. Mann (1970) studied the relationship between teachers' ideology and their perceptions of school conditions. Teachers with internally consistent ideologies were more satisfied with personal autonomy. Teachers with inconsistent patterns of ideology were more satisfied to work under others.

Lunenberg and O'Reilly (1974) found that teachers in open schools were more satisfied in their ideology than teachers in closed schools. At the same time, there

were significant differences between teacher levels of dogmatism and their PCI. This replicated in part the work of Appleberry and Hoy (1969) who found a significant relationship between humanistic PCI and relatively open climate in elementary schools. Similarly, teachers in relatively open schools were more humanistic in their PCI than teachers in relatively closed schools.

Gossen (1969) reported that teachers in low socio-economic schools held a more custodial PCI than teachers in middle or high socio-economic status schools. A study by Hoy and Jalovich (1979) of a sample of 80 elementary and middle-school teachers linked open education, open attitudes and PCI. As they expected, open attitudes were directly related to open practices, and custodial pupil control orientation was inversely related to open attitudes and open patterns of classroom behaviour.

B : Teachers and PCI

PCI has been used to explore the functions and actions teachers attach to their role positions, and to discover conflict in schools. Willower, Hoy and Eidell (1967) used their larger 1967 study, The School and Pupil Control Ideology, to examine the consequences of one finding - that counsellors were significantly less

custodial in their PCI than teachers. The sample included 945 elementary and secondary teachers, and 180 counsellors. In organisational theory, the attitudes and behaviour of school personnel are in part explained in terms of efforts to maintain and enhance status relative to others. Pupils are a serious potential threat to teacher status, but are less so for counsellors, who are not directly responsible for pupil control.

While it might seem that there was considerable potential for conflict between counsellors and teachers over matters of pupil control, Willower et al felt open conflict was smothered by the weight of other demands from within the organisation, and pressures from without. Behaviour and ideology were not necessarily in step. Counsellors adapted in part to the views of their teacher colleagues by supportive behaviour to help maintain the equilibrium of the organisation.

The socialization of teachers into their roles has been treated in a number of studies. A group of students were followed through their student teaching period and their first two teaching years by Hoy (1967, 1968, 1969). The total group, and both elementary and secondary student

teachers, were found to be considerably more custodial after the student teaching experience. The level of PCI for all groups was even more custodial for the first year of teaching. There was no significant change in PCI after the second year of teaching.

Roberts (1969) also examined this trend. He found the change in PCI was related to the student teachers' perception of the co-operating teachers' PCI and to the socialization pressure of the student teaching experience. Jones and Blankenship (1970) linked humanistic PCI among biology teachers to those classroom practices where the teacher was able to play a major role in teacher-pupil interaction.

The question of a link between PCI and professional orientation of classroom teachers was examined by Willower and Landis (1970). They found the two variables were only weakly related to one another. Yuskiewicz (1971) linked job satisfaction to the congruence between the PCI held by the teacher and the PCI of the teachers' colleagues and of the principal, as perceived by the teacher. Teachers felt more satisfied if they perceived the principal and their colleagues as sharing their views on pupil control.

C : Personal Qualities and PCI

Roberts (1969) reported that extremely custodial teachers were more direct in their behaviour than extremely humanistic teachers. Helsel's first 1971 study linked status obedience to custodialism in PSI. This was one indicator that psychological variables helped determine educators' attitudes to pupil control. In his second 1971 study, on values held and PCI, he found traditionalism in educators' values to be positively related to custodialism in their PCI.

McAndrew (1971) found no connection between level of teacher esteem and PCI, or between level of esteem and the teachers' perception of the PCI of others.

Leppert and Hoy (1972) correlated PCI and personality characteristics. They felt their results tended to support the view that ideology formation is a function both of personality and factors in the social system. Packard and Willower (1972) explored the dimensions of pluralistic ignorance. In relation to PCI, teachers and pupils both thought the other held a much greater custodial PCI than was the case. Rexford, Willower and Lynch (1972) showed that custodial teachers would verbalise more directly than humanistic teachers.

Two Australian studies affirmed aspects of the model of a custodial school that were drawn in The School and Pupil Control Ideology. Bartlett (1976) reported such teacher attitudes as emphasis on content, teacher direction, rigid classroom procedures, and social disengagement from pupils, in custodial schools. In 1977, Bartlett found links between custodial PCI and a custodial attitude, an emphasis on subject matter, and control behaviour by teachers.

Closed-mindedness was associated with custodialism by Helsel (1976); this in turn influenced custodial pupil control behaviour. Nachtsheim and Hoy (1976) found that a custodial PCI and an autocratic family ideology underlay authoritarian personalities. A positive relationship between teacher self-actualization and humanism in PCI was reported by Noll, Willower and Barnette (1977).

In Australia, McArthur (1978) confirmed earlier North American findings that beginning teachers experience a shift in their ideology from idealistic humanism to a more realistic, more custodial view during their initial teaching. In 1979 he reported that this shift entered a plateau phase during the first five years of

teaching. Jones (1981) found a buildup of stress among student teachers who resist the socialization process by which they shift their attitude in the direction of the custodial attitude held by their co-operating teachers. Willower and Lawrence (1979) found some support for their view that there was a link between custodial views on pupil control and teacher perceptions of student threat to teacher status.

D : Principals and PCI

Two studies have reported on principals and PCI. Hoy and Appleberry (1970) reported on teacher-principal relationships in humanistic and custodial elementary schools. School climate and PCI were linked significantly in four areas: thrust, disengagement, esprit and aloofness. Humanistic schools were significantly more open than custodial schools.

In 1980, Long and Willower showed that teachers rated principals' leadership highly when their own views on pupil control were similar to their perception of the principals' views.

E : Students and PCI

Hoy (1971) showed a relationship between student alienation and custodialism in secondary schools. Deibert and Hoy (1977) reported an inverse relationship between student self-actualization and custodial orientation in schools.

F : Trends in the Study of PCI

Three articles have been grouped under this heading. Each is a summary of the use of PCI in research, but in different countries. They are valuable in dispelling the notion that PCI is timebound and placebound; as well, they help sum up the state of research on PCI and bring it nearer to the present day.

Willower (1975) pointed to the following personal features associated with humanistic teacher PCI: low dogmatism, low status obeisance, creativity, self-actualization, teacher interpersonal needs, a high sense of power, and commitment to emergent values.

Traditionalism in value orientation and teacher status obeisance were associated with custodial teacher PCI.

Teacher level of self-esteem, race, and twelve personality characteristics could not be assigned to either end of the PCI continuum.

Humanistic aspects of schools were: more pupil-centred behaviour, a more favourable attitude to innovation, and an open school climate. Custodial aspects of schools were: student unrest and alienation, and absenteeism in lower socio-economic schools. Principals, counsellors, elementary teachers and women elementary teachers were more humanistic than men elementary teachers and secondary school teachers. Pluralistic ignorance was associated with custodialism.

Willower commented that the research he reported on was time-bound and placebound to American public schools. However, studies in Canada and in Australia can partly dispel this notion.

Hamalian (1979) reported on a study of a sample of 202 teachers in Montreal, Canada. Female teachers and elementary and preschool teachers had a humanistic PCI: male teachers and secondary teachers were associated with a custodial PCI. Hamalian commented

that there were lower means for PCI of teachers in this study than in the USA.

Fisher (1980) reported on studies of PCI in ACT schools in 1973 and 1978. In 1973 open plan education schools in a 5-school sample were more humanistic than traditional schools. In 1978 a sample of 49 teachers in 4 primary schools reported trends opposite to those of previous research: older teachers were less custodial than younger teachers, and females were more custodial than males. Fisher felt these teachers were perhaps responding to the political and economic pressures in the ACT community of the time.

Fisher further reported that in one high school females were significantly more custodial than males. At another high school, younger teachers were more custodial than those over age 30. This conclusion came from a survey of 3 high schools. For one part of the Canberra urban area he found no difference in control ideologies between the feeder primary schools and their drawing high schools. He also found little difference between the control concepts of teachers in older high schools and teachers in two new flexible space high schools. The staff of a secondary college (enrolling

students for their fifth and sixth years of secondary schooling) showed a humanistic PCI, but it was the only college surveyed.

G : SUMMARY OF REVIEW

The previous section, Themes in PCI Research, was an outline of the various trends apparent in the application of PCI theory. The main applications were to the personal qualities and the role models held by public school educators. Other uses of PCI theory were to explore the administrative style, the conditions, the climate, and the practices of schools as organisations.

Willower (1975) summarised the main results of PCI research, as outlined previously. His final comment was that schools and teachers with a humanistic PCI have what are considered to be many of the admirable qualities of the teaching profession - but that these are often very difficult to apply in practice.

An important omission from the apparent trends in PCI research is the effect on teacher PCI of the teacher's organisational role as a member of a subject faculty. Two studies not yet commented on, are the exceptions. They will be referred to in the next section.

ISSUES FOR RESEARCH

Willower, Eidell and Hoy (1967) were concerned with organisational position in their pioneer PCI study. This field study is of one important aspect of the teacher's position in ACT government high schools.

In past research teachers were viewed collectively as a single school staff, or considered as a group according to their place in the formal learning sequence provided by schools. In the past, classroom teachers were compared with administrators or with school counsellors, experienced with inexperienced teachers, elementary with secondary teachers, and so on. But in most ACT government high schools, groups of teachers led by Senior Teachers are organised into subject faculties or departments. These subjects have long been labelled as practical or humanities. There was an intuitive sense of a relationship between this organisational position of the teacher, and the attitude of the teacher to pupil control. The field study focuses on the suspected relationship.

Jones and Garner (1978) surveyed the PCI of teachers in middle schools (Grades 5-8). In reporting that upper

grade teachers were more custodial than lower grade teachers, they felt it was because the training of the upper grade teachers offered a subject-centred approach to teaching.

McArthur (1979) contacted a group of 800 Victorian trainee teachers in 1972 to survey their PCI over their first five years of teaching. Of this original sample, 534 (70.5%) completed a followup questionnaire in 1973. This showed that teachers of physical sciences and practical subjects like physical education and home economics, were much more custodial than teachers of humanities subjects (english, history, languages). In a 1978 followup of 358 of his original sample, he reported that 133 teachers of science and practical subjects were much more custodial than 141 teachers of humanities subjects.

The main reason for this field study is to affirm or otherwise the relationship between teacher organisational position in a subject faculty and their attitude toward pupil control. This relationship, if it is found, has implications for school administration policy on pupil control. For instance, variety in rather than school-

wide policies on discipline and behaviour could be considered by the staff of a school. The consequence could be more consistency in staff and student attitudes to acceptable behaviour. At the very least, some light would be shed on present observed anomalies in teacher attitudes to school discipline.

The same considerations motivate replication of earlier studies on links between sex, age, teaching experience, administrative role, and teacher PCI. It is useful to confirm that PCI research can give ACT government high schools in the 1980's the insights it gave North American schools in the late 1960's and in the 1970's.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

This field study uses the ex post facto model to study the possible connections between PCI as a dependent variable, and a number of independent variables in the history of the subjects. The subjects were ACT government high school teachers, placed in one of two groups according to a classification of their position in the high school organisation as a member of either a practical subject faculty or a humanities subject faculty.

The teachers completed a PCI Form and results from the two faculty groups were compared. The groups were also compared according to the variables of age, sex, teaching experience, teaching subject, administration level and school. It was expected that PCI scores would allow teachers to be placed on a continuum ranging from a custodial to a humanistic orientation. Statistically significant differences between any of the variables would be the basis for discussion of likely sources of variance.

The weakness of this method of research is that it points to functional rather than causal relationships

among the variables. As the subjects of this study could not be controlled in the fashion of a controlled experiment, the results could well be influenced by factors apart from the variables. The limitations of this kind of research mean that any conclusions are circumscribed.

THE RESEARCH DESIGN

The design considered appropriate to the problem was to administer the PCI Form questionnaire to a sample of ACT government high school teachers. The dependent variable for this study was PCI. Independent variables were teacher age, sex and aspects of their professional careers - how long they had been in teaching, their subject faculty, major teaching area (i.e. main teaching subject), level of school administration, and school they worked in. These aspects were recorded as follows:

Sex: Recorded as Male or Female.

Level of School Administration: Shown as 1, 2, 3 or 4 according to the Band level.

Age: Shown as a numeral referring to age that year.

How Long in Teaching: Shown as a numeral as of that year.

Subject Faculty: 21 faculties were identified and coded.

Major Teaching Area: 39 areas were identified by the respondents and coded as their main teaching subject.

School: The five schools in which the respondents worked were coded from 1 to 5.

Statistical hypotheses were devised by considering the relationships between PCI and the variables offered by the subjects. An operational form of the statistical hypothesis is that there is no statistically significant difference between each of the independent variables of each of the subjects as shown by their scores on the PCI Form.

DELINEATION OF RESEARCH DESIGN

The dependent and independent variables were arranged and tested in the following fashion:

- 1(a) Practical subject faculties (PCI scores) vs. humanities subject faculties (PCI scores) :
 - (b) t-test for independent samples.

- 2(a) Practical subjects (PCI scores) vs. humanities subjects (PCI scores) :
 - (b) t-test for independent samples.

- 3(a) Zero to four years teaching experience (PCI scores) vs. more than four years teaching experience (PCI scores) :
 - (b) t-test for independent samples.

- 4(a) Zero to four years teaching experience (PCI scores) vs. five to nine years teaching experience (PCI scores) vs. more than nine years teaching experience (PCI scores) :
 - (b) one-way analysis of variance.

- 5(a) Teachers aged 29 years or less (PCI scores) vs. teachers aged 30 years or more (PCI scores) :
 - (b) t-test for independent samples.

- 6(a) Band 1 teachers (PCI scores) vs. Band 2 teachers (PCI scores) vs. Band 3 teachers (PCI scores) vs. Band 4 teachers (PCI scores) :
 - (b) one-way analysis of variance.

7(a) Male teachers (PCI scores) vs. female teachers (PCI scores) :

(b) t-test for independent samples.

8(a) Teachers at School 1 (PCI scores) vs. teachers at School 2 (PCI scores) vs. teachers at School 3 (PCI scores) vs. teachers at School 4 (PCI scores) vs. teachers at School 5 (PCI scores) :

(b) one-way analysis of variance.

Steps one to five, six and seven were repeated for the respondents from School 4.

POPULATION

The total population comprised the teaching staff of seventeen ACT government high schools. It was not possible physically to survey all schools. It was also not necessary: the Canberra urban area has been formed into four major towns by the planning of the National Capital Development Commission. These towns are all alike socially, economically and geographically. It was expected that the staff of high schools in one of the town areas would supply representative data.

The Belconnen town area was selected for the survey because the researcher's high school was one of the six Belconnen schools. One school declined to take part because, its Principal explained, it had been heavily involved in the research leading to the Steinle Report on ACT government high schools (The Challenge of Change). Its staff wanted a respite from surveys.

The total sample available was 275 out of a total population of 942 not including counsellors. Teachers were asked to name both the subject faculty they belonged to and their major teaching area. Responses are shown arranged in two groups: Faculty/Band/School and Major Teaching Area/School. These are in Tables 1 and 2.

TABLE 1 : RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE BY FACULTY/BAND/SCHOOL

FACULTY	BAND	SCHOOL 1				SCHOOL 2				SCHOOL 3				SCHOOL 4				SCHOOL 5				TOTALS				
		B4	B3	B2	B1	B4	B3	B2	B1	B4	B3	B2	B1	B4	B3	B2	B1	B4	B3	B2	B1	B4	B3	B2	B1	
ENGLISH	B234			2				1					1		1		1						2		4	
	B1				1				1			3				4									9	
HISTORY	B234														2										2	
	B1															1									1	
HUMANITIES	B234																	1	2				1	2		
	B1																			2					2	
SOCIAL SCIENCES	B234			1				1							1										3	
	B1				1											3									4	
LIBRARIAN	B234																									
	B1															2				1					3	
SPECIAL EDUCATION	B234																									
	B1															3									3	
REMEDIAL READING	B234																									
	B1								1																1	
LANGUAGES	B234			1			1	1							1								1	3		
	B1				2						1					2									5	
MATHEMATICS	B234									1				1	1								2	1		
	B1				1											4				2				7		
SCIENCE	B234			1			1		1						1						1			3		
	B1				3			4			4					6				2				19		
HOME SCIENCE /ECONOMICS	B234														1									1		
	B1							2								3			2					7		
PERFORMING ARTS	B234																									
	B1							1								2									3	
ART/INDUSTRIAL ARTS	B234													1	1			1					2	1		
	B1								2			1				6			2					11		
P.E./HUMAN PERFORMANCE	B234														1				1					2		
	B1				2			3								3			2					10		
TOTALS				5	10		1	4	14	1	1		9	1	2	10	39	1	2	3	13	3	6	22	85	
				15				19				11				52				19				116		

TABLE 2 : RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE BY MAJOR
TEACHING AREA AND SCHOOL

SUBJECT	SCHOOL					
	1	2	3	4	5	
AGRICULTURE				2		2
ART		2		2	1	5
BIOLOGY				1		1
CHEMISTRY		1	1			2
COMMERCE						
DRAMA				1		1
DRAWING					1	1
ENGLISH	2	1	1	5	1	10
ENGLISH LANGUAGE			2			2
FRENCH	3			1		4
GEOGRAPHY	1	1		2		4
GEOLOGY				1		1
GENERAL PRIMARY					1	1
GERMAN		1		1		2
HISTORY				4		4
HOME ECONOMICS		2			2	4
HOME SCIENCE				2		2
HUMANITIES					3	3
HUMAN PERFORMANCE	1					1
INDONESIAN			1			1
INDUSTRIAL ARTS			1	3	1	5
LANGUAGES		1		1		2
LIBRARY				2	1	3
LIVING SKILLS		1				1
MATHEMATICS	1		1	7	1	10
METALWORK				1		1
MUSIC		1		1		2
NEEDLEWORK				2		2
PHYSICAL EDUCATION	1	2		4	3	10
READING		1				1
REMEDIAL ENG./MATHS				1		1
SCIENCE	4	3	4	3	2	16
SECRETARIAL STUDIES	1					1
SOCIAL SCIENCE				1		1
SPORT & RECREATION		1				1
TEXTILES						
WOODWORK				2		2
ENGLISH/HISTORY		1		2	2	5
ENGLISH/COMMERCE	1					1
TOTALS	15	19	11	52	19	116

INSTRUMENTATION

The PCI Form devised by Willower, Eidell and Hoy (1967) was used to gather the data for this field study. The PCI Form has 20 Likert-type items with 5 response categories for each item. The categories range from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The theoretical range of scores is from 20 to 100 and the higher the score, the more custodial the pupil control ideology. Of the 20 items, 18 are framed to be positive to the custodial viewpoint; the other two are framed to be positive to the humanistic outlook.

Reliability coefficients for the final draft of the PCI Form as reported by Willower et al, were .91 with the Pearson product moment formula, and .95 with the Spearman-Brown formula (using a sample size of 170). Validation procedure followed the known groups method by using school principals to judge the PCI of a certain number of their teaching staff. Willower et al concluded that by the standards usually applied, their instrument appeared to be relatively reliable and valid. Later studies, reported on in Chapter II of the field study, have established the PCI Form as a useful measure in this field.

A factor analysis was carried out on the 20 items of the PCI Form using Subprogram Factor of the SPSS system (Nie et al, 1975). The power of factor analysis is in its ability to find and quantify patterns of variables: in this case, to confirm that scores on the PCI Form are valid. Table 3 shows the eigenvalues obtained in generating five factors during the analysis. A very large proportion of the variance is accounted for by the first factor, which as it should be, and confirms the findings of previous studies as to the validity of the PCI Form.

TABLE 3 : EIGENVALUES IN FACTOR ANALYSIS

FACTOR	EIGENVALUE	PCT OF VAR	CUM PCT
1	5.98003	69.4	69.4
2	.74431	8.6	78.1
3	.74108	8.6	86.7
4	.62659	7.3	94.0
5	.51887	6.0	100.0

FIELD PROCEDURES

Contact was first made in writing with the principals of six high schools in the Belconnen area of the ACT. Their approval was requested to establish personal contact with the teaching staffs of their schools to conduct the survey. At the same time approval for the research was sought from Dr. W. Donovan, Principal Education Officer, Evaluation and Research Section, ACT Schools Office. This is a standard formality. Favourable replies were received from Dr. Donovan, and from the principals of five of the schools after follow-up phone calls. Copies of letters sent are in Appendix I.

The researcher arranged for a senior teacher in four of the high schools to be the contact person in the distribution and collection of the survey forms. The researcher would do this in his own school. Each form had a covering letter attached explaining its purpose (see Appendix I). Survey forms were given to each school contact in June, and completed forms were collected in July. A summary of responses is shown in Table 4.

TABLE 4 : SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESPONSES

	SCHOOL	NO. RESPONSES	NO. STAFF	% RETURN
	1	15	65	23.0
	2	19	64	29.6
	3	11	46	23.9
	4	52	61	85.25
	5	19	39	48.71
TOTAL	5	116	275	42.18

The overall rate of return of under 43% was disappointing. On reflection, it could have been increased if the researcher had visited all schools to talk to their staffs before distributing the questionnaire. The advantages of this personal contact would have been to make the survey more meaningful to the respondents, and increase their willingness to take part. In the researcher's own school the 85.25% rate of returns was partly due to personal contact, to willingness by the researcher to remind people frequently, and to his knowing from which faculties returns were due.

Written reminders could have been distributed shortly after the survey forms went out, to encourage more teachers to complete and return their forms. The demands of the questionnaire may have been unappealing, in that too much was sought from the respondents. However, the number of returns was high enough to give hope that useful results could be obtained.

THE SURVEY FORM

A copy of the form follows this section. It has three parts. The first part was designed to obtain all necessary personal and professional information to allow teacher characteristics to be related to survey data. The second part is headed Teachers' Beliefs About Discipline. It used a survey form devised by Glickman and Tamashiro (1980). The information collected in this part was not used in the field study.

The third part has the 20 questions of the PCI Form. The design of the survey form was such as to have all questions and information fit on two sides of an A4 size sheet. The intention of the form design was to collect responses to two research instruments, but the PCI Form responses were the main data for the field study.

SURVEY OF TEACHER ATTITUDES TOWARDS DISCIPLINE

Please tick the appropriate space: MALE () FEMALE () - BAND 1 () BAND 2 () BAND 3 () BAND 4 ()

Please write in the space provided: (1) Your age in years: _____
 (2) Your years of teaching experience - at this school _____
 - overall _____
 (3) The name of your subject faculty: _____
 (4) Your major teaching area: _____

TEACHERS' BELIEFS ABOUT DISCIPLINE

Three schools of thought about teachers' beliefs on discipline have been identified:

A. The Non-Interventionists believe that misbehaviour is the result of unresolved inner conflicts. Individuals who are given the opportunity and appropriate support will be able to bring to the conscious level their inner difficulties and will be able to solve their own misbehaviours. In other words, students are masters of their own destiny and have the inherent capability to solve their own problems. Teachers should not impose their own rules but should allow students to reason for themselves. According to this school of thought, the student is given high control and the teacher low.

B. The Interactionalists believe that students learn to behave as a result of encountering the outside world of objects and people. Students must learn to accommodate to others as others learn to accommodate to them. Thus, the solution to misbehaviour is a reciprocal relationship between student and teacher (or classmates). One does not make one's own solution but rather is confronted with the realities of living with others and abiding by rules of behaviour that are satisfactory to all parties. Both teacher and student share equal control over each other.

C. The Interventionists believe that students learn to behave only as certain behaviours are reinforced, so a student's misbehaviour is the result of inadequate rewards or punishments. The teacher must set the standards and go about efficiently and consistently shaping the appropriate behaviour. The way students learn to behave is for a teacher to systematically teach those standards. The inner or reciprocal worlds of the student are not important. The teacher exerts high control over the student.

WHAT ARE YOUR BELIEFS ON DISCIPLINE?

PART 1:

Instructions: Rank order the discipline models according to how you think you generally believe. Place 1 next to the model you think most dominates your beliefs, 2 next to the second, and 3 next to the third.

1A: INTERVENTIONIST: _____ NON-INTERVENTIONIST: _____ INTERACTIONIST: _____

Next, answer the following questions by ticking the appropriate space:

In handling classroom discipline, how often do you think you take:	Nearly 100% of the time	About 75% of the time	About 50% of the time	About 25% of the time	Nearly 0% of the time
1B: an Interventionist rather than either a Non-Interventionist or an Interactionalist position:					
1C: a Non-Interventionist rather than either an Interventionist or an Interactionalist position:					
1D: an Interactionalist rather than either an Interventionist or a Non-Interventionist position:					

PART 2:

Instructions: For each question below there are two statements, A and B. Choose the statement that is closest to how you feel. You might not agree with either choice, but you must choose one. Circle either A or B, but not both. Please be sure to answer all 12 items.

1. A - Students are not always capable of making rational and moral decisions.
B - Students' inner emotions and capacity for decision making must always be considered legitimate and valid.
2. A - Generally, I assign students to specific seats or areas in the classroom.
B - Generally, my seating (or work area) placements are open to negotiation.
3. A - Even though students are not fully mature, teachers should give them responsibilities and choices.
B - Students should not be expected to be fully responsible for their decisions because they are strongly influenced by teachers, parents, friends and TV.
4. When the noise level in my classroom bothers me, I will most likely:
A - Discuss my discomfort with the students, and attempt to come to a compromise with them about noise levels during activity periods.
B - Allow the activity to continue as long as the noise is not disturbing or upsetting any student.
5. During class, if a student wrecks a classmate's portable cassette player, I as the teacher will most likely:
A - Scold both students, one for disrespecting others' property, and the other for breaking a rule prohibiting personal radios and players in school.
B - Avoid interfering in something that the students (and possibly their parents) need to resolve themselves.

- 6. If students unanimously agree that a classroom rule is unjust and should be removed but I (the teacher) disagree with them, then
 - A - The rule probably should be removed, and replaced by a rule made by the students.
 - B - The students and I should jointly decide on a fair rule.
- 7. When a student does not join a group activity,
 - A - The teacher should explain the value of the activity to the student, and encourage the student to participate.
 - B - The teacher should attempt to identify the student's reasons for not joining, and to create activities that meet the needs of the student.
- 8. During the first week of class I will most likely:
 - A - Allow the students to interact freely and initiate any rulemaking.
 - B - Announce the classroom rules and inform students how the rules will be fairly enforced.
- 9.
 - A - Students' creativity and self-expression should be encouraged and nurtured as much as possible.
 - B - Limits on destructive behaviours have to be set without denying students their sense of choice and decision.
- 10. If a student interrupts my lesson by talking to a neighbour, I will most likely:
 - A - Move the child away from other students and continue the lesson; class time should not be wasted on account of one student.
 - B - Tell students about my annoyance and conduct a discussion with students about how they feel when being interrupted.
- 11.
 - A - A good educator is firm but fair in disciplining violators of school rules.
 - B - A good educator discusses several alternative disciplinary actions with a student who violates a school rule.
- 12. When one of the more conscientious students does not complete an assignment on time:
 - A - I know the student has a legitimate reason, and that the student on his/her own will turn in the assignment.
 - B - I tell the student that she/he was expected to turn in the assignment when it was due, and then with the student we will jointly decide on the next steps.

PART 3:

Instructions: Following are twenty statements about schools, teachers, and pupils. Please indicate your personal opinion about each statement by ticking the appropriate response at the right of the statement:

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
1. It is desirable to require pupils to sit in assigned seats during assemblies.					
2. Pupils are usually not capable of solving their problems through logical reasoning.					
3. Directing sarcastic remarks toward a defiant pupil is a good disciplinary technique.					
4. Beginning teachers are not likely to maintain strict enough control over their pupils.					
5. Teachers should consider revision of their teaching methods if these are criticized by their pupils.					
6. The best principals give unquestioning support to teachers in disciplining pupils.					
7. Pupils should not be permitted to contradict the statements of a teacher in class.					
8. It is justifiable to have pupils learn many facts about a subject even if they have no immediate application.					
9. Too much time is spent on guidance and activities and too little on academic preparation.					
10. Becoming friendly with pupils often leads them to become too familiar.					
11. It is more important for pupils to learn to obey rules than that they make their own decisions.					
12. Student governments are a good "safety valve" but should not have much influence on school policy.					
13. Pupils can be trusted to work together without supervision.					
14. If a pupil uses obscene or profane language in school, it must be considered a moral offence.					
15. If pupils are allowed to use the toilet without getting permission, this privilege will be abused.					
16. A few pupils are just young hoodlums and should be treated accordingly.					
17. It is often necessary to remind pupils that their status in school differs from that of teachers.					
18. A pupil who destroys school material or property should be severely punished.					
19. Pupils cannot perceive the difference between democracy and anarchy in the classroom.					
20. Pupils often misbehave in order to make the teacher look bad.					

DATA COLLECTION AND RECORDING

Those survey forms which were returned were identified, for later reference, by a number signifying the school and response. For example, forms from School 1 were numbered from 1/1 to 1/15. A format was devised for placing survey data on an 80-column IBM-type punch card for processing on the Univac 1100 Computer at the ANU Computer Centre. All data was transposed into numerals which were punched onto 65 columns of the punch card.

Data was grouped as:

Columns 1 to 12 : Information on teachers.

Columns 13 to 32 : PCI Form responses.

Columns 33 to 38 : Choice of discipline models.

Columns 39 to 62 : Responses to forced-choice questions.

Columns 63 to 65 : School and survey form coding.

Specific responses to the survey form questions were recorded as shown in Table 5. Tables 6 and 7 display the coding used to record major teaching areas and subject faculties.

TABLE 5 : CODED RESPONSES TO SURVEY FORM QUESTIONS

PUNCH CARD COLUMN	NUMERALS USED	DATA RECORDED FROM SURVEY FORM RESPONSES
1	1 or 2	Male or Female
2	1 to 4	Band 1,2,3,4
3	0 to 9	Age of Teachers
4	0 to 9	
5	0 to 9	Years of Teaching Experience at this
6	0 to 9	school
7	0 to 9	Years of Teaching Experience overall
8	0 to 9	
9	0 to 9	Name of Subject Faculty
10	0 to 9	
11	0 to 9	Major Teaching Area
12	0 to 9	
13	5 to 1	Part 3-statement 1
14	5 to 1	Part 3-statement 2
15	5 to 1	Part 3-statement 3
16	5 to 1	Part 3-statement 4
17	1 to 5	Part 3-statement 5
18	5 to 1	Part 3-statement 6
19	5 to 1	Part 3-statement 7
20	5 to 1	Part 3-statement 8
21	5 to 1	Part 3-statement 9
22	5 to 1	Part 3-statement 10
23	5 to 1	Part 3-statement 11
24	5 to 1	Part 3-statement 12
25	1 to 5	Part 3-statement 13
26	5 to 1	Part 3-statement 14
27	5 to 1	Part 3-statement 15
28	5 to 1	Part 3-statement 16
29	5 to 1	Part 3-statement 17
30	5 to 1	Part 3-statement 18
31	5 to 1	Part 3-statement 19
32	5 to 1	Part 3-statement 20
33	1 to 3	Part 1: 1A-Interventionist
34	1 to 3	Part 1: 1A-Non interventionist
35	1 to 3	Part 1: 1A-Interactionist
36	1 to 5	Part 1: 1B
37	1 to 5	Part 1: 1C
38	1 to 5	Part 1: 1D
39	0 or 1	Part 2: 1A
40	0 or 1	Part 2: 1B

TABLE 5 CONTINUED :

PUNCH CARD COLUMN	NUMERALS USED	DATA RECORDED FROM SURVEY FORM RESPONSES
41	0 or 1	Part 2: 2A
42	0 or 1	Part 2: 2B
43	0 or 1	Part 2: 3A
44	0 or 1	Part 2: 3B
45	0 or 1	Part 2: 4A
46	0 or 1	Part 2: 4B
47	0 or 1	Part 2: 5A
48	0 or 1	Part 2: 5B
49	0 or 1	Part 2: 6A
50	0 or 1	Part 2: 6B
51	0 or 1	Part 2: 7A
52	0 or 1	Part 2: 7B
53	0 or 1	Part 2: 8A
54	0 or 1	Part 2: 8B
55	0 or 1	Part 2: 9A
56	0 or 1	Part 2: 9B
57	0 or 1	Part 2: 10A
58	0 or 1	Part 2: 10B
59	0 or 1	Part 2: 11A
60	0 or 1	Part 2: 11B
61	0 or 1	Part 2: 12A
62	0 or 1	Part 2: 12B
63	1 to 5	Schools 1 to 5
64	0 to 9	Number Code of each Survey Form
65	0 to 9	

TABLE 6 : CODING OF MAJOR TEACHING AREAS

(TEACHING SUBJECTS)

CODE	MAJOR TEACHING AREA
01	AGRICULTURE
02	ART
03	BIOLOGY
04	CHEMISTRY
05	COMMERCE
06	DRAMA
07	DRAWING
08	ENGLISH
09	ENGLISH LANGUAGE
10	FRENCH
11	GEOGRAPHY
12	GEOLOGY
13	GENERAL PRIMARY
14	GERMAN
15	HISTORY
16	HOME ECONOMICS
17	HOME SCIENCE
18	HUMANITIES
19	HUMAN PERFORMANCE
20	INDONESIAN
21	INDUSTRIAL ARTS
22	LANGUAGES
23	LIBRARY
24	LIVING SKILLS
25	MATHS
26	METALWORK
27	MUSIC
28	NEEDLEWORK
29	PHYSICAL EDUCATION
30	READING
31	REMEDIAL ENGLISH AND MATHS
32	SCIENCE
33	SECRETARIAL STUDIES
34	SOCIAL SCIENCE
35	SPORT AND RECREATION
36	TEXTILES
37	WOODWORK
38	ENGLISH/HISTORY
39	ENGLISH/COMMERCE

TABLE 7 : CODING OF SUBJECT FACULTIES

<u>CODE</u>	<u>FACULTY</u>
01	ART
02	ENGLISH
03	ENGLISH/HISTORY
04	HISTORY
05	HOME ECONOMICS/HOME SCIENCE
06	HUMANITIES
07	INDUSTRIAL ARTS
08	LANGUAGES
09	LIBRARY
10	MATHS
11	LANGUAGES/PERFORMING ARTS
12	HUMAN PERFORMANCE
13	PHYSICAL EDUCATION
14	REMEDIAL READING
15	SCIENCE
16	SOCIAL SCIENCE
17	SPECIAL EDUCATION
18	not assigned
19	MUSIC
20	ENGLISH/SOCIAL SCIENCE
21	DRAMA

Tables 8 to 13 record PCI scores and specific details of variables for each respondent in Schools 1 to 5.

TABLE 8 : LIST OF CASES BY NUMBER, FACULTY, SUBJECT
CODE AND PCI SCORE

CODE	CASE-NO.	FACULTY	SUBJECT	PCI SCORE
School 1/1	1	2	8	48
2	2	2	8	45
3	3	20	39	61
4	4	10	25	67
5	5	15	32	47
6	6	15	32	56
7	7	15	32	59
8	8	15	13	0
9	9	16	11	64
10	10	16	33	60
11	11	8	10	37
12	12	8	10	46
13	13	8	10	58
14	14	12	19	52
15	15	12	29	48
School 2/1	16	8	22	57
2	17	2	8	35
3	18	2	38	48
4	19	15	32	41
5	20	15	4	49
6	21	15	24	56
7	22	15	32	44
8	23	15	32	64
9	24	16	11	63
10	25	5	16	69
11	26	5	16	66
12	27	1	2	45
13	28	1	2	49
14	29	8	14	51
15	30	19	27	51
16	31	12	29	42
17	32	12	29	49
18	33	12	35	56
19	34	14	30	70
School 3/1	35	15	32	75
2	36	10	25	66
3	37	2	0	51
4	38	2	9	52
5	39	2	8	46
6	40	15	4	56
7	41	15	32	55
8	42	15	1	48
9	43	15	32	43
10	44	7	21	61
11	45	8	20	51

TABLE 8 CONTINUED :

CODE	CASE-NO.	FACULTY	SUBJECT	PCI SCORE
School 4/1	46	3	38	53
2	47	7	21	61
3	48	10	25	43
4	49	2	8	52
5	50	3	8	48
6	51	3	8	58
7	52	3	38	55
8	53	3	8	61
9	54	4	15	38
10	55	4	38	48
11	56	4	15	52
12	57	10	25	57
13	58	10	25	53
14	59	10	25	35
15	60	10	25	77
16	61	10	25	52
17	62	15	32	40
18	63	15	1	65
19	64	15	3	43
20	65	15	12	52
21	66	15	1	55
22	67	15	32	60
23	68	15	32	48
24	69	16	11	54
25	70	16	15	53
26	71	16	11	57
27	72	16	0	66
28	73	5	16	56
29	74	5	16	46
30	75	5	28	60
31	76	5	28	61
32	77	7	21	54
33	78	1	2	49
34	79	7	37	46
35	80	7	21	40
36	81	7	26	53
37	82	7	2	58
38	83	7	37	62
39	84	8	22	67
40	85	11	27	63
41	86	8	10	55
42	87	8	14	46
43	88	21	6	50
44	89	12	29	54
45	90	12	29	58

TABLE 8 CONTINUED :

CODE	CASE-NO.	FACULTY	SUBJECT	PCI SCORE
46	91	12	29	65
47	92	12	29	54
48	93	9	23	51
49	94	9	23	47
50	95	17	8	55
51	96	10	31	55
52	97	17	31	39
School 5/1	98	18	38	27
2	99	6	38	44
3	100	7	21	51
4	101	6	18	32
5	102	6	18	44
6	103	6	8	49
7	104	6	18	46
8	105	10	13	53
9	106	10	25	58
10	107	15	32	29
11	108	15	32	54
12	109	5	16	58
13	110	5	16	57
14	111	7	7	71
15	112	12	29	45
16	113	12	29	0
17	114	12	29	55
18	115	9	23	55
19	116	0	0	56

TABLE 9 : INFORMATION ON VARIABLES - SCHOOL 1

CODE	SEX		BAND	AGE		TEACHING EXP.			SUBJECT FACULTY	MAJOR TEACHING AREA
	M	F		U.30	30+	U.5	5-9	10+		
1/1		*	2		*		*		English	English
1/2	*		2		*			*	English	English
1/3		*	1	*		*			Eng/Social Sc	Eng/Commerce
1/4		*	1		*		*		Mathematics	Mathematics
1/5	*		2		*			*	Science	Science
1/6		*	1		*			*	Science	Science
1/7		*	1		*			*	Science	General Science
1/8	*		1		*			*	Science	Primary/Gen. Sec
1/9	*		2		*			*	Social Science	Geog/Comm/Ecs/BK
1/10		*	1		*			*	Social Science	Sec. Studies/Comm
1/11		*	1	*		*			Languages	French/German
1/12	*		2		*		*		Languages	French
1/13	*		1		*			*	Languages	French/German
1/14		*	1	*			*		Human Perform	Human Perform
1/15		*	1		*			*	Phys. Ed	Phys. Ed
15	6	9	B2 5 B1 10	3	12	2	4	9		
TOTALS										

N.B. U = Under, in years
+ = More than, in years

TABLE 10 : INFORMATION ON VARIABLES - SCHOOL 2

CODE	SEX		BAND	AGE		TEACHING EXP.			SUBJECT FACULTY	MAJOR TEACHING AREA
	M	F		U.30	30+	U.5	5-9	10+		
2/1	*		3		*			*	Languages	Languages
2/2	*		2		*		*		English	English
2/3		*	1		*		*		English	English/History
2/4		*	2		*			*	Science	Science
2/5		*	1		*			*	Science	Chemistry
2/6		*	1		*			*	Science	Living Skills
2/7		*	1		*	*			Science	Science
2/8	*		1		*		*		Science	Science
2/9	*		2		*			*	Social Science	Geography
2/10		*	1		*			*	Home Economics	Home Economics
2/11		*	1		*			*	Home Economics	Home Economics
2/12		*	1		*		*		Art	Art
2/13		*	1		*			*	Art	Art
2/14	*		2		*			*	Languages	German
2/15		*	1		*			*	Music	Music
2/16		*	1		*		*		Phys. Ed	Phys. Ed
2/17		*	1	*			*		Phys. Ed	Phys. Ed
2/18	*		1		*		*		Phys. Ed	Sport/Recreation
2/19		*	1		*			*	Rem. Read/Math	Reading
19	6	13	B3 1 B2 4 B1 14	1	18	1	7	11		
TOTALS										

N.B. U = Under, in years
+ = More than, in years

TABLE 11 : INFORMATION ON VARIABLES - SCHOOL 3

CODE	SEX		BAND	AGE		TEACHING EXP.			SUBJECT FACULTY	MAJOR TEACHING AREA
	M	F		U.30	30+	U.5	5-9	10+		
3/1	*		4		*			*	Science	Science
3/2	*		3		*			*	Mathematics	Mathematicsc
3/3		*	1		*		*		English	English
3/4		*	1		*			*	English	Eng. Language
3/5		*	1	*		*			English	English
3/6		*	1		*			*	Science	Chemistry
3/7	*		1		*			*	Science	Science
3/8	*		1	*			*		Science/Agric	Science/Agric
3/9		*	1		*			*	Science	Science
3/10	*		1		*			*	Ind. Arts	Ind. Arts
3/11		*	1	*		*			Languages	Languages
11	5	6	B4 1 B3 1 B1 9	3	8	2	2	7		
TOTALS										

N.B. U = Under, in years
+ = More than, in years

TABLE 12 : INFORMATION ON VARIABLES - SCHOOL 4

CODE	SEX		BAND	AGE		TEACHING EXP.			SUBJECT FACULTY	MAJOR TEACHING AREA
	M	F		U.30	30+	U.5	5-9	10+		
4/1	*		4		*			*	History/English	History/English
4/2	*		3		*			*	Industrial Arts	Industrial Arts
4/3	*		3		*			*	Mathematics	Mathematics
4/4		*	2		*			*	English	English
4/5		*	1		*			*	English/History	English
4/6		*	1	*		*			English/History	English
4/7		*	1	*		*			English/History	English/History
4/8		*	1		*			*	English/History	English
4/9		*	2		*			*	History	Hist/Social Sci.
4/10	*		2		*			*	History	Hist/Eng/Social Sc
4/11	*		1		*	*			History	History
4/12	*		2		*			*	Mathematics	Mathematics
4/13		*	1	*		*			Mathematics	Mathematics
4/14	*		1	*		*			Mathematics	Mathematics
4/15	*		1		*			*	Mathematics	Mathematics
4/16	*		1		*			*	Mathematics	Mathematics
4/17		*	2		*			*	Science	Science
4/18	*		1	*		*			Science	Agriculture
4/19		*	1		*			*	Science	Biology
4/20		*	1		*			*	Science	Geology
4/21		*	1		*			*	Science	Agriculture
4/22		*	1		*	*			Science	Science
4/23	*		1	*		*			Science	Science
4/24	*		2		*			*	Social Science	Geography
4/25	*		1		*			*	Social Science	History/Soc. Sc
4/26	*		1		*			*	Social Science	Geog/ASS/CBS
4/27		*	1	*		*			Social Science	Not recorded
4/28		*	2		*			*	Home Economics	Home Science
4/29		*	1		*			*	Home Economics	Home Science
4/30		*	1		*			*	Home Science	N'work/Home Sc
4/31		*	1		*			*	Home Science	Needlework
4/32	*		2		*			*	Industrial Arts	Industrial Arts
4/33		*	1	*		*			Art	Art
4/34	*		1	*		*			Industrial Arts	Woodwork
4/35	*		1	*		*			Industrial Arts	Industrial Arts
4/36	*		1	*		*			Industrial Arts	Metalwork
4/37	*		1		*	*			Industrial Arts	Art
4/38	*		1	*		*			Industrial Arts	Woodwork
4/39		*	2		*			*	Languages	Languages
4/40	*		1		*			*	Lang/Perf. Arts	Music

TABLE 12 CONTINUED :

CODE	SEX		BAND	AGE		TEACHING EXP.			SUBJECT FACULTY	MAJOR TEACHING AREA
	M	F		U.30	30+	U.5	5-9	10+		
4/41		*	1		*		*		Languages	French/German
4/42	*		1		*	*			Languages	German
4/43		*	1		*		*		Drama	Drama
4/44	*		2		*			*	Phys. Ed	Phys. Ed
4/45	*		1	*			*		Phys. Ed	Phys. Ed
4/46		*	1	*		*			Phys. Ed	Phys. Ed
4/47		*	1	*			*		Phys. Ed	Phys. Ed
4/48		*	1		*		*		Library	Lib/Maths/Science
4/49		*	1		*			*	Library	Library
4/50		*	1		*			*	Special Ed	English/Maths
4/51		*	1		*			*	Mathematics	Remedial Eng/Math
4/52		*	1		*		*		Special Ed	Maths/English
52	24	28	B4 1 B3 2 B2 10 B1 39	15	37	17	6	29	TOTALS	

N.B. U = Under, in years

+ = More than, in years

TABLE 13 : INFORMATION ON VARIABLES - SCHOOL 5

CODE	SEX		BAND	AGE		TEACHING EXP.			SUBJECT FACULTY	MAJOR TEACHING AREA
	M	F		U.30	30+	U.5	5-9	10+		
5/1	*		4		*			*	N/A	English/History
5/2	*		3		*			*	Humanities	English/History
5/3	*		3		*			*	Industrial Arts	Industrial Arts
5/4	*		2		*			*	Humanities	Humanities
5/5		*	2		*		*		Humanities	Humanities
5/6		*	1		*		*		Humanities	English
5/7		*	1	*		*			Humanities	Humanities
5/8		*	1		*			*	Mathematics	Gen. Prim/Read/Math
5/9		*	1		*		*		Mathematics	Mathematics
5/10	*		1		*			*	Science	Science
5/11	*		1		*		*		Science	Science
5/12		*	1		*			*	Home Ec/Library	Home Economics
5/13		*	1		*			*	Home Science	Home Ec/Textiles
5/14	*		1	*		*			Industrial Arts	Drawing
5/15	*		2		*			*	Phys. Ed	Phys. Ed
5/16	*		1	*			*		Phys. Ed	Phys. Ed
5/17		*	1		*		*		Phys. Ed	Phys. Ed
5/18		*	1	*		*			Library	Lib/Living Skills
5/19		*	1		*				Communications	Art
19	9	10	B4 1 B3 2 B2 3 B1 13	4	15	3	6	9		
TOTALS										

N.B. U = Under, in years
+ = More than, in years

TABLE 14 : SUMMARY OF INFORMATION ON VARIABLES
OF CASES FOR SCHOOLS 1 TO 5

	CODE	SEX		AGE		TEACHING EXP.			BAND			
		M	F	U.30	30+	U.5	5-9	30+	4	3	2	1
SCHOOL 1	15	6	9	3	12	2	4	9	-	-	5	10
SCHOOL 2	19	6	13	1	18	1	7	11	1	-	4	14
SCHOOL 3	11	5	6	3	8	2	2	7	1	1	-	9
SCHOOL 4	52	24	28	15	37	17	6	29	1	2	10	39
SCHOOL 5	19	9	10	4	15	3	6	9*	1	2	3	13
TOTALS	116	50	66	26	90	25	25	65	4	5	22	85

N.B. U = Under, in years

+ = More than, in years

* No information from 1 respondent on teaching experience

CHAPTER IV

THE RESULTS

INTRODUCTION

The data were analysed using the SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) system of computer programs (Nie et al 1975).

In the first section are results for the population sample. Subprogram T-TEST was computed to determine the difference in means of each pair of samples for Hypotheses 1, 2, 3, 5 and 10.

Subprogram ONEWAY was computed to obtain a one-way analysis of variance with one independent variable for Hypotheses 6 through 9 and 11.

In the second section are results from the School 4 sub-sample. Tables 23 to 28 depict computed results for School 4 for Hypotheses 1 to 10.

Table 29 brings together in summary form statistical values produced by the SPSS package for the total sample from five independent variables: Faculty, Subject Taught, Sex, Teaching Experience and Age. This is the third section of this chapter.

Subprogram ANOVA was computed to obtain an analysis of variance between independent variables Sex and Faculty, and between Sex and Subject Taught. Results were not significant : for purposes of information, they appear in Appendix II.

MAIN RESULTSTABLE 15T-TESTVARIABLE : PRACTICAL FACULTIES BY VARIABLE : HUMANITIESFACULTIES

<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>NO. OF CASES</u>	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>STANDARD DEV.</u>	<u>STANDARD ERROR</u>	<u>F VALUE</u>	<u>2-TAIL PROB.</u>
PCI						
PRACTICAL FACULTIES	56	51.6071	13.196	1.763		
HUMANITIES FACULTIES	60	52.1833	9.527	1.230	1.92	.015

Hypothesis 1

There is no statistically significant difference between the score of teachers in practical subject faculties on the PCI Form and the scores of teachers in humanities subject faculties on the PCI Form at the 0.05 level of significance.

Decision

Reject the null hypothesis.

TABLE 16T-TEST

VARIABLE : PRACTICAL SUBJECTS BY VARIABLE : HUMANITIES
SUBJECTS

<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>NO. OF</u> <u>CASES</u>	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>STANDARD</u> <u>DEV.</u>	<u>STANDARD</u> <u>ERROR</u>	<u>F</u> <u>VALUE</u>	<u>2-TAIL</u> <u>PROB.</u>
PCI						
PRACTICAL SUBJECTS	57	51.6316	13.079	1.732		
HUMANITIES SUBJECTS	59	52.1695	9.608	1.251	1.85	.021

Hypothesis 2

There is no statistically significant difference between the scores of teachers of practical subjects on the PCI Form and the scores of teachers of humanities subjects on the PCI Form at the 0.05 level of significance.

Decision

Reject the null hypothesis.

TABLE 17T-TESTVARIABLE : LOWEST THRU 4 YEARS OF TEACHING BYVARIABLE : 5 THRU HIGHEST YEARS OF TEACHING

<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>NO. OF CASES</u>	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>STANDARD DEV.</u>	<u>STANDARD ERROR</u>	<u>F VALUE</u>	<u>2-TAIL PROB.</u>
<u>PCI</u>						
LOWEST THRU 4	26	53.0000	9.196	1.803		
					1.70	.133
5 THRU HIGHEST	90	51.5889	11.987	1.264		

Hypothesis 3

There is no statistically significant difference between the scores of teachers with from 0 to 4 years of teaching experience on the PCI Form and the scores of teachers with 5 or more years of teaching experience on the PCI Form at the 0.05 level of significance.

Decision

Accept the null hypothesis.

TABLE 18ONEWAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

VARIABLE : PCI BY VARIABLE : YEARS OF TEACHING AS
THREE GROUPS (0 to 4; 5 to 9; 10 or more years)

VARIABLE PCI

BY VARIABLE YEARS OF TEACHING

ONEWAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

SOURCE OF VARIANCE	D.F.	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	F RATIO	F PROB
BETWEEN GROUPS	2	325.0701	162.5351	1.257	.2886
WITHIN GROUPS	113	14616.8841	129.3530		
TOTAL	115	14941.9542			

Hypothesis 4

There is no statistically significant difference between the scores of teachers with from 0 to 4 years of teaching experience on the PCI Form and the scores of teachers with from 5 to 9 years of teaching experience on the PCI Form and the scores of teachers with 10 or more years of teaching experience on the PCI Form at the 0.05 level of significance.

Decision

Accept the null hypothesis.

TABLE 19T-TEST

VARIABLE : AGE (lowest thru 29) BY VARIABLE :
AGE (30 thru highest)

<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>NO. OF CASES</u>	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>STANDARD DEV.</u>	<u>STANDARD ERROR</u>	<u>F VALUE</u>	<u>2-TAIL PROB.</u>
PCI						
LOWEST THRU 29	27	50.9259	13.390	2.577		
					1.54	.142
30 THRU HIGHEST	89	52.2022	10.791	1.144		

Hypothesis 5

There is no statistically significant difference between the scores of teachers of up to 29 years of age and the scores of teachers of 30 years of age or older at the 0.05 level of significance.

Decision

Accept the null hypothesis.

TABLE 20ONEWAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCEVARIABLE : PCI BY VARIABLE : BAND 1, 2, 3, AND 4

VARIABLE PCI

BY VARIABLE BAND 1, 2, 3, 4

ONEWAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

SOURCE OF VARIANCE	D.F.	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	F RATIO	F PROB.
BETWEEN GROUPS	3	207.8288	69.2763	.519	.6072
WITHIN GROUPS	110	14686.6608	133.5151		
TOTAL	113	14894.4895			

Hypothesis 6

There is no statistically significant difference between the scores of Band 1 teachers on the PCI Form and the scores of Band 2 teachers on the PCI Form at the 0.05 level of significance.

Hypothesis 7

There is no statistically significant difference between the scores of Band 1 teachers on the PCI Form and the scores of Band 3 teachers on the PCI Form at the 0.05 level of significance.

Hypothesis 8

There is no statistically significant difference between the scores of Band 1 teachers on the PCI Form and the scores of Band 4 teachers on the PCI Form at the 0.05 level of significance.

Hypothesis 9

There is no statistically significant difference between the scores of Band 1 teachers on the PCI Form and the scores of all other Band levels of teachers on the PCI Form at the 0.05 level of significance.

Decision

Accept null hypotheses 6, 7, 8 and 9.

TABLE 21T-TESTVARIABLE : SEX (male) BY VARIABLE : SEX (female)

GROUP 1 - SEX : MALE

GROUP 2 - SEX : FEMALE

<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>NO. OF CASES</u>	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>STANDARD DEV.</u>	<u>STANDARD ERROR</u>	<u>F VALUE</u>	<u>2-TAIL PROB.</u>
<u>PCI</u>						
GROUP 1	51	50.4510	14.438	2.022	3.08	.000
GROUP 2	65	53.0462	8.222	1.020		

Hypothesis 10

There is no statistically significant difference between the scores of male teachers on the PCI Form and the scores of female teachers on the PCI Form at the 0.05 level of significance.

Decision

Reject the null hypothesis.

TABLE 22ONEWAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCEVARIABLE : PCI BY VARIABLE : SCHOOL 1, 2, 3, 4 AND 5

VARIABLE PCI

BY VARIABLE SCHOOL 1, 2, 3, 4, 5

ONEWAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

SOURCE OF VARIANCE	D.F.	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	F RATIO	F PROB
BETWEEN GROUPS	4	960.1969	240.0492	1.886	.1181
WITHIN GROUPS	109	13876.7228	127.3094		
TOTAL	113	14836.9197			

Hypothesis 11

There is no statistically significant difference between the scores of teachers on the PCI Form for each high school surveyed at the 0.05 level of significance.

Decision

Accept the null hypothesis.

RESULTS FOR SCHOOL 4TABLE 23SCHOOL 4 : T-TEST FOR HYPOTHESIS 1VARIABLE : PRACTICAL FACULTIES BY VARIABLE : HUMANITIES
FACULTIES

VARIABLE	NO. OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEV.	STANDARD ERROR	F VALUE	2-TAIL PROB.
PCI						
PRACTICAL FACULTIES	24	54.2917	7.515	1.534		
HUMANITIES FACULTIES	28	52.7500	8.763	1.656	1.36	.458

Decision

Accept the null hypothesis.

TABLE 24SCHOOL 4 : T-TEST FOR HYPOTHESIS 2VARIABLE : PRACTICAL SUBJECTS BY VARIABLE : HUMANITIES
SUBJECTS

VARIABLE	NO. OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEV.	STANDARD ERROR	F VALUE	2-TAIL PROB.
PCI						
PRACTICAL SUBJECTS	24	54.2917	7.515	1.534		
HUMANITIES SUBJECTS	28	52.7500	8.763	1.656	1.36	.458

Decision

Accept the null hypothesis.

TABLE 25

SCHOOL 4 : T-TEST FOR HYPOTHESIS 3

VARIABLE : LOWEST THRU 4 YEARS OF TEACHING BY VARIABLE :
5 THRU HIGHEST YEARS OF TEACHING

VARIABLE	NO. OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEV.	STANDARD ERROR	F VALUE	2-TAIL PROB.
PCI						
LOWEST THRU 4	18	53.6111	8.637	2.036	1.15	.702
5 THRU HIGHEST	34	53.3824	8.042	1.379		

Decision

Accept the null hypothesis.

TABLE 26

SCHOOL 4 : ONEWAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR HYPOTHESIS 4

VARIABLE : PCI BY VARIABLE : YEARS OF TEACHING AS THREE
GROUPS (0 to 4; 5 to 9; 10 or more years)

VARIABLE PCI

BY VARIABLE YEARS OF TEACHING

ONEWAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

SOURCE OF VARIANCE	D.F.	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	F RATIO	F PROB
BETWEEN GROUPS	2	24.3855	12.1928	.177	.8384
WITHIN GROUPS	49	3378.5372	68.9497		
TOTAL	51	3402.9227			

Decision

Accept the null hypothesis.

TABLE 27SCHOOL 4 : T-TEST FOR HYPOTHESIS 5VARIABLE : AGE (lowest thru 29) BY VARIABLE :AGE (30 thru highest)

<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>NO. OF CASES</u>	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>STANDARD DEV.</u>	<u>STANDARD ERROR</u>	<u>F VALUE</u>	<u>2-TAIL PROB.</u>
<u>PCI</u>						
LOWEST THRU 29	16	53.6875	8.830	2.207		
					1.22	.603
30 THRU HIGHEST	36	53.3611	7.986	1.331		

TABLE 28

SCHOOL 4 : ONEWAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR

HYPOTHESES 6, 7, 8 AND 9

VARIABLE : PCI BY VARIABLE : BAND 1, 2, 3 AND 4

VARIABLE .PCI

BY VARIABLE BAND 1,2,3,4

ONEWAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

SOURCE OF VARIANCE	D.F.	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	F RATIO	F PROB
BETWEEN GROUPS	3	34.1536	11.3845	.162	.9213
WITHIN GROUPS	48	3368.7689	70.1827		
TOTAL	51	3402.9225			

Decision

Accept the null hypotheses.

TABLE 29

SCHOOL 4 : T-TEST FOR HYPOTHESIS 10

VARIABLE : SEX (male) BY VARIABLE :SEX (female)

GROUP 1 - SEX : MALE

GROUP 2 - SEX : FEMALE

VARIABLE	NO. OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEV.	STANDARD ERROR	F VALUE	2-TAIL PROB.
PCI						
GROUP 1	24	53.7083	8.800	1.796		
GROUP 2	28	53.2500	7.744	1.464	1.29	.521

Decision

Accept the null hypothesis.

SUMMARY OF STATISTICAL VALUES FOR POPULATION SAMPLE
FOR FIVE VARIABLES

TABLE 30 : STATISTICAL VALUES FOR FIVE VARIABLES

VARIABLE	NUMBER	MEAN	STAND. DEV.	STAND. ERROR	F VALUE	2-TAIL PROB.	
1. FACULTY							
PRACTICAL	56	51.607	13.196	1.763	1.92	.015	*
HUMANITIES	60	52.183	9.527	1.230			
2. SUBJECT							
PRACTICAL	57	51.63	13.079	1.732	1.85	.021	*
HUMANITIES	59	52.16	9.608	1.251			
3. SEX							
MALE	51	50.45	14.43	2.022	3.08	.000	*
FEMALE	65	53.04	8.22	1.020			
4. TEACH. EXP.							
A. 0 to 4	26	53.00	9.196	1.803	1.70	.133	N.S.
5 or more	90	51.58	11.987	1.264			
B. 0 to 4	26	53.00	9.195	1.803	F RATIO 1.257	F PROB .2886	N.S.
5 to 9	25	48.72	12.411	2.482			
10 or more	65	52.69	11.72	1.454			
5. AGE							
Up to 29	27	50.92	13.390	2.577	1.54	.142	N.S.
30 or more	89	52.20	10.791	1.144			

N.B. * = SIGNIFICANT

N.S. = NOT SIGNIFICANT

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION, INTERPRETATION,
IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE STUDIES

INTRODUCTION

The intention of this study was to establish that the PCI of teachers in practical subject faculties in ACT government high schools would be custodial in relation to a bi-polar continuum of control ideology, while the PCI of humanities teachers in these schools would be humanistic. It was expected that these relationships would also be observed in surveys of teachers of practical or humanities subjects. The PCI Form was the selected research instrument.

The study had a subsidiary purpose: to replicate earlier research findings that male teachers were more custodial than female teachers, older teachers were more custodial than younger teachers, teachers in school administration were less custodial than classroom teachers, and teachers in open space high schools were more humanistic than teachers in traditional space high schools.

A questionnaire including the PCI Form was devised and distributed to the teaching staffs of five Belconnen area government high schools. Scores on the PCI Form were processed and subjected to statistical analysis using the t-test and ANOVA (one-way analysis of variance) from the SPSS package.

The statistical tests were applied to eleven null hypotheses developed from considering the relationship between teacher PCI and membership of a practical or a humanities subject faculty, and from considering earlier research findings on teacher PCI.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

A. The Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1. There is a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of teachers in practical subject faculties and the mean scores of teachers in humanities subject faculties. The group mean of teachers in humanities faculties was higher than that of teachers in practical faculties. This suggests that humanities teachers appear to be more custodial than practical teachers..

Hypothesis 2. There is a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of teachers of practical subjects and the mean scores of teachers of humanities subjects. The group mean of humanities subject teachers was higher than that of the practical subject teachers. This suggests that the humanities subject teachers appear to be more custodial than the practical subject teachers. This is consistent with the result observed in hypothesis 1. It is in the opposite direction from McArthur's findings (1979).

Hypothesis 3. There is no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of less experienced teachers (0 to 4 years) and the mean scores of more experienced teachers (5 or more years). The mean scores of the less experienced teachers were the higher of the two groups. This suggests that they appear to be more custodial than the more experienced teachers. Fisher (1980) reported this trend in the ACT, but his finding was also not statistically significant.

Hypothesis 4. A division of teachers into three groups of from 0 to 4 years, 5 to 9 years, and 10 years or more of teaching experience, did not produce any statistically significant differences among their group means when a one-way analysis of variance was programmed. This result does not support findings first reported by Willower et al (1967).

Hypothesis 5. There is no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of teachers whose ages are 29 or less and the mean scores of teachers whose ages are 30 or more. The younger teachers' mean scores were lower than those of the older teachers. This suggests that younger teachers appear to be more humanistic than older teachers. Earlier researchers

such as Willower et al (1967) had reported statistically significant findings showing a shift from a humanistic PCI to a custodial PCI as teachers grew older. However, Fisher (1980) reported that in one ACT high school younger teachers were more custodial than older teachers.

Hypotheses 6, 7, 8 and 9. There were no statistically significant differences among the group means of the Band 1, Band 2, Band 3 and Band 4 teachers on a one-way analysis of variance. This finding is in contrast to Willower et al's conclusion (1967) that classroom teachers were more custodial than school administration people. Fisher (1980) agreed with Willower et al in reporting that classroom teachers were more custodial than school administration teachers, although Fisher did not report any significant differences in mean scores of the groups in his study.

Hypothesis 10. There is a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of male teachers and the mean scores of female teachers. The group mean of the females was higher than the group mean of the males. This suggests that female teachers are more custodial than male teachers. Fisher (1980) reported the same finding for one ACT high school. This finding is in the opposite direction to Willower et al's 1967 findings.

Hypothesis 11. There were no statistically significant differences among the mean scores of the teachers of the five high schools surveyed on a one-way analysis of variance. Fisher reported the same result for the schools he surveyed in the ACT (Fisher 1980).

B. Findings For School Four

School four staff were responsible for almost half of the total of 116 questionnaires returned. Each of the hypotheses except for Number 11, were applied to the PCI scores of the school staff. No statistically significant differences among the staff were found for any of the hypotheses.

C. Analysis of Variance

Statistically significant differences for three of the independent variables - faculty, subject and sex - were obtained from the PCI scores. Accordingly it was decided to test for statistically significant interaction among these variables. SPSS subprogram ANOVA was used to determine the effects of the variable sex upon each of the other two variables. The result showed that there was no significant interaction effect between either of the two pairs of variables, sex/faculty and sex/subject. Nor was there a statistically significant overall effect. The statistical analyses appear as Appendix II.

INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS

In the end, statistically significant relationships were found between PCI and faculty, PCI and subjects taught, and PCI and sex of teacher. They were not found for the variables of years of teaching, age of teacher, Band level, or type of school. The findings on sex of teacher and subjects taught were in the opposite direction to previous findings. Otherwise, there was no replication of earlier research findings.

A. Faculty and Subject Taught

The significant faculty and subject results reflect the virtually identical pairing of these two elements of teachers' work situations. As was suggested at the start of this study, school administration structure influences teacher PCI. Teachers identify with faculty colleagues and share goals, teaching methods, policies and attitudes. It is not surprising to find a sharing of PCI.

However, the direction of findings is unexpected. The higher mean scores of humanities faculty and subject teachers suggest they are more custodial than the practical faculty and subject teachers. There was an

intuitive feeling that with the need for stricter supervision and control in the potentially dangerous practical teaching areas, practical teachers would have as a natural corollary a custodial PCI.

Support for this feeling came from McArthur (1978, 1979). Teachers of humanities subjects (english, history, languages) saw themselves as less custodial toward students than teachers of practical and scientific subjects such as physics, chemistry, home economics, and physical education . McArthur rationalized that greater control was found for safety reasons in practical subject areas. The results of this field study suggest other influences are at work.

A possible explanation of the more humanistic PCI shown by the practical teachers begins by considering the exercise of stricter rules for students in their work areas, and the acceptance by students of the rules. Students do not have to take most practical subjects; instead, they choose them as electives. Student acceptance of the stricter rules that come as part of their elective choice may lead to practical teachers feeling more secure in their roles and more confident of their functions. There is less pressure on them from within and without to be custodial. Paradoxically

they function in their more controlled work areas in more humanistic ways, striving to promote student self-discipline through the skills and attitudes they impart. Science is usually a compulsory subject, but its prestige value motivates students to want to do it, and science teachers respond like teachers of elective subjects.

In contrast, the more open classrooms in the humanities areas may generate a desire for stricter control in less stable teachers. In this context the observation of Zak (1979) can be noted, that teachers who had a high psychological uncertainty about the best course of action to choose to satisfy their needs, would tend to be attracted to the custodial end of the PCI continuum. Inconclusive studies related to this observation were made by Leppert and Hoy (personality characteristics: 1973), McAndrew (level of teacher esteem: 1971), and Noll, Willower and Barnette (teacher self-actualization: 1977). McArthur (1978, 1979) noted that some teachers whose sense of commitment changed from strong to weak after their initial teaching experience, showed a significant shift from a humanistic to a custodial PCI.

A related point to consider is the relative satisfaction of practical teachers compared to humanities teachers in imparting replicable, demonstrable skills and abilities to students who have elected to be with them. Humanities teachers may experience relative frustration at their lack of visible success in imparting attitudes and values, knowledge, and expression of thought to students who are compelled to be with them. It is possible that these relative satisfactions and frustrations are reflected in the observed PCI scores.

An interesting research study offering some support for these speculations was done by Jones and Garner (1978). They reported that lower grade teachers in middle schools (grades 5-8) were more humanistic than upper grade teachers. They felt that higher grade teachers were more custodial because their training offers a subject-centred approach to teaching. There is no statement of what these subjects are, but they do differentiate between middle school teachers and non-classified resource teachers in art, music and physical education. Presumably middle school teachers offer humanities subjects. The researchers do not explain how a subject-centred approach conditions teachers to a custodial PCI orientation.

B. Sex of Teacher

The composition of the sample provides clues to explain the results obtained. There are more females than males (66 to 50) and 58 of the females are Band 1 teachers (Table 14). This reflects the general pattern in the ACT teaching body of a preponderance of females at the Band 1 level. Of the 50 males, 23 are at Band 2 level or above. There are 6 male Band 3 teachers and no female Band 3 teachers in the sample. The female work situation of greater classroom contact with students and greater need for pupil control suggests that female teachers would have a more noticeable response to the PCI Form.

The group mean of females is higher than the male group mean. This points to their holding more custodial views than the males, which is what Fisher (1980) found for one ACT high school. It is an opposite result to those in studies by Willower et al (1967), Hamalian (1979), and McArthur (1979). Means for both male and female groups are noticeably lower than in Willower et al's study. They are similar to group means reported in more recent studies in the ACT (Fisher), Montreal, Canada (Hamalian), and in Victoria (McArthur). Unfortunately, mean scores were not reported in the work of Bartlett

(1976, 1977) in Queensland, so comparisons among Australian States and Territories are not possible. The ANOVA (analysis of variance) tests done with the SPSS program found no statistically significant relationship in the sample between sex and faculty, or between sex and subject taught, (see Appendix II).

C. Replication Studies

Comments are necessary on the non-replication of earlier findings on PCI and age of teacher, years of teaching experience, and type of school. This part of the research was undertaken for several reasons. It is useful to confirm or otherwise important past findings to clarify their implications for educational practice. It would have been instructive to see if earlier findings applied to a sample of ACT teachers, and by extension to the ACT government high school system. It was necessary to counter the notion that PCI was timebound and placebound.

This notion has already been met effectively through the work of McArthur, Fisher and Bartlett in Australia, and by Hamalian in Canada. Certainly the social environment of US schools in the late 1960's differs from that of ACT schools today, as do the education

systems and the population samples. But the ubiquitous function of comprehensive secondary schools, and their role in the education systems of modern Western democracies, counterbalance the differences. The school organisation is probably the most important unifying factor in PCI research, and overcomes the effects of distance in place and time.

Replication of studies may take several forms. These include the literal approach of doing exactly what the first researcher did; the operational approach of copying the sampling and experimentation techniques of the first in the field; and constructive replication, where the aim is to get the same results as the first, using one's own methods (Lykken 1968). This study uses the third approach.

The apparent reason for the lack of success in replicating the findings of Willower et al and McArthur is the difference in sampling techniques and sample sizes. Both had access to large responsive samples. Willower et al got responses from 1306 educators in thirteen educational districts, mainly at staff meetings which the educators attended in the normal course of their duties. McArthur had access to a group of 800 trainee teachers who were waiting on notice of initial teaching appointments, and

who completed the PCI Form in tutorial group sessions. By contrast, one school would not take part in this study because its staff had had enough of surveys.

Willower et al and McArthur had significance levels of .001 because of their larger sample size. Both their and Fisher's statistical techniques are similar to the ones in this study. Fisher found few differences between the control ideologies of staff in flexible space high schools and staff in traditional high schools. His other findings were noted earlier. He surveyed fewer high schools but got a bigger response (156 vs. 116). He pointed to the effects of community politico-economic pressures on teacher PCI, and thought the social environment's influence on PCI needed more examination. In this study the low response rate from four out of the five schools probably precluded results similar to Fisher's. This rate suggests that it is not profitable to speculate on possible influences from the environment at the time the study fieldwork was done.

METHODOLOGICAL LIMITATIONS

A. Sampling Procedures

The original choice of six high schools was reasonable as it offered access to about one third of ACT government

high school teachers. The location of the six schools was a matter of weighing up the merits of alternatives. The Belconnen area had three flexible space and three traditional space schools. Inner Canberra had five traditional space schools. The Woden-Weston area had one flexible and three traditional space, and Tuggeranong had two flexible space schools. While a choice of schools to represent the inner, static, and outer, growing areas of Canberra had possibilities, the Belconnen area had a mix of established and growing suburbs and schools. That pattern, the chance to use personal contacts in the schools, the broad similarity of Canberra town areas, limitation of time and transport, all pointed to choosing five Belconnen schools (one flexible space high school declined to take part).

The researcher assumed that the available sample was also representative of the population of ACT government high school teachers. Absence of empirical data precluded any chance of checking that assumption. The number of returns was sufficiently high to give hope of meaningful results. However, a qualifying effect on the results must arise from the personality of the respondents. The suspicion is that the non-respondents would have given interesting results and that there is a bias in the returns. The non-respondent rate is a factor in any conclusions drawn from this study.

There were two reasons why subjects and faculties were classified as practical or humanities: the fit they made with the definitions stated in Chapter I; and the researcher's own experience of how these areas of school curriculum and organisation are commonly viewed by staff. Maths, music and art were not neat fits because of their teaching methods and products, but the first two were assigned to humanities and the last to the practical group.

B. Instrumentation

A factor analysis confirmed the validity of the PCI Form. Its usefulness had been signalled in studies reported in Chapter II, in particular by Willower (1975). The layout of the questionnaire used in this study is open to comment. A pre-test should have been held to evaluate its format - there is a suspicion that its design discouraged some respondents. In particular, the statements of the PCI Form should have been on the first side, followed by the Beliefs on Discipline Inventory, and not the other way round.

C. Data Collection

Some thirteen respondents wrote comments on the questionnaire sheet about thirteen of the twenty PCI Form statements. The comments made most often were

"depends" or "qualified" to indicate their disagreement with the custodial slant of the statements. Humanistic statement no. 13 drew five such comments. One respondent felt there were too many leading statements, and the researcher should get the result wanted. One respondent wanted a "not necessarily" response column: in his view practically all the statements were generalisations that applied to some kids or situations and not to others. These comments strengthen the suspicion of a certain bias among the respondents affecting the results.

Flaws in procedures in this part of the study were noted in Chapter III under Field Procedures. In brief, they were: lack of personal contact with respondents; reliance on intermediaries; lack of written reminders to those being surveyed. As well, no standard conditions were set for teachers in which to complete the questionnaire. In contrast, McArthur and Willower et al used formal meetings at set times with their sample groups. In theory, staff meeting time at each school could have been sought. In practice, the possibility of getting sufficient time on the usually full meeting agenda, was not considered a realistic option.

The other option used, of passing out and returning sheets over a longer time period, had its problems. In the chosen period of four weeks in June and July, many teachers were distracted by the need to complete semester student assessments and reports. A final comment is that a personal means of precontacting teachers could have been used - letter, card, or visit - to give the survey a higher profile with them.

D. Data Analysis

The practical significance of the field study results, as opposed to their statistical significance, is open to question. Statistical significance was sought by using the t-test for independent means to determine whether the null hypothesis would be rejected. Those concerning PCI and faculty, PCI and subject and PCI and sex of teacher, were rejected. A one-way analysis of variance showed that these three variables did not differ significantly from one another.

The statistical significance level of .05 meant that for each null hypothesis rejected, the mean difference between each pair of groups on PCI was greater than the mean difference that would be found once in twenty samples if the population mean difference was zero. In

practice, the data analysis showed a small mean difference between each pair of variables. Group means as shown in Table 29 are all in the low fifties. PCI scores do not give absolute values - rather, they express in numeric terms the relative positions of two groups on the PCI continuum. The means of the more custodial groups are rather lower than means of equivalent groups in the study done by Willower et al. The small mean differences found throw doubts on the practical value of the statistically significant findings.

E. The Ex Post Facto Research Design

This design was used to discover relationships among the specified variables. The subjects, teachers in five ACT government high schools, obviously could not be manipulated along experimental lines. It was only possible to survey them and compare the results. Although statistically significant relationships were observed, inferences are limited because of the lack of subject control inherent in this design. For example, it is not possible to say that being a humanities subject teacher gives one a custodial ideology, although a relationship was found between the subjects and this ideology. Other interpretations are possible.

OTHER EXPLANATIONS OF OBSERVED RESULTS

Other influences on teacher PCI need to be explored. To consider: teachers are in direct contact with students each day, but students doing most practical subjects elect to be there, while they have no choice about doing most humanities subjects. The relationship between student attitude to subject and teacher PCI is an area that needs testing. Another possible influence on teacher PCI is the level of psychological uncertainty in teachers about how to satisfy their needs. A third influence to consider is teacher sense of commitment. It may be that teachers of practical subjects have a higher level of commitment, which is in turn related to a humanistic PCI. A fourth element is teacher sense of achievement: the visible display by students of their learnt skills may give practical teachers a greater sense of achievement, which is in turn related to a humanistic PCI.

IMPLICATIONS

If the findings of this field study are to have practical application, more research is necessary. To meet doubts raised earlier, an appropriate task would be to survey the PCI of teachers in faculties in two or three

government high schools in another Canberra town area, and compare results with this study. A second approach is to devise and test alternative hypotheses.

More light needs to be shed on the causes of the observed relationships. Student attitude to subject, teacher level of psychological uncertainty, teacher sense of commitment, and teacher sense of achievement, as mentioned previously, are possibly influences. Plausible cases can be made for each of these variables as a determining factor in the observed relationships. More powerful statistical analyses of the relationships between all the likely variables could be conducted. The problem then is to find whether suitable research instruments exist to measure the variables. Another variable, length of teaching experience in a particular school, could be considered if a larger sample was available.

The field study results have limited practical significance, but the relationships observed suggest that identifying determining factors in these relationships is a worthwhile future task.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- APPLEBERRY, J.B. AND HOY W.K. The PCI of Professional Personnel in "Open" and "Closed" Elementary Schools. Education Admin. Quarterly., 3, 1969, pp. 74-85.
- BARFIELD, V. AND BURLINGAME M. The PCI of Teachers in Selected Schools. The Journal of Experimental Education. V. 42, N. 4 Summer 1974 pp. 6-11.
- BARTLETT, V. LEO. Teacher Attitudes as a Function of PCI. The Journal of Educational Administration. V.XIV N.2 Oct. 1976 pp. 211-219.
- BARTLETT, V.L. Teacher Beliefs and Behaviour : The Organisational Theme of Pupil Control. Administrator's Bulletin. Vol. 8, N. 1. Mar. 1977 Univ. of Qld.
- BORG, W.R. AND GALL, M.D. Educational Research : an Introduction. 4th Ed. Longman. N.Y. 1983.
- CARLSON, R.O. Environmental Constraints and Organisational Consequences : The Public School and its Clients, in Behavioural Science and Educational Administration ed. D.E. Griffiths, Chicago:63rd Yearbook of the NSSE, 1964.

DEIBERT, J.P. AND HOY W.K. "Custodial" High Schools
and Self-Actualization of Students.
Educational Research Quarterly. V. 2, N. 2,
Summer 1977. pp. 24-31.

DEIGHTON, L.C. The Encyclopedia of Education. N.Y.
Macmillan and the Free Press. 1971.

DOBSON, R. AND GOLDENBERG, R. AND ELSOM. B. PCI and
Teacher Influence in the Classroom. The Journal
of Educational Research. V. 66, N. 2, Oct. 1972
pp. 76-80.

FISHER, M. Teacher Pupil Control Ideology Trends in
the ACT. ACT Papers on Education 1980. pp. 54-60.

FOLEY, W.J. AND BROOKS, R. PCI in Predicting Teacher
Discipline Referrals. Educational Administration
Quarterly. V. 14, N. 3 (Fall 1978) pp. 104-112.

GILBERT, D.C. AND LEVINSON, D.J. 'Custodialism' and
'Humanism' in Mental Hospital Structure and in
Staff Ideology. The Patient and the Mental Hospital.
ed. M. Greenblatt et al. Glencoe Ill. : The Free
Press. 1957.

GLICKMAN, C.D. AND TAMASHIRO, R.T. Clarifying Teachers'
Beliefs About Discipline. Educational Leadership.
March 1980. pp. 459-464.

GINNINDERRA HIGH SCHOOL EVALUATION COMMITTEE.

Ginninderra High School - 1977 Evaluation :
private paper for GHS Staff and School Board.

GOSSEN, H.A. An Investigation of the Relationship
Between Socio-economic Status of Elementary
Schools and the PCI of Teachers. Unpublished
doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University,
1969.

HAMALIAN, A. PCI : Comparative Perspectives - United
States and Canada. The Alberta Journal of Educational
Research. Vol. XXV, No. 1. pp. 37-47. March 1979.

HELSEL, A. RAY. Status Obeisance and PCI. The
Journal of Educational Administration. Vol. IX.
No. 1. May 1971.

HELSEL, A. RAY. Value Orientation and PCI of Public
School Educators. Educational Administration
Quarterly. Winter 1971. pp. 24-33.

HELSEL, A. RAY. Personality and Pupil Control
Behaviour. Journal of Educational Administration.
XIV, 1. May 1976. pp. 79-85.

HOY, WAYNE K. Organisational Socialisation : The Student Teacher and PCI. Journal of Educational Research. V. 61, Dec. 1967. pp. 153-155.

HOY, W.K. The Influence of Experience on the Beginning Teacher. The School Review. V. 76, Sept. 1968. pp. 312-323.

HOY. W. PCI and Organisational Socialization : a Further Examination of the Influence of Experience on the Beginning Teacher. The School Review. V. 77, Dec. 1969. pp. 257-265.

HOY W. An Investigation of the Relationships Between Characteristics of Secondary Schools and Student Alienation. Small Programs Grant No. OE6-2-700011 (509) Project No. 9B160, U.S. Office of Education, Mimeo, 1971.

HOY, W.K. AND APPLEBERRY J.B. Teacher-Principal Relationships in Humanistic and Custodial Elementary Schools. Journal of Experimental Education. V. 39, Winter 1970. pp. 27-31.

- HOY, W.K. AND BLANKENSHIP, J.W. A Comparison of the Ideological Orientations and Personality Characteristics of Teacher "Acceptors" and "Rejectors" of BSCS Biology. Science Education. 56 (1) : pp. 71-77.
- HOY, W.K. AND JALOVICK, J.M. Open Education and Pupil Control Ideologies of Teachers. Journal of Educational Research. V. 73, N. 1, Sept./Oct. 1979. pp. 45-49.
- JONES, DAN R. PCI as a Source of Stress : the Student Teacher's Dilemma. Paper presented at Annual Meeting of National Association for the Education of Young Children. Detroit. Nov. 5-8, 1981. Feb. 82. 11p.
- JONES, P.L. AND BLANKENSHIP, J.W. A Correlation of Biology Teachers' PCI and Their Classroom Teaching Practices. Science Education. V. 54, July-Sept. 1970. pp. 263-265.
- JONES, P. AND GARNER, A.E. A Comparison of Middle School Teachers' PCI. The Clearing House. Feb. 1978. V. 51, N. 6. pp. 292-294.

- JONES, T.E. The Relationship Between Bureaucracy and the PCI of Secondary Schools and Teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1969.
- LEEDY, PAUL D. Practical Research : Planning and Design. Macmillan Pub. Co. N.Y. 1974.
- LEPPERT, E. AND HOY W.K. Teacher Personality and PCI. The Journal of Experimental Education. V. 40, 3, Spring 1972. pp. 57-59.
- LONG, J.N. AND WILLOWER D.J. Pupil Control, Pluralistic Ignorance and Teachers' Ratings of Their Principals' Leadership. Educational Research Quarterly. V. 2, N. 3, Fall 1980. pp. 34-39.
- LUNENBERG, F.C. AND O'REILLY R.R. Personal and Organisational Influence on PCI. The Journal of Experimental Education. V. 42, N. 3, Spring 1974. pp. 31-35.
- LYKKEN, DAVID T. Statistical Significance of Psychological Research. Psychological Bulletin 70 (1968). pp. 155-159.

- McANDREWS, J.B. Teachers' Self-Esteem PCI and Attitudinal Conformity to a Perceived Teacher Peer Group Norm. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1971.
- McARTHUR, J.T. What Does Teaching Do To Teachers? Educational Administration Quarterly. V. 14, N. 3, (Fall 1978). pp. 89-103.
- McARTHUR, J. Teacher Socialization : the First Five Years. The Alberta Journal of Educational Research. V. 25, N. 4, Dec. 1979, pp. 264-274.
- MANN, J.B. Dimensions of Teacher Ideology and Their Relationship to Aspects of Perceived Work Environment and Job Satisfaction in Crisis Secondary Schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1970.
- MOORE, RICHARD W. Introduction to the Use of Computer Packages for Statistical Analyses. Prentice Hall Inc. Englewood Cliffs. N.J. 1978.
- MYERS, I.F. The Limited Development of Teachers as Administrators : A Study of Middle Management at Ginninderra High School. Unpublished paper submitted for unit : Theory and Process in Education Administration. M. Ed. course work at Canberra CAE : Semester 1, 1982.

NACHTSCHEIM, N. AND HOY W.K. Authoritarian Personality and Control Ideologies of Teachers. The Alberta Journal of Educational Research. V. XXII, N. 2. June 1976. pp. 173-178.

NIE, N.H. HULL, C.H. JENKINS, J.G.
STEINBRENNER, K. BENT, D.H. SPSS : Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. 2nd Ed. McGraw-Hill. 1975.

NOLL, R.L., WILLOWER, D.J. AND BARNETTE, J.J. Teacher Self-Actualization and PCI - Behaviour Consistency. The Alberta Journal of Educational Research. V. 23, No. 1. March 1977. pp. 65-70.

PACKARD, J.S. AND WILLOWER, D.J. Pluralistic Ignorance and PCI. Journal of Educational Administration. X. 1, May 1972. pp. 78-87.

ROKEACH, M. The Open and Closed Mind , Basic Books Inc. New York. 1960.

REXFORD, G.E. The Relationship Between PCI and Observed Behaviour of Selected Secondary Teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1970.

REXFORD, G.E., WILLOWER, D.J. AND LYNCH, P.D.

Teachers' Pupil Control Ideology and Classroom Verbal Behaviour. The Journal of Experimental Education. Vol. 40, No. 4. Summer 1972, pp. 78-82.

ROBERTS, R.A. The Relationship Between the Change in PCI of Student Teachers and the Student Teachers' Perception of the Co-operating Teacher's PCI. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Uni. of Missouri, 1969.

SHIPMAN, M.D. The Sociology of the School. Longman, London. 2nd Ed. 1975.

WILLOWER, D.J. Barriers to Change in Educational Organisations. Penn. State Uni. Reprinted from Theory into Practice. II 5 Dec. 1963. pp. 257-263.

WILLOWER, D.J. Hypotheses on the School as a Social System. Penn. State Uni. Reprinted from The Educational Administration Quarterly. 1, 3. Autumn, 1965. pp. 40-51.

WILLOWER, D.J. The Teacher Subculture and Rites of Passage . Urban Education. IV, 2. July 1969. pp. 103-114.

WILLOWER, D.J. Social Control in Schools. in L.C. Deighton (ed.). The Encyclopedia of Education. N.Y. MacMillan and the Free Press. 1971. pp. 245-253.

WILLOWER, D.J. Some Comments on Inquiries on Schools and Pupil Control. Teachers College Record. Dec. 1975. V. 77, N. 2. pp. 219-230.

WILLOWER, D.J., EIDELL, T.L. AND HOY W.K. The School and Pupil Control Ideology. The Pennsylvania State University. Studies No. 24. University Park, Pennsylvania. 1967.

WILLOWER, D.J., EIDELL, T.L. AND HOY W.K. Custodialism and the Secondary School. The High School Journal. V. 52, (Jan. 1969). pp. 182-191.

WILLOWER, D.J., HOY, W.K., AND EIDELL, T.L. The Counselor and the School as a Social Organisation. Personnel and Guidance Journal. Nov. 1967, pp. 228-234.

WILLOWER, D.J. AND JONES, R.G. When Pupil Control Becomes an Institutional Theme. Phi Delta Kappan. 45 : 107-109, Nov. 1963.

WILLOWER, D.J. AND LANDIS C.A. PCI and Professional Orientation of School Faculty. Journal of Secondary Education. V. 45, March 1970. pp. 118-123.

WILLOWER, D.J. AND LAWRENCE J.D. Teachers' Perceptions of Student Threat to Teacher Status and Teacher PCI. Psychology in the Schools. V. 16, N. 4. Oct. 1979. pp. 586-590.

YUSKIEWICZ, V.D. PCI and Job Satisfaction of Public School Teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The Pennsylvania State University, 1971.

ZAK, ITAI. Developmental transitions in the professional growth of teachers. In Teacher Effectiveness : Proceedings of the 4th Conference of the International Association of Educational Assessment. New York : Pergamon Press, 1979.

APPENDIX I

Letters seeking approval to conduct the
survey.

APPENDIX II

Results of analysis of variance for independent variables faculty, subject, and sex of teacher.

TABLE 31ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

VARIABLE PCI
BY VARIABLE FACULTY
BY VARIABLE SEX

SOURCE OF VARIATION	SUM OF SQUARES	D.F.	MEAN SQUARES	F RATIO	SIGNIF OF F
MAIN EFFECTS	198.415	2	99.208	.754	.473
FAC	5.947	1	5.947	.045	.832
SEX	188.799	1	188.799	1.436	.233
2-WAY INTERACTIONS	16.811	1	16.811	.128	.721
FAC SEX	16.811	1	16.811	.128	.721
EXPLAINED	215.226	3	71.742	.546	.652
RESIDUAL	14726.726	112	131.489		
TOTAL	14941.952	115	129.930		

TABLE 32
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

VARIABLE PCI
BY VARIABLE SUBJECT
BY VARIABLE SEX

SOURCE OF VARIATION	SUM OF SQUARES	D.F.	MEAN SQUARES	F RATIO	SIGNIF OF F
MAIN EFFECTS	200.186	2	100.093	.943	.392
SUB	4.032	1	4.032	.038	.846
SEX	194.115	1	194.115	1.829	.179
2-WAY INTERACTIONS	14.371	1	14.371	.135	.714
SUB SEX	14.371	1	14.371	.135	.714
EXPLAINED	214.557	3	71.519	.674	.570
RESIDUAL	11886.155	112	106.126		
TOTAL	12100.712	115	105.224		



**GINNINDERRA
HIGH SCHOOL**

Starke Street
Holt ACT 2615
Phone: 542622

3 May, 1983

Dr. W. Donovan,
Principal Education Officer,
Evaluation and Research Section.

Dear Dr. Donovan,

I am at present doing a field study as part of my course work for the M.Ed degree from the Canberra C.A.E. You may remember attending one of our seminars in Semester 2, 1981, when you spoke about evaluation processes in the A.C.T. Laurie Kendall, who is my field study supervisor, arranged the seminar.

My field study concerns whether, if there are significant variations in the Pupil Control Ideology (PCI) of high school teachers, these can be explained by teacher orientation to practical or to humanities subject discipline. In other words, is there a significant relationship between teaching subject(s) and a teacher's PCI.

There have been quite a number of studies of PCI in North American schools and a few in Australia, since Willower, Eidell and Hoy published The School and Pupil Control Ideology in 1967. The most recent work on the A.C.T. that I found was by M. Fisher : Teacher Pupil Control Ideology Trends in the A.C.T. (1980), which looked at primary and Woden area schools. There is NO research concerned with subject disciplines and since these are so important in our curriculum I have chosen to investigate the possible link between PCI and teaching subject.

I am writing to you to seek your approval for the necessary personal contacts I need to establish to collect my data. I need to survey the staff of five Belconnen High Schools. I propose to survey Ginninderra, Charnwood, Canberra, Belconnen and either Melba or Kaleen High Schools early in second term.

My survey instrument is a three part questionnaire on Teacher Beliefs about Discipline, which asks respondents to answer about 35 questions by checking or circling answers. It should take no more than 15-20 minutes to complete. Responses will be computer processed and confidential, because that is the nature of field study work in the M.Ed course. However, if the results are conclusive, I would arrange briefings for interested parties. I would think there is some value for the system in my field study, as conclusive results would indicate whether there was a need for reassessment of teacher strategies on discipline.

May I anticipate a favourable reply from you?

Yours sincerely,

IAN MYERS.

P.S. My vacation address is: 1 Phillimore Place, Charnwood.
Ph. 58 8803



Reference:

Contact: Janet Hunt

Telephone: 478 633

2 June 1983

Ian Myers
Ginninderra High School
Starke Street
HOLT 2615 ACT

Dear Ian,

Thank you for your letter requesting approval to conduct research in five Belconnen high schools in the area of Pupil Control Ideology.

Subject to agreement to participate on the part of schools themselves, I am happy for you to go ahead and look forward to receiving a copy of your completed field study.

Yours sincerely,

Janet E. Hunt.

JANET HUNT
Senior Research Officer
Evaluation & Research Section



**GINNINDERRA
HIGH SCHOOL**

Starke Street
Holt ACT 2615
Phone: 542622

3 May, 1983

The Principal,
.....High School.

Dear

I am at present doing a field study as part of my course work for the M.Ed degree from the Canberra C.A.E. My field study concerns whether, if there are significant variations in the Pupil Control Ideology (PCI) of high school teachers, these can be explained by teacher orientation to practical or to humanities subject disciplines. In other words, is there a significant relationship between teaching subject(s) and a teacher's PCI. There has been little or no research concerning this, and since subject disciplines are so important in our curriculum I have chosen to investigate possible links between PCI and teaching subject.

I am writing to you to seek your approval for the necessary personal contacts I need to establish to collect my data. I would like to survey the staff of five Belconnen area High Schools, including your own. I would ask a staff member I know to act as the contact for distribution and collection of my survey forms. The form is a three part questionnaire on Teacher Beliefs About Discipline, which asks respondents to answer about 35 questions by checking or circling answers. It should take no more than 15-20 minutes to complete.

Responses will be computer processed and confidential, because that is the nature of field study work. However, if the results are conclusive I would arrange briefings for interested parties. I would hope there is some value for your school in my field study, as conclusive results would indicate a possible need for reassessment of teacher strategies on discipline.

I have written to Dr. W. Donovan, Evaluation and Research, seeking approval for the survey and hope to receive a favourable reply from you.

Yours in anticipation,

IAN MYERS.

The attached Survey is to be returned after completion to

Alan Moore, by Tuesday, 14 June if possible.

Dear Colleague:

As you will have heard, I am doing a survey of teacher attitudes towards discipline as part of research for an M.Ed. I would like to ask for your co-operation in completing the attached form and handing it to or placing it in the pigeonhole of Alan Moore for return to me. It should take no more than 15-20 minutes to complete.

Since I am collecting opinions, there are no correct or incorrect answers. All that is necessary is that you give your frank opinion. Your responses will be strictly confidential; all replies are anonymous.

Please read the opening paragraphs carefully and then proceed to answer all the questions. Some of the questions may be difficult to answer with the information given, but please respond to each statement as well as you are able, following the directions.

Your prompt attention and co-operation will be greatly appreciated as it is a pre-requisite to the success of this research. However, if you are unable to agree to my request, I will understand.

Thank you,

Yours sincerely,

IAN MYERS
Ginninderra High School

3 June 1983