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ABSTRACT

A notable feature of drama in schools is that its purpose, practice and subsequent pupil outcomes are governed by the belief systems of teachers. Using a conceptual framework derived from belief systems theory, the aims of the present research were threefold.

The first aim was to determine the nature of the Teacher Belief Climate in which drama in schools was deemed to operate. A sample of 235 primary teachers from 42 schools was invited to respond to belief statements about teaching, learning, drama and interpersonal relationships concerning immediate colleagues and pupils. The sample also indicated their actual and ideal drama choices. It was found that the teachers agreed on most in a series of given statements, but they failed to agree on the kinds of drama best suited to achieving their common educational intentions. Moreover, most teachers felt unable to pursue their ideal drama choices.

The second aim of the research was to examine the relationship between the drama choices of teachers and the achievement of intended pupil outcomes. A sub-sample of 16 teachers was selected on the basis of professing to use either theatre or dramatic play; these particular options were found to be the most popular ideal drama choices of the total sample (n=235). It was found that certain members of
the sub-sample of teachers were using drama exercise instead of dramatic play. As a consequence of this observation the number of drama options under scrutiny was increased from 2 to 3, that is, theatre, dramatic play and drama exercise. Interviews with the sub-sample revealed that, in spite of professing to use different kinds of drama, all members chose the same facets of personal and social development as their intended pupil outcomes. A pretest-posttest design was employed in order to determine gains and losses of pupils on indices of intended outcomes over a set period of time. Of the three kinds of drama employed only teachers of dramatic play managed to produce any significant pupil gains on outcomes. Teachers of drama exercise promoted significant pupil losses on creativity measures and teachers of theatre generated neither gains nor losses on pupil outcomes.

The third aim of the work was to investigate the respective influence of beliefs, behaviour and belief-behaviour consistency of teachers on the outcomes of pupils. Responses to the Teacher Opinionnaire and classroom observations, made via the use of the Drama Inventory, were employed to group the sub-sample of 16 teachers according to their beliefs, behaviour and belief-behaviour consistency. Inspection of outcomes according to these teacher groupings showed that very few single elements of belief or behaviour were associated with significant pupil change. However,
specific combinations of belief-behaviour were found to be related to significant gains and losses of pupils. Combinations of teacher belief-behaviour associated with pupil success were more evident among teachers of dramatic play than those who used either of the other two options. In respect of pupil outcomes, it was more important for teachers of dramatic play to be consistent than teachers using other methods.

The research also analysed profile characteristics of highest and lowest achieving teachers on each pupil outcome except self-esteem (where no significant changes had been evidenced). Besides reflecting the group findings outlined above, highest achieving teachers were found to possess relatively open belief systems, whereas lowest achieving teachers behaved as if they had closed belief systems.

Overall, teachers who achieved their intended pupil outcomes had certain characteristics; they used dramatic play; they were consistent and they possessed relatively open belief systems. In contrast, teachers unable to meet their desired goals tended to employ theatre or drama exercise; they were often inconsistent and acted in accord with closed belief systems.
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INTRODUCTION

1. THE PRIMACY OF TEACHER BELIEFS

The ways in which drama can be studied and experienced by children in schools is governed by the belief systems of the teachers involved. The implication of this assertion is that the educational outcomes of drama for the child are largely dependent upon a range of beliefs that the teacher brings to the study of drama. Teacher belief systems may be seen to influence all aspects of educational activity in a number of fundamental ways. Combs (1982) states that:

teacher belief systems serve as individual theories of teaching and provide a personal set of guidelines for professional practice. (Combs, 1982, p.vii).

Central to a teacher's 'theory of teaching' are those dispositions regarding role. Expectations about what a teacher 'is', and 'should be', provide the basis for classroom practice.

Views about role may well vary among teachers. On the one hand some teachers may perceive themselves as focal points for all classroom activities. These teachers are likely to believe that it is their job to transmit actively to pupils a societal view of what constitutes 'worthwhile'
knowledge. Teachers' views about guided learning are likely to be influenced by a perceived need for active and even didactic involvement in educational activities.

Alternatively, some teachers prefer not to see themselves as focal points for all, or even most, aspects of pupil learning. In this instance, teachers are more inclined to see their role as transmitting to pupils 'worthwhile' knowledge by placing it within reach of the child. These teachers may see themselves as guides to learning and attempt to remove as many mediators as possible (including themselves) which may stand between the pupil and that which is to be learned.

The role stances outlined so far may not be mutually exclusive for the individual teacher. The stance which teachers adopt may vary from one educational activity to another, and vary even within one activity. Much may depend on the educational context and the perceived needs and priorities of the teacher, all of which are subject to change. Sometimes the teacher may believe that the main task is to take a central position within an educational activity. At other times the same teacher may believe that s/he should remove him/herself from the focal point of an activity. The teacher-centredness-pupil-centredness dimension is only one dimension about which views of teacher role may vary. The overall role which teachers adopt will depend upon held beliefs.
In defining his/her own role the teacher comes to define the role of the learner. Each role carries with it certain expectations emanating from a variety of sources including the teacher, the pupils, the school principal, colleagues, the parents and wider societal groups and individuals. For a teacher to fulfil his/her task, the pupil must meet the teacher's requirements of what a learner 'should' be. Teachers who perceive their role in one way are likely to differ, in terms of learner expectations, from colleagues who see the role of the teacher in other ways. Regardless of which role perceptions are maintained, the teacher is likely to have an irresistible desire to put these beliefs into practice perhaps not fully comprehending the consequences. By doing this the teacher is able to define the role into an operational form and thereby to justify the actions that arise from the role.

As part of these role expectations, the teacher is likely to hold beliefs about the 'worthwhile' aims and priorities of 'education'. The teacher's major task is to decide which goals are worth pursuing and which are not.

Views about teacher role are likely to govern the nature of intended outcomes. There are those teachers whose aims are predominantly focused upon the cognitive aspects of the curriculum. In this instance, top priority, in terms of teacher time and effort, is likely to be given to academic
endeavour. Other teachers may profess to aims which extend beyond the 'basic' curriculum to include greater concentration upon aspects of the affective domain of education. There may be teachers who prefer to work without any explicitly stated purposes, possibly in the belief that these may serve to constrain, rather than promote, more 'spontaneous' educational activities. Many of these teachers may find genuine difficulty in making their intended outcomes more explicit.

A teacher's 'set of guidelines' is likely to invite particular behavioural strategies when efforts are made to put aims into practice. As Ryans (1960) observes:

One might expect a teacher committed to a particular set of viewpoints to behave differently in specified school situations from some other teacher committed to some other viewpoint. (Ryans, 1960, p.148).

The extent to which different teacher behaviour may lead to variations in the quality of pupil outcomes remains to be seen. Consequently, how successful teachers are in implementing their educational intentions is likely to be related to the kinds of outcomes they choose to pursue and the means by which they put them into action.

A teacher's beliefs can act as constraints on what s/he feels is possible in the classroom. Views about pupils, in terms of likely success and potential behaviour, may limit the kinds of strategies and options teachers believe they have at their disposal.
A further source of influence on what teachers believe they can and might do is likely to emanate from colleagues in the same school. Fellow teachers may have the collective power to promote or inhibit what teachers feel they should be doing in classrooms.

Schools may possess an explicit statement of educational aims and goals. Individual teachers may or may not agree with its contents, but nevertheless will be expected to abide by it. The extent of colleague support given to teachers may well depend upon an individual's ability to follow the norms and values of this collective educational intent.

Taylor (1974) sees teacher beliefs as factors likely to affect what is taught by '... creating a framework of values in relation to which decisions about what to teach can be made' (Taylor, 1974, p.2). What teachers would like to teach, might teach, and are able to teach, is seen to be influenced by this 'framework of values'. This framework is seen to reflect a belief system which serves to govern what a teacher 'is', what his/her aims are and, ultimately, what measure of success is likely to be achieved with pupils. As such, a teacher's belief system may be seen to have a fundamental influence on all aspects of teacher decision-making in classrooms, including drama.

When we look at the doing of drama in schools, we are likely to do so most effectively if we take into account
teacher belief systems. How are the individual and shared beliefs of teachers related to drama use in schools? In terms of pupil outcomes, are some beliefs superior to others? What are the normative characteristics of teacher belief systems?

A major task of the present study is to investigate the influence of teacher belief systems on drama choices and pupil outcomes.

2. THE PROBLEM OF DRAMA CHOICE FOR TEACHERS

On the face of it, a teacher's choice of drama may only appear to be limited by the number of options available. However, given the primacy of teacher beliefs upon educational outcomes, it could be that the choices for some teachers may be minimised and for others could well be non-existent.

What teachers believe about drama teaching depends on the beliefs they hold about teaching in general. A drama option may only be adopted by teachers insofar as it is seen to facilitate the overall educational purposes of the teacher.

Teachers who view their classroom role as that of a 'director' are likely to be attracted towards those kinds of drama which afford a high degree of teacher direction. Two kinds of drama in particular exemplify contrasting views of teacher role: 'informal drama' and 'theatre'.
Informal drama may be seen to accommodate 'child-centred' ideologies and beliefs. Thompson (1978) defines 'informal drama' as: "drama that is done without a script" (Thompson, 1978, p.26). The role of the teacher is that of 'guide' (Slade, 1954; et al.); the task is to "... extend experience [of pupils] by means of helpful suggestion" (Newsham, 1975, p.26). In this activity, it is common for pupils to create their own dramatic efforts, "irrespective of any function of communication to an audience" (Way, 1967, p.3). The teacher-qua-guide usually invites all pupils to participate and tends to promote the merits of 'experiential' learning.

Other teachers may see 'drama' in terms of theatre, which is "... largely concerned with communication between actors and an audience" (Way, 1967, p.2). In theatre, the teacher's conventional task is to direct the performance of pupil-actors. By virtue of his/her relative expertise, the teacher has a central position in the activity. The pupil's job is to master the script and to communicate words and meaning to an audience. The pupil is required to demonstrate that learning has taken place. As a consequence, the teacher may only select those pupils able to meet the standards of a theatre performance - thus pupil participation is likely to be limited.

Whether teachers 'should' choose to do 'informal drama' or theatre has been the cause of much debate among educators
for the last forty years. Many teachers may share the view promulgated by the Plowden Report (1967) that:

[although] some primary school children enjoy having an audience of other children, or their parents, formal presentation of plays [theatre] on a stage is usually out of place. (Plowden, 1967, p.3).

Many of these teachers may feel that drama, viewed as theatre, has no place in the primary school because it has nothing to contribute towards the teacher's cognitive aims. Others may agree that theatre has no place but for different reasons. 'Progressive' teachers may feel that theatre is an adult-orientated activity and therefore reject it on the grounds that it is not of the child's own making. Great store may be placed on the affective aspects of 'informal drama', in the belief that the child's participation may result in clarity of self-expression and an overall ability to cope in school.

However, there are numerous teachers who believe that theatre is 'not out of place' in the primary school. Play productions, parent evenings and end of year concerts give outward and tangible evidence of the drama work that may be done in the schools. There may also be those educators who approach 'informal drama' in a theatrical manner (Watkins, 1981, p.31). Some traditional teachers see theatre as a vehicle by which the young may be introduced to the cultural heritage of Man. They may well even reject the child's
efforts if those efforts do not meet the standards of the adult theatre. These and other arguments are given further scope in Chapter Two.

It is clear that drama choice in schools remains a matter of contention among primary school teachers. Given this apparent dilemma, what drama options 'should' teachers adopt in their classrooms?

Much of what pupils manage to achieve in drama is likely to rest on the teacher's intended outcomes. By what outcomes do teachers come to judge a given option? It may well be that teachers pursuing an informal kind of drama have their sights set upon the achievement of personal and social development as a major drama aim. Others operating in a theatre mode may place emphasis on the virtues of memory and recall.

Clearly some drama options may be more relevant to particular teacher aims than others. Conversely, certain teacher aims will be best achieved by some drama options and not others. The wisdom of drama choice may be examined in the light of pupil outcomes. As Combs (1982) says:

> Expected or desirable [pupil] outcomes provide a measure of proof that the theories from which they arose have some validity. (Combs, 1982, p.7).

Other teacher beliefs may well intervene between what a teacher hopes to achieve with his/her pupils and what s/he manages to achieve: expectations concerning pupils may have
A more detailed examination (beyond the scope of this thesis) of the pupil control ideology issue will take into account Willower's Penn State studies. See Willower, D.J., Eidell, T.L. and Hoy, W.K. (1967). *The school and pupil control ideology*. Pennsylvania, Penn State University.
some bearing on drama choices. Evidence suggests that teacher attitudes regarding pupil abilities can be 'self-fulfilling', (Rosenthal & Jacobsen, 1966, 1968; Beez, 1972; Budd-Rowe, 1974; Galton & Delafield, 1981). At worst, such expectations might lead a teacher to avoid the use of drama altogether. At best, the teacher's assessment of the positive and negative attitudes of pupil abilities, may serve to constrain teacher options severely.

Teachers who hold relatively negative expectations for pupil behaviour in drama may well select those options that facilitate a high level of pupil control. Hargreaves (1979) cites one instance where:

teachers opted to do mime 'because it's less chaotic than anything else'. Despite all the cognitive benefits that might accrue to pupils ... the teacher's decision here is closely related to its [mime] potential for social control. (Hargreaves, 1979, p.138).

The teacher's belief in the need for 'social control' may have an important influence upon drama choice. It further suggests an element of risk that may be present when decisions about drama use come to be made.

Berlack et al. (1966) note:

it is a salient characteristic of the game of teaching that either both players, the teacher and his pupils, win or both lose. (Berlack et al., 1966, p.58).

The perception of the 'game' may be seen to derive from the belief system of the teacher. It may be that the danger of
'losing' may loom too large in the minds of some teachers, and inhibit the use of drama completely. As such, teacher expertise in drama may provide insufficient guarantee that decisions about drama options will be based on 'educational criteria' rather than personal prejudice. Given the possible constraining nature of teacher beliefs about pupils, we need to ask what options do teachers really have when faced with pupils? Elsewhere, beliefs regarding colleague supportiveness may have an influence on drama decisions. Pursuit of common drama goals may lead to a supportive school atmosphere for drama efforts. On the other hand, it may be a brave teacher indeed who elects to undertake a kind of drama which colleagues are unwilling or unable to accept.

A teacher's beliefs about pupils and colleagues may lead him/her to distort or modify drama practice. The overwhelming desire to fulfil role expectations may far outweigh the need to succeed in drama.

3. BELIEF-BEHAVIOUR CONSISTENCY AND PUPIL OUTCOMES

How teachers come to put their beliefs into practice may well hold consequences for pupil outcomes in drama. Are teachers doing what they say they are doing?

In terms of pupil success, how important is it for teachers to act according to their beliefs? Can beliefs
alone serve to guarantee pupil success? It may well be that certain combinations of belief-behaviour can lead to positive pupil outcomes regardless of drama choice. How viable are certain belief-behaviour combinations in meeting intended pupil outcomes? Furthermore, is it more critical for teachers to behave according to their beliefs when doing one particular kind of drama rather than another? For example, if a teacher believes in being a 'guide' in informal drama, but due to constraints behaves as a 'director', what are the consequences for pupil outcomes? Are these results the same if a teacher attempts to guide, rather than direct, theatre?

A survey of drama literature suggests that if teachers approach informal drama in a formal manner then pupil outcomes are likely to be influenced in a negative way. It is pertinent to note that these and other claims, regarding what are essentially the antecedents of informal drama, remain untested. With this in mind, a second major task of the present research is to examine the influence of teacher belief-behaviour consistency on pupil success in drama.

It is noticeable, that research workers in drama have paid little attention, if any, to the school-based influences on drama use. In particular, when pupil outcomes have been assessed, little account has been taken of the primacy of teacher beliefs on drama choices and teacher behaviour.
4. **STATEMENT OF THE RESEARCH PROBLEM**

i. What are the normative characteristics of teacher belief systems?
   a. What do teachers believe about teaching?
   b. What do teachers believe about drama?

ii. What kinds of drama do teachers choose to do?
   a. What choice do they have when faced with pupils?
   b. By what outcomes do they come to judge a given option?

iii. What account need we take of drama choices when pupil outcomes are examined?
   a. How viable are selected drama options in meeting intended pupil outcomes?

iv. Are teachers doing what they say they are doing?

v. To what extent may pupil outcomes be explained in terms of belief-behaviour consistency:
   a. Regardless of drama options?
   b. According to drama options?

vi. What are the profile characteristics (drama choices, beliefs and behaviour) of teachers who produce negative versus positive pupil outcomes?
5. **AN OVERVIEW**

A teacher's use of drama may be viewed within certain overarching educational contexts shared by other aspects of the curriculum. In particular, its doing may be subject to the relationship between:

a. what teachers might be doing (philosophical base of the curriculum) and what they believe they are doing (professional understanding);

b. what teachers believe they are doing and what they are actually doing; and

c. what outcomes teachers hope to achieve and what they tend to produce.

At each stage, teacher reasons and preferences for particular drama choices and subsequent outcomes may be revealed. It is precisely because drama is an unresolved issue that educational prejudices and processes of independent decision-making among different teachers may be revealed. The value of using drama as a vehicle in this study is seen to lie in its very uncertainty.
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INTRODUCTION

The present chapter is divided into two main sections. Section one is concerned with literature relating to the use of drama in schools - the object of the present research. In this part, particular examination is made of the controversy regarding what drama 'is', how it 'should' be done and the perceived value derived from its use.

Views concerning notions of drama are seen to be polarised: there are those who define drama as an 'informal' activity and others who see it as 'theatre'. The conflict is one of drama choice, based not so much on 'facts or findings', but more on differences of belief which exist among drama educators and teachers alike.

It soon becomes clear that there is a paucity of empirical research in the drama area. The remainder of the first section is given over to some possible explanations for this observation.

Section two of the chapter begins by examining the literature relating to belief systems per se. Attention is then paid to research regarding teacher belief systems, the relationship between teacher beliefs and teacher behaviour, and the expectancy effects of teacher beliefs.
One particular example of research is analysed in order to elaborate specific, philosophical and methodological problems likely to be met when researching the area of teacher belief systems.

Overall, conflicts of drama choice, the primacy of teacher beliefs and the relationship between beliefs and actions, may be seen to provide a focal point for the present study.

1. LITERATURE AND RELATED RESEARCH CONCERNING DRAMA USE IN SCHOOLS

1.1 Perspectives on the conflict between drama and theatre

Surveys of drama use in secondary (McGregor, 1977) and primary (Stabler, 1978) schools suggest that there is a wide variety of dramatic activities which are given the name of 'drama'. However, underlying these varied notions of 'drama' are two fundamental approaches to the work which have come to polarise drama doing in schools.

There are those who believe drama to be an 'informal' activity in which pupils are encouraged to invent and play out their own dramatic ideas, without the presence of an audience (Slade, 1958; Way, 1967; and many others). Even supporters of the 'informal' view admit that the work often appears to adults as 'shapeless' (Way, 1967) and "... is suspected of leading nowhere" (Franklin, 1961, p.167).
As Lloyd (1976) observes:

The traditionalist might argue, do we not seriously mislead ourselves when we confidently apply the word 'creativity' where, at a moment's notice, children improvise dramatizations ... from their daily lives. [They] may display charm and insight, and the exercise may foster confidence. But, he is likely to protest at putting these achievements in the same category as a performance by Olivier. (Lloyd, 1976, p.103).

Dramatic material from pupils' 'daily lives' may well consist of ideas from television, believed by a number of writers to be 'tawdry' in nature (Crosscup, 1966, p.13).

It is notable that far greater criticism is levelled at those teachers who choose to do theatre in the primary school. 'Theatre' is used in the conventional sense of the word. Here, actors, usually pupils, are given the task of communicating dramatic meaning to an audience. Whether or not pupils are capable of fulfilling this specialised role of communicator remains a matter of contention. There are those who support Way's (1967) view that, "communication to an audience is beyond the capacity of the majority of children and young people" (Way, 1967, p.3). The view above is based on an implicit notion of 'theatre readiness', given support by numerous writers. They hold that pupils are not ready for theatre until they have experienced the creation of their own dramatic work throughout the primary years and beyond. As such they contend that theatre has no place on the primary school curriculum.
However, there are others who support a view advanced by Holmes (1912) that "young children are born actors" (Holmes, 1912, p.174). They advance the view that a pupil's ability to communicate to an audience primarily depends on "the size and relationship of the audience as well as the material to be presented", that is, a more 'pragmatic' approach to drama choice (Hodgson, 1972, p.41).

Informal drama protagonists further argue that the 'material to be presented' is often of a 'poor quality' and is predominantly founded on adult rather than pupil problems, anathema to child-centred theorists and practitioners. Allied to this issue is the criticism that pupils are given a peripheral, rather than a central, part in the theatrical proceedings (Thompson, 1978). Moreover, informal protagonists accuse theatre teachers of using the medium to facilitate their own domination in the classroom (Watkins, 1981). Bolton (1978) further notes that some teachers have a tendency to approach 'informal' drama in a theatrical manner by getting children to prepare their work in anticipation of an imaginary audience.

In determining who can or cannot communicate to an audience, informal drama protagonists accuse their theatrical colleagues of being elitist in their approach to casting: they are seen to favour "the talented few" (Kolczynski, 1977, p.285) "intelligent pupils" (Barnfield,
1968, p.5), and speaking parts are only given to "gifted children" (Fletcher, 1967, p.290). It is reasonable to assume that pupils who are more able to meet the technical demands of theatre are the ones most likely to be chosen to participate. Informal drama protagonists believe that all pupils should have a part in the activity.

The question of competence in the theatre does not end with the pupil. There are those who doubt the ability of primary school teachers to practice the art of theatre with primary pupils, or any other. Primary teachers in particular are seen to lack the necessary expertise and skills for a 'successful performance' (Thompson, 1978; et al.).

The supporters of informal drama see the element of audience as a likely intervening variable between intended and actual pupil outcomes (Davis, 1973; et al.). The element of audience is seen to be a source of embarrassment (McGregor, 1977) and shyness (Way, 1967) and a source of unnecessary distraction for all participants (Slade, 1958; et al.). Added to this is the view that the audience themselves do not know how to respond sensitively towards pupil efforts (Crosscup, 1966).

Views concerning the respective needs for an audience appear to reflect more underlying beliefs about the nature of educational evaluation. Informal drama supporters stress the virtues of formative modes of evaluation in drama.
Drama is seen as a developmental process warranting continuous kinds of assessment (Courtney, 1980).

On the other hand, theatre lends itself more readily to summative modes of evaluation, since a production is there as an outcome. The audience may be seen as the only contributor to evaluation beyond the pupil's own enjoyment. The major aim of those teachers working in the theatre mode is likely to be that of a 'smooth performance' and other benefits such as pupil growth will presumably take second place (Fletcher, 1967).

There are a few writers who believe that both informal drama and theatre should be considered as 'drama'. Informal drama and theatre are not viewed as opposite poles, but more as a single dimension with an emphasis on process at one end and an emphasis on performance-product at the other.

McGregor (1977) notes that:

The crucial question for drama in practice is whether or not for this group, at this time and in this context, such a shift of emphasis can fulfil any additional or worthwhile function. (McGregor, 1977, p.19).

McGregor wrote this in relation to drama in the secondary school. However, this matter of 'emphasis' may be a concern for colleagues in the primary school. How wise teachers are in their drama choice is a question asked within the parameters of the present research. What is clear at the outset is that neither informal drama nor
theatre, nor any position between the two poles, has been given any empirical support in terms of pupil outcomes. There is no evident indication as to which kind of drama is likely to meet intended pupil outcomes.

Before proceeding to analyse some of the likely reasons for a lack of empirical evidence, it is necessary to pay attention to the kinds of pupil outcomes that informal drama protagonists claim as a result of participation in the medium. How far these claims are supported by empirical evidence remains to be seen. Claims about the outcomes of 'drama' stem predominantly from supporters of informal drama. As such the word 'drama' will be used in reference to this kind of activity.

1.2 Perspectives on the outcomes of drama

There is no shortage of literature in which authors attempt to define the practice and educational potential of drama use in schools. As Thompson (1978) notes:

> Over the past ten years hundreds of books have been published extolling the values and virtues of drama ... In every one the author commits to print thousands of words to buttress his beliefs and offers anecdotal evidence of their worth. He then usually offers a step-by-step method by which the reader can engage young children in the art of drama. (Thompson, 1978, p.14).

Derived from a number of these literature sources is the declared aim of 'developing the whole child', via the
use of drama. This common statement of drama intent has its roots in child-centred ideologies and serves to act as a general blanket under which a wide array of other aims may be subsumed. The examples which follow are by no means exclusive to the authors cited. Drama is seen to be aimed at developing or improving a pupil's oracy (Barker, 1974); social health (O'Neill, 1976); social attitudes (Heathcote, 1972); emotional mastery (Way, 1967); self-confidence (Siks, 1958); resourcefulness (Slade, 1954) and critical thinking (Dallmann, 1966).

Stephenson (1971), Chairman of the 'International Conference on Teaching and Learning English' held at York University (U.K.) admitted that:

The claims made for drama by enthusiasts are often exaggerated and always difficult to substantiate. Yet its potential as a mode of learning is evident and increasingly recognised. (Stephenson, 1971, p.12).

It may be argued that if, as Stephenson suggests, the outcomes of drama use were 'evident and increasingly recognised', then drama would be a more settled issue on the school timetable. In spite of these observed claims, 'exaggerated' or otherwise, few empirical studies have been carried out to investigate their alleged validity.

Of those that have employed empirical means, efforts have been focussed on either drama as a vehicle for personal development, or as a way of promoting other aspects of the
curriculum. Empirical studies have been varied and have examined drama as an instrumental means of enhancing: intonation and enunciation (Hayes, 1970); articulation (Ludwig, 1963); science concepts (Rattley, 1979); reasoning skills (Pidgeon, 1975); proficiency in reading (Ross and Roe, 1975); the self-concept of culturally deprived children (Carlton et al., 1965); language concepts and creativity (Hensel, 1973); retention of learning material (Ingersoll, 1970); role-taking ability (McCall, 1981) and the use of holistic learning processes (Rubin, 1978; McClendon, 1982). It is notable that very few researchers in the field of drama have had their studies replicated. Noticeable also is a paucity of empirical research into the nature of drama and the criteria employed by teachers for its selection. This is possibly a reflection of the disregard of researchers for the influence of environmental school-based factors that might constrain the outcomes of drama use in schools.

Given these observations, it is now worth examining some possible constraints upon the overall quantity and quality of empirical research in the area of 'educational' drama.
1.3 A lack of empirical research in the area of drama

1.3.1 Empirical research as an 'inappropriate mode of enquiry'

Several studies (for example Hoetker, 1975 and Brossell, 1975) argue in favour of an ethnological, rather than an empirical, experimental approach to drama enquiry. They assert that drama is a 'subjective phenomenon' and therefore should be observed with more subjective means that 'objective research instruments'. It is reasonable to suggest that all observed phenomena are subjective from the view of the observer (and sometimes the observed). When one makes an empirical enquiry, the identification of variables and research criteria provide a firm base from which important, predetermined issues may be profitably explored. In doing this, a set of conventions may be established regarding the nature of 'appropriate' criteria which allow for more emphasis on empirical evidence and less on the researcher's own imagination when conclusions come to be drawn about findings.

1.3.2 The teacher as a major contributor to dramatic enquiry

Stephenson (1977) and others, believe that teachers are in a good position to contribute towards an ethnologically-oriented enquiry into classroom drama.
Stephenson states that:

Many more teachers would incorporate it [drama] into their teaching if they were better informed about exactly how it could contribute to their children's learning. There is a need for more detailed description and analysis of drama at work in the classroom. Teachers themselves are in the best position to provide them. (Stephenson, 1971, p.12).

This advocacy apparently begins and ends with the classroom teacher and suggests a continuing reliance upon the "anecdotal evidence" mentioned earlier by Thompson (1978). An 'inside look' at drama may have its merits in terms of providing detailed observations for further consideration. However, the nature of anecdotes is such that they are presented as 'non-challengable' accounts of personal teaching experiences and thus invite no further scrutiny.

1.3.3 A basic distrust of empirical research methods

The desire for an exclusive ethnological base of enquiry, regardless of the problem at hand, may stem in part from an underlying distrust of empiricism. Informal drama, as mentioned earlier, has its roots in child-centred ideologies and is synonymous with 'progressive' education. Entwistle (1981) says of 'progressive' educators that:

They are as likely to have as little confidence in traditional research methodology as they have in formal methods of teaching. Their evidence is
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drawn from observation and experience built up through anecdotes, to demonstrate by repeatable instance the efficacy of the approach they endorse. (Entwistle, 1981, p.231).

1.3.4 Researcher determination to 'show that drama works'

The two examples which follow serve to illustrate the influence of researcher beliefs on the outcomes of empirical research in drama.

One researcher, Bellman (1974) set out to:

determine the effect of a model creative dramatics program on personality as shown in self-concept. (Bellman, 1974, 5668-A)

Following the administration of a measure of self-concept, Bellman noted that:

On the basis of pre and posttests there did not appear to be any significant change in the scores as a result of a creative dramatics program. (Bellman, 1974, 5668-A)

She also noted that:

From the observation data ... some changes could be noted. The teacher observer pointed to several individuals where greater expressive abilities seemed evident after participating in creative dramatics. (Bellman, 1974, 5668-A)

Finally, it appears that Bellman felt confident enough from the observation of those "several individuals" to conclude that:
Student participation does improve self-concept as seen through teacher observer comments. (Bellman, 1974, 5668-A)

Not only did Bellman appear to ignore her own empirical evidence, but would also seem to have exaggerated the number of students deemed to have improved in self-concept. No criteria were offered to explain the nature of observer 'evidence' of self-concept change.

Bellman's overriding concern appears to have been the validation of a particular drama program and possibly the affirmation of the researcher's own beliefs. It may well be that this would have been more readily achieved without the empirical framework which was eventually abandoned in favour of teacher comments.

Another worker, Layman (1974) provides a similar example of someone engaged in putting forward a particular drama approach within a quasi-empirical framework. The purpose of Layman's study was to:

ascertain the effects which drama had upon [children's] attitudes in relation to an increased interest in learning. (Layman, 1974, p.4).

Layman devised a twelve week program of creative dramatics and selected a number of teachers to carry out this work with their respective pupils. Once underway, the cooperating teachers met Layman for regular in-service meetings to discuss mutual problems. Here they reported upon the progress of the program. In addition to this,
Layman demonstrated for each member exactly how drama 'should' be done with their pupils, both at in-service meetings and with the pupils in class. It is reasonable to suggest that the pupils might well act in an atypical manner consistent with the novelty of the situation. This likely reaction to the researcher's input is referred to as the 'Hawthorne effect'. Gephart and Ingle (1969) describe this phenomenon as being:

characterised by an awareness on the part of the subjects of special treatment created by artificial experimental conditions. This awareness becomes confounded with the independent variable under study, with a subsequent facilitatory effect on the dependent variable, thus leading to ambiguous results. (Gephart and Ingle, 1969, p.204).

Written reports were made by 'impartial' referees and included presumably, the observations arising from the Layman-led drama sessions. The observers were there to utilise:

A system of reports ... set up to record the classroom activities and student participation and response. (Layman, 1974, p.8).

And:

Each student was rated for interest, before and after the twelve week period. (Layman, 1974, p.8).

Given that observers were to measure pupil interests, seemingly from an 'external' viewpoint, Layman does not make it clear what it was the observers were actually looking at,
nor did she make explicit the interpersonal criteria upon which between-observer decisions were made. What was believed to be measured was made explicit in Layman's findings:

From my personal observations ... and a small statistical base ... I am convinced that the following relevant changes occur in children exposed to a well designed program in educational drama: an improved attitude of the child towards his educational experience; an increased pleasure through practical involvement in the school program; a greater interest in the world around him. (Layman, 1974, p.3).

The notion of pupil 'interest' appears to have generated other associated aspects or 'traits' which were observed or noted as being observed. Observer ratings are particularly susceptible to the 'Halo effect', described by Best (1977) as:

a tendency to rate a person who has a pleasing personality high on other traits. This 'halo' is likely to appear when the rater is asked to rate many factors on a number of which he has no evidence for judgement. (Best, 1977, p.180).

It would be difficult to know if it was the children or the program itself which was the subject of the 'halo'. Either one it seems, may serve to account for the apparently unmeasured traits outside the scope of Layman's study.

The "small statistical base" given attention in Layman's conclusions was not presented for discussion, nor was the hypothesis it presumably generated.
As with Bellman (1974), Layman appeared intent on showing that 'drama works'. The quasi-empirical approach into selected uses of drama illustrated by Bellman and Layman, has done little, it seems, to throw light on the nature of drama and concomitant outcomes, nor has it served to identify some of the methodological problems involved in such undertakings.

1.3.5 The influence of 'extraneous' variables

In attempting to explain why so few research hypotheses had been supported in relation to drama use, Woody (1974) noted

Existing empirical studies have been plagued with problems of design and extraneous variables. (Woody, 1974, p.2).

In one example, Woody cites Allen (1968) who attributed a lack of significant change in self-concept to "racial differences between teacher and student" (Allen, 1968, p.9).

It may well be that these "extraneous variables" play a decisive part in influencing both the nature and study of drama in schools. As mentioned earlier, authors and researchers alike seem to pay scant regard to the school-based, human context of drama in schools. This assumption is evidenced by statements such as those given by Davis (1975) that:

Creative dramatics provides a non-threatening atmosphere which allows stretching of the imagination. (Davis, 1975, p.449).
"Creative dramatics" does not provide anything. Rather one might suggest that it is teachers and pupils together who provide a non-threatening, or any other kind of atmosphere. It is the nature of this school-based, 'peopled' environment that may serve to provide an influential context in which decisions about drama choice and subsequent pupil outcomes may be profitably observed. The 'context' of the present study is that of teacher belief systems.

2. LITERATURE AND RELATED RESEARCH CONCERNING BELIEF SYSTEMS

2.1 Perspectives on the notion of belief systems

Belief systems are seen to possess certain fundamental characteristics. Rokeach (1960) suggests that:

the total belief system may be seen as an organisation of beliefs varying in depth, formed as a result of living in nature and society. (Rokeach, 1960, p.12).

Belief systems are seen by theorists to have a definite structure. They contend that individuals do not subscribe to an aggregate of unrelated beliefs, but hold 'systems' of beliefs which are 'internally consistent' (Rokeach, 1960, 1970; Bem, 1970).

Within this belief structure some dispositions are seen to be more centrally positioned than others. The more central beliefs appear to have the greatest capacity for
resisting change (Horney, 1939; Lowe, 1961; Purkey, 1970). Moreover, the more central beliefs are seen by Rokeach (1970) to possess the most number of 'connections' with other beliefs within the system. The central beliefs appear to hold consequences for other linked beliefs. For example, the beliefs of the teacher are likely to be centred on the role of the 'professional self'. From this central vantage point, other beliefs regarding the aims, purposes and strategies of teaching will come under the influence of the 'professional self'. It follows that a change in the view of teacher role will hold consequences for these other 'connected' educational beliefs.

In describing both beliefs and attitudes, Kerlinger (1967) poses the notion of relevance. He states that some beliefs may be more relevant for some persons than others. As he puts it: "what is critical for me may or may not be critical for another individual ... we can assume a continuum of relevance for any referent" (Kerlinger, 1967, p.111). It may be that given a choice of curriculum activity teachers may well differ in what they regard as "relevant". As Rokeach (1960) observes:

we tend to value a given belief, sub-system, or system of beliefs in proportion to the degree of congruence with our own belief system. (Rokeach, 1960, p.83).

It is pertinent to note that the terms 'attitude' and
'belief' are often used interchangeably throughout literature in the beliefs area. Krech and Crutchfield (1948) point out that although attitudes consist of beliefs, not all beliefs are linked to any attitude. Assumptions about which beliefs constitute an attitude has been a source of difficulty for both research workers and educators alike. There has been a profusion of teacher attitude measures many of which derive from suppositions about the nature of 'teacher effectiveness'. One popular example is the 'Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory' (Cook, Leeds & Callis, 1951). In an attempt to differentiate teachers on the basis of their 'democratic-authoritarian values', this measure produces a single score. The problem lies in the notion of what is being measured (noted by Callis & Fergusson, 1953). There is a real difficulty, it seems, in knowing how many or how few beliefs to include in an attitude measure in order to measure reliably what was intended. The amorphous nature of beliefs further compounds the problem of attitude and belief measures since both may be difficult to operationalise in terms of what is being measured.

Commercial interests have sponsored a great many attitude surveys often based on a single response of the 'like-dislike' kind. Their concern has been with customer preference, not with more underlying beliefs. Social scientists have tended to opt for the measure of attitudes
rather than belief systems possibly because the former are more amenable to measurement. It seems that there may be some problems with the measurement of attitudes, but those relating to the measure of beliefs may be greater.

Single beliefs, multiple beliefs and attitudes are seen to form part of an individual's belief system. Rokeach (1960) says of belief system theories that they:

share the common assumption that man strives to maintain consistency ... among two or more related beliefs, among all the beliefs entering into an attitude organisation and among all the beliefs and attitudes entering into a total system of beliefs. (Rokeach, 1960, p.114).

This 'striving to maintain consistency' is seen by Lecky (1945), and Combs and Snygg (1959), to be the major source of human motivation, and by Maslow (1954, 1956) to be a basic tenet of 'self-actualisation'. Theories of 'consistency' assume that any change of attitude or belief will motivate an individual to bring about harmony among the components of his belief system.

There are four major psychological models which advocate the notion of harmonious belief systems: Freud's psychoanalytic theory, congruency, balance, and dissonance models.

Freud

Freud was primarily concerned with the internal conflicts between an individual's id (primeval impulse), the
libido (sexuality) and the superego. However, psychoanalysis does appear to be concerned with the notion of harmony between the aggressiveness and sexuality of the id and the guilt of the superego – all of which come under the benevolent influence of the conscious ego (Deighton, 1971).

**Congruity**

Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum (1957) put forward the notion of 'congruity' to explain the nature of attitude change. When an individual encounters attitudes inconsistent with his own there is an attempt to make these 'inconsistent' attitudes more congruent. They postulate that an individual is motivated towards 'congruity' by the need to reduce dissonance between the varying attitudes.

**Balance**

Abelson and Rosenberg (1960) applied the model of balance to describe the relationship between an individual's attitudes. When an attitude changes there is an imbalance. If this attitude change is not harmonious with other attitudes the individual may have to implement various strategies to redress the balance.

**Dissonance**

Leon Festinger's (1957) 'theory of dissonance', like other congruity models, concerns the notion of consonance-
dissonance between attitudes within a belief system. The dissonance arising from 'conflicting' attitudes may only be reduced when one or more attitudes is modified within the belief system.

Given the nature of belief systems, and in particular the view of 'consistency', Combs (1982) has aligned these belief characteristics (derived mainly from Rokeach, 1960, 1970), with the notion of 'teacher effectiveness'. He states that:

> teachers need the strongest possible system of beliefs. Accurate, comprehensive, congruent, personal theories ... [which will] provide effective guidelines for daily action [and] provide a rational basis for justifying and supporting one's professional stance. (Combs, 1982, p.5).

The extent to which some belief systems may be more 'effective' than others in achieving desired pupil outcomes is investigated within the confines of the present research.

2.2 Perspectives on the relationship between teacher beliefs and teacher behaviour

The degree of apparent consistency between held beliefs and observed behaviour has posed a number of problems for researchers. Sharp and Green (1975) examined the apparent disparity between the beliefs that 'progressive' teachers profess to hold and their subsequent behaviour. Deutscher (1965) has it that the disjunction between theory and observed practice is a widespread phenomenon.
Wicker (1969) states that:

The main conclusion to emerge from forty years of attitude research is that there is no consistent relationship between attitudes and behaviour. (Wicker, 1969, p.53).

This finding may in part be due to the amorphous nature of beliefs and attitudes mentioned earlier. However, Bem (1970) warns that:

before we accuse a man of being inconsistent we should make sure that the alleged inconsistencies are not just in the eyes of us beholders who are simply ignorant of the actual premises underlying the belief system. (Bem, 1970, p.29).

Added to this rejoinder is the possible need for researchers to be aware of other held beliefs which are likely to have a bearing on the attitude in question. It is a prominent feature of the literature that little attention has been paid to the constraining influences of beliefs upon attitudes.

Hargreaves (1979) in an attempt to explain the rift regarding perceived inconsistencies between belief and behaviour states that:

Practice will not be a simple reflection of those [teacher] values because practice arises in a different situation which has quite a different structure and set of constraints. (Hargreaves, 1979, p.80).

Be that as it may, one may argue that the "different structure" referred to by Hargreaves, is really another set
of attitudes held by the teacher. These attitudes are likely to concern the nature of the situation in which a teacher finds her/himself. As Rokeach (1960) observes:

behaviour is a result of the interaction between two attitudes - attitude towards object and attitude toward situation. (Rokeach, 1960, p.127).

At various times teacher beliefs and attitudes have been used to predict teacher behaviour. Clusters of beliefs and attitudes have been found to predict behaviour more accurately than the unitary measures as exemplified by the 'M.T.A.I.'. Harvey et al. (1968) found a significant, but low correlation between teacher behaviour (establishing a classroom atmosphere) and three measures of belief. Murphy and Brown (1970) investigated the relationship between teacher beliefs, teacher 'style' and subsequent behaviour. When teachers were categorised according to their belief scores it was possible to predict a teacher's verbal behaviour for seven out of nine behaviours.

Harvey et al. (1966, 1967) have sought to predict teacher behaviour from the way in which teacher's hold their beliefs. They found that teachers of 'abstract' and 'concrete' belief systems differed in their respective behaviour. It was found that these kinds of belief systems affected the teacher's overt 'resourcefulness', 'dictatorialness' (sic), 'and punitiveness' (sic) in the classroom.

Other researchers have given attention to the content
of beliefs as likely predictors of behaviour. Fishbein and Ajzen (1974, 1975) and Triandis (1977) have suggested that beliefs about normative desirability of an action, norms and beliefs about self and expectations about others, should be considered as likely determinants of human behaviour. Kreitler and Kreitler (1972) see behaviour as being predicted from four sets of beliefs: beliefs about self; general beliefs (unspecified); beliefs about norms and values; and beliefs about goals. They claim that all four types of belief are necessary in order to predict behaviour.

2.3 Teacher expectations and pupil outcomes

It appears that the beliefs a teacher holds about pupils and other 'significants', serve to generate expectations, not only about present observations, but future behaviour too. Expectations regarding what pupils may or may not do can be 'self-fulfilling' and have a detrimental effect on pupil performance. Expectations represent one potent example of the primacy of teacher beliefs in the classroom. Beez' (1968) findings support those by Rosenthal and Jacobsen (1966), that pupils are influenced by their teacher's expectations, and tend to behave in accord with these beliefs. Beez distributed fake psychological reports to teachers and observed the behaviour of both teachers and pupils in the classroom. He found that teachers acted upon the faked reports. When teachers expected pupils to fail,
"they attempted to teach less, spend more time on each class, give more examples of meaning ... than when they expected better performance from the child" (Beez, 1968, p.330).

Similarly Budd-Rowe (1974) looked at the amount of time that pupils were given to answer teacher questions. They discovered that below average pupils were given less time to answer questions than other pupils. They explained the observation by suggesting that if a below average child failed to answer immediately, the teacher would assume they did not know the answer. Above average pupils were given more time to answer questions. It is suggested that this is because a delay in answering the teacher would be seen as contemplation of an answer. Barker-Lunn (1970) and Burstall (1970) have both drawn conclusions which relate the attrition of pupil achievement to the negative expectations of teachers.

Although there has been much debate on just how teacher expectations operate in the classroom, a number of theories have been forthcoming. Good and Brophy (1970) state that:

Expectations tend to be self-sustaining. They affect both perception, by causing the teacher to be alert for what he expects and less likely to notice what he doesn't expect, and interpretation, by causing the teacher to interpret (and perhaps distort) what he sees, so that it is consistent with his expectations. In this way, some expectations persist even though they don't fit the facts. (Good & Brophy, 1970, p.75).
Expectations may be seen as a further example of an individual's "striving for consistency", even if, as Good and Brophy state, the beliefs "... don't fit the facts".

There is an apparent lack of research concerning the likely influence of teacher expectations as constraints on curricular choices and teacher decision-making in the classroom.

2.4 Teacher beliefs about one curricular approach: some problems

Work by Richards (1975) provides an example of some of the philosophical and methodological problems which may beset researchers in the area of beliefs. The overall purpose of Richards' study was to "clarify part of current practice", and in particular, "to identify those learning situations which primary school teachers recognised as involving 'discovery learning' and to relate these to 'discovery learning' as described in research and other literature" (Richards, 1975, p.75). Further, the research "assumed that how teachers perceived discovery learning situations determined in part how they reacted in the everyday transactions which made up the operational curriculum" [what teachers actually teach] ... [On the basis that] ... perceptions affected the types of situations they [teachers] set up, the kinds of learning they encouraged, and the type of teaching procedures they adopted" (Richards,
1975, p.76). It would be reasonable to assume that a study intent on clarifying "current practice" would pay attention to what teachers actually do in classrooms, i.e., the 'operational curriculum'. However, this was not the case. Richards states that:

> It did not prove possible within the confines of the present research to supplement the questionnaire by classroom observation. (Richards, 1975, p.76).

It may be argued, that far from being a supplementary part of the research, teacher behaviour might be considered a central feature of any research intent on describing the classroom-as-it-is. As Allen notes:

> One of the useful outcomes of research in recent years has been the realisation that in studies involving teaching methods there needs to be a direct check on the fidelity of the teacher's classroom behaviour. (Allen, 1973, p.1).

Sampling procedures in Richards' study were based on the willingness of teachers to take part, not on any randomised or representative basis. Richards says that the study "did not seek to set up hypotheses, nor to generalise from the sample to the teaching population as a whole" (Richards, 1975, p.78). It may be seen that the researcher appeared to do both. Richards expressed surprise that teachers should hold one educational aim in greater esteem than another. This was followed by an explanation of why the teachers might have made that particular choice. It
seems to be an inconsistent procedure for a research presumably based on the notion of 'null hypotheses'.

In terms of generalisation, Richards refers to his sample as "English teachers" and proceeds to compare them with American teachers - thus violating the limits of his sample. However, it was the choice of items for a beliefs questionnaire, and subsequent conclusions, which serve to underly some of the pitfalls which may beset workers in the area of teacher beliefs. Richards devised a six part questionnaire consisting of:

(1) biographical details of respondents;
(2) teacher beliefs about the aims of education;
(3) vignettes of 'discovery learning';
(4) beliefs about the outcomes of discovery learning;
(5) beliefs about the practicalities of 'discovery learning'; and
(6) beliefs concerning 'discovery learning' in the curriculum.

Items were drawn from a number of sources including the researcher's own teaching experience. The "vignettes" which Richards gave to the sample warrant particular attention. Respondents were given thirty-three 'discovery learning situations', comprising one-third of the questionnaire. The conclusion which Richards was able to draw from teacher responses highlight both the problem of operationalising variables, (e.g., 'discovery learning') and also the ever
present risk of researchers imprinting their own values and beliefs on findings.

When comparing teacher responses with literature, Richards concludes that:

Their [teachers] perceptions were not congruent with such theorists as Foster et al (1972) who appears to equate discovery learning with informal learning. (Richards, 1975, p.82).

An examination of items rated as "definitely discovery learning" would suggest that teacher responses were "congruent" with notions of 'informal learning'. One highly rated item was:

The gift of a precision geometry set inspired Scott (nine) to experiment with drawing circles, patterns and regular polygons. In the process he taught himself some geometry. (Richards, 1975, p.81).

Within the limits of the example the child is seen to be his own source of learning motivation - a basic tenet of informal learning. It is not clear, however, if the 'discovery learning' situation was in school or at home. Teachers may be reluctant to classify the example as 'informal learning' since the situation was left unspecified. Further, it is notable that teachers were only able to respond to Richards' collective view of what constitutes 'discovery learning'. No follow up was done to check on the teacher's definition of 'discovery learning' e.g. via interviews. The apparent fluidity of terms such as 'discovery learning' and 'informal
learning', highlight the need for researchers to obtain from the teachers themselves what they do, and do not, mean when they use terms. Knowing whether or not teachers agree with the researcher's own perceptions is not enough in determining the nature of curriculum. Definitions within the 'operational curriculum' are based on what teachers do when they label an activity as such. Richards further observes that:

The teachers were obviously uncertain as to the distinction between project work and discovery learning. (Richards, 1975, p.85).

It is clear that the "distinction" mentioned by Richards is the researcher's own and simply emphasises the need for operational variables mentioned earlier.

Finally Richards concludes the study by stating:

The research reported here was concerned with one small part of the operational curriculum of the primary school. Its focus was on the classroom as it 'is', rather than on the visionary classroom of 'should be' or 'might be'. (Richards, 1975, p.92).

Teachers were asked if the given examples constituted discovery learning; they were not asked if they practiced 'discovery learning' in their classrooms - an entirely different question. Either way no effort was made to find out how they defined their beliefs in practice.
3. SUMMARY OF LITERATURE AND RELATED RESEARCH

Regardless of the numerous claims made by informal drama protagonists as to the value of classroom drama, little empirical support has been given to the validity of such claims. Empirical research has been apparently limited to investigating the instrumental nature of drama. Whether empirical methods should be used at all, and whether outcomes are of higher quality when they have been utilised, are two issues likely to influence research perceptions.

A number of extraneous variables have been cited as factors capable of providing obstacles to effective exploration of hypotheses; it is likely that these factors will play a central rather than a peripheral part. Little or no account has been taken of the educational context of drama when research has taken place in schools. It is this context, in particular the influence of teacher beliefs, which is a central feature of the present research.

Examination of literature relating to teacher beliefs shows that little work has been done on the primacy of belief systems, apart perhaps from the work on expectancy effects upon pupil outcomes. In particular scant regard has been paid to the constraining influences of teacher beliefs upon curricular choice and behaviour.

More work has focused upon attitudes than beliefs probably because the former is easier to measure.

In respect of research methodology, workers in the area
may encounter more problems than most due to the amorphous nature of belief systems. Difficulties can well occur in the definition of belief variables.

In all aspects of belief work, particularly those concerning curricular approaches there is a need to make certain that teachers are doing what they say they are doing. Above all, there is a paucity of research concerning teaching methods and pupil outcomes where teacher beliefs are considered as relevant variables.
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INTRODUCTION

In this chapter the notion of belief systems is examined in relation to its employment as a conceptual base for the present research.

The first part of the chapter looks at some of the major theoretical assumptions which underpin the notion of belief systems. Included in this examination is an outline of general systems theory from which a view of beliefs as a 'system' is seen to be derived. Rokeach (1960, 1968) is one of the few workers who have paid attention to the theoretical constructs of belief systems. As a consequence, the preliminary part of the chapter draws upon his work in particular.

The second part of the chapter examines the research efforts which have been productive in expanding upon the theoretical notions of belief systems. By examining the use of a belief systems concept in different areas of research, it should be possible to construct a profile of descriptors which may be seen to contribute towards a greater understanding of the notion as used in the present study. Also included in this examination is the application of belief systems theory within the area of education. There is a
need to note how the construct has been used and with what degree of success.

Finally, the concept of belief systems will be looked at in relation to the present work. It is hoped to show that the present study represents a direct attempt to put into practice the conceptual notions of belief systems.

1. **SOME ASSUMPTIONS REGARDING THE ORGANISATION OF BELIEF SYSTEMS**

The notion of an individual's beliefs as part of an organised 'system' is derived from general systems theory. A 'system' has been defined by Miller (1955) as any organisation "... surrounded by a single boundary ... continuous in space time, and having recognisable functional relationships" (Miller, 1955, p.515).

Von Bertalanffy (1901-1972) has been the foremost protagonist of a general systems theory derived from views generated within the biological and physical sciences. Systems thinking is seen by von Bertalanffy and others as a way of viewing the world as an organised, rather than randomised, entity. Organised systems are seen by von Bertalanffy to possess certain properties. These are: "wholeness" (the extent to which parts of a system are dependent upon other parts of the system); "centralization" (the extent to which one part of a system dominates all other parts of the system); and, "open-closedness" (the
degree to which systems are able to have input and output to one or more other systems) (von Bertalanffy, 1968, pp.39-66).

The properties of systems mentioned above are seen to be isomorphic, that is, the laws generated from the observation of systems properties have been generalised by von Bertalanffy and others to systems elsewhere. The concept of general systems theory has encompassed a variety of disciplines. Problems within various fields have been confronted in a general systems manner. It has been used in areas such as applied systems research, computerisation and simulation, cybernetics, information theory, game theory and linguistic theory.

The holistic view of the world advanced by Bertalanffy has also made inroads into the area of social science. Janchill (1969) examined the person-in-situation concept as a product of general systems theory. In this approach the problems of individuals are observed in the light of numerous environmental influences. Similarly, Lilienfeld (1978) cites instances where systems theory has been applied to the practice of family therapy in which the individual is viewed within "... a network or system of cognitive and affective processes generated by his family" (Lilienfeld, 1978, p.233).

Systems theorists see Man not only as part of a wider system, but also as a system to himself. Man is viewed as a
"centred system" and as an "active personality system" (von Bertalanffy, 1968, p.192). Above all, von Bertalanffy sees Man as a "self-organising system" (von Bertalanffy, 1968, p.96). This latter view is seen to set Man apart from a total reliance upon the external stimuli of the outside world. Thus it is possible for Man to act in a way which may be contrary to the rational demands of the context in which s/he finds him/herself. This notion is explored more fully in the work of Adorno et al. (1950) described in Section 2.1 of the present chapter.

Systems theorists agree that the concept of 'system' "is not limited to material entities but can be applied to any 'whole' consisting of interacting components" (von Bertalanffy, 1968, p.106). The properties of systems that is, organisation, wholeness, centralization and open-closedness, are used by Rokeach (1960) to describe belief systems which are essentially non-materialistic in nature. Rokeach (1960) describes a system of beliefs as a "psychological system", in which, "the parts are interrelated without necessarily being logically related" (Rokeach, 1960, p.33). The notion of 'logic' is an external one; for the experiencing individual all held beliefs may appear to be "logically interrelated". One consequence of this assumption is that individuals may hold contradictory beliefs.

Rokeach (1960) has it that the organisational properties of belief systems are dimensional in nature. One
major dimension is the central-peripheral continuum mentioned in the previous chapter. This dimension is seen to possess three interrelated "layers". The first layer consists of those beliefs most central to the system. They include dispositions regarding the nature of Self and other "primitive" beliefs relating to a consensual view of reality. Central views are seen to be highly resistant to change. The second, or 'middle' layer consists of "intermediate" beliefs which contain views about authority. An 'authority' is defined as:

any source to whom we look for information about the universe, or to check information we already possess. (Rokeach, 1960, p.43).

Beliefs about the nature of authority, including sources of information, serve as important mediators between an individual and reality. The final layer of this dimension consists of "peripheral" beliefs. These are dispositions derived directly from both central and intermediate beliefs. They include the content of ideological stances which individuals may adopt, that is, beliefs which others may or may not share.

A further dimension proffered by Rokeach is a "belief-disbelief" continuum: this represents an individual's beliefs regarding what is true and what is false. It is seen that individuals can accommodate apparent contradictory beliefs by keeping the 'opposing' beliefs apart from each
other, or compartmentalised. By isolating certain beliefs it is possible for persons to maintain 'consistency' among all beliefs — regarded by Rokeach as the main functional purpose of organised belief systems. Furthermore, beliefs along the belief-disbelief continuum may be regarded as relevant-irrelevant; declared so in order to ward off potential threats to belief consistency.

The dimensions above are used by Rokeach to explain how persons strive to maintain the 'integrated, holistic and systematic character' of their belief systems. The organised system is seen to be designed to fulfil two important functions at the same time, namely:

the need to know and understand the need to ward off threatening aspects of reality. (Rokeach, 1960, p.67)

The way(s) in which persons come to terms with these conflicting needs has led Rokeach (1960) to speculate upon the relative "Open-Closed" nature of belief systems. Those with relatively "open" cognitive systems adhere to the central belief that the world is a hospitable place. Thus more effort may be spared on "the need to know and understand" and less on warding off "threatening aspects of reality". Beliefs about authority are seen to be flexible and open to change. Open persons are deemed to possess integrated belief systems with less need for isolating single beliefs to avoid apparent contradiction. These individuals tend to have input into other belief systems and to welcome innovation.
Persons with more closed cognitive systems tend to be viewed as neophobic with an exaggerated concern for ego-defense. They see reality from the vantage point of a "tightly woven network of cognitive defenses against anxiety" (Rokeach, 1960, p.69). Authority figures are not to be questioned and other persons are evaluated according to their agreement with this held view. The belief systems of these people are likely to contain many isolated beliefs linked only by their common origin of views about authority. Isolation of beliefs is seen to create resistance to change and thus the more closed-minded individual has little input, if any, into other systems.

The importance of these and other differences between systems may become more evident when research efforts are discussed which have enlarged upon these theoretical notions.

2. SOME RESEARCH CONTRIBUTIONS TOWARDS THE CONCEPT OF

BELIEF SYSTEMS

A survey of the literature suggests that work on belief systems per se is scarce in relation to an abundance of material regarding the nature of social attitudes. The research examples which follow serve to illustrate the transferability of belief systems theory to different contexts. Descriptors used by researchers to describe the characteristics of belief systems in dimensional terms,
further suggest that all dimensions cited may be subsumed beneath one overarching belief system. Therefore, emphasis here is given to research findings in terms of the profile characteristics of various belief system dimensions. It is hoped that this approach may give further clarity to the concept of belief systems as a context for the present research.

The first example of research in the belief systems area concerns the cognitive functioning of individuals within society at large.

2.1 The Authoritarian Personality

In 1950 Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson and Sanford published a collection of research efforts under the title of "The Authoritarian Personality". This work represented a general departure from the study of single beliefs and/or attitudes. It began as a study into the nature of anti-Semitic beliefs against a background of anti-Jewish feeling in Nazi Germany. The researchers analysed the ideological content of anti-Semitism and devised means of measuring it (Levinson & Sanford, 1944); they then examined the personality characteristics associated with it (Frenkel-Brunswick & Sanford, 1945). They discovered that S's who scored high on anti-Semitic scales also scored high on attitudes against other racial groups. From here the study was broadened to include the general notion of ethnocentrism.
Derived from this was the 'F' scale (Fascism) - designed to measure general prejudice. Those who scored high on the 'F' scale similarly scored high on measures of ethnocentrism, anti-Semitism and anti-negro feeling and tended to be politically conservative. Persons high on measures of authoritarianism are characterised by, strict adherence to conventional values, uncritical attitudes towards moral authorities, aggression towards those who violate conventions, opposition to the imagination, toughmindedness, disposition to think in rigid categories, overly concern with dominance-submissiveness dimension, generalised hostility, belief in the world as a dangerous place and a prudish attitude towards sex.

The writers describe the 'Authoritarian Personality' as "a single syndrome, a more or less enduring structure in the person that renders his receptiveness to anti-democratic propaganda" (Adorno et al., 1950, p.9). The "structure" is seen to consist of prejudiced and hostile attitudes - an expression of inner needs. Furthermore, persons who are deemed to be high on authoritarianism, as compared with persons who are deemed to be low, tend to be more rigid in their problem-solving behaviour, more concrete in their thinking and more narrow in their grasp of a particular subject. They also have a greater inclination to premature closure in their perceptual processes and tend to be intolerant of ambiguity.
The authors were primarily concerned with the influence of anti-democratic propaganda upon persons with predominantly authoritarian attitudes. They make it clear that all persons are likely to possess authoritarian tendencies to a greater or lesser degree.

2.2 Dogmatic persons

In an attempt to move from the concept of Open-Closed mindedness to its measure, Rokeach (1960) developed the 'Dogmatism Scale'. Dogmatism is viewed as a manifestation of general authoritarianism as distinguished from ideological authoritarianism (Adorno et al., 1950). On the basis of his findings, Rokeach suggests that:

we categorise people and groups of people in terms of the extent to which their beliefs are congruent or incongruent with our own. We generally seem to prefer ... those with belief systems that are more congruent with our own. (Rokeach, 1960, p.391).

Rokeach adds that the acceptance or rejection of people, ideas and beliefs depends heavily upon a "continuum of similarity" between belief systems (Rokeach, 1960, p.391).

The dogmatic person has been characterised as frustrated by changeable conditions, submissive and conforming, conservative, and respecting of established ideas (Vacchiano et al., 1968). On the whole, dogmatic persons tend to be intolerant of people who do not share their values.

Both the 'Authoritarian Personality' and Rokeach's work
on dogmatism are primarily concerned with the cognitive functioning of individuals within society as a whole. Implicit to both is the notion that holders of particular belief systems may be potentially more 'effective' than others in carrying out role tasks within social contexts.

2.3 Belief systems and assumptions about role

Kahn (1964) contrasted the role characteristics of persons deemed to be predominantly "Flexible" and others of a more "Rigid" disposition, within the context of industry. 'Rigid' persons were seen as 'closed-minded' and highly dogmatic. Their internal values were deemed to be founded upon tightly structured belief systems. They had a tendency to simplify problems and "favour a highly structured, consistent, orderly and stable situation with well defined tasks" that could be finished on schedule (Kahn, 1964, p.291).

In interpersonal relations, 'Rigids' tended to hold prejudices at the expense of gratifying friendships and were further inclined to be highly judgmental of others. Those with 'Rigid' systems were also orientated towards status and authority, preferring to control or to be controlled, "to be master or servant" (Kahn, 1964, p.285). Direction and control would only be accepted from legitimate sources of authority, but not from peers or subordinates. 'Rigids' were seen to be fitted to tasks that required perseverance, but not innovation.
On the other hand, the 'Flexible' person was deemed to be 'open-minded', low on dogmatism and 'Other' orientated (Riesman, 1950) in outlook. 'Flexibles' were found to be tolerant of those with opposing views and more ready to accept new ideas than 'Rigid' persons. They tended to proffer integrated solutions to problems and welcomed participation in decision-making. 'Flexibles' were sensitive to, and accepting of, role pressures. They welcomed change and preferred a minimum number of set routines.

Research efforts by Rokeach (1960), Adorno et al. (1950) and Kahn (1964), have served to exemplify some major ways in which the notion of belief systems has been employed in relation to the cognitive functioning of individuals within the general context of society. The latter work by Kahn (1964) has served to demonstrate the primacy of belief systems in their effect upon role behaviour.

3. THE CONCEPT OF BELIEF SYSTEMS IN EDUCATION

Little work has been done on the nature of belief systems in comparison to the volume of research relating to teacher and pupil attitudes. Most work in the area of teacher beliefs appears to be concerned with the 'Open-Closed' nature of systems proposed by Rokeach et al (1960).

Investigations have come to focus upon the study of dogmatism in relation to teacher attitudes and behaviour.
Some workers have employed the notion of 'general authoritarianism' as an operational definition of the 'ineffective' teacher, who holds negative attitudes towards teaching and is unable or unwilling to incorporate new methods or ideas into her teaching approach (Johnston, 1967; Ofchus & Gnagney, 1963; Del Popolo, 1960; Combs, 1982).

Dogmatism in the classroom teacher has been described by one writer as "a condition (which) could well prove fatal to both the afflicted teacher and the exposed pupil" (Soderbergh, 1964, p.245). Cohen (1971) found that teacher trainees high on dogmatism expressed particular preference for primary school pupils "who were obedient, willing to accept the judgements of authorities, quiet, reserved and preferring to work on their own" (Cohen, 1971, p.160). She concluded that, "highly dogmatic teacher trainees appeared to show preferences for teacher directed rather than pupil directed classrooms" (Cohen, 1971, p.160).

Harvey et al. (1966) examined the classroom behaviour of teachers possessing relatively 'concrete-abstract' belief systems. 'Concreteness' is defined by the authors as, "a disposition towards categorical and fixed beliefs, authority rather than task concern, and a preference for a simple structured environment" (Harvey et al., 1966, p.156).

'Abstractness' is characterised by flexible and sophisticated belief systems and an inclination towards a complex structured environment. It was found that the
majority of abstract teachers "expressed greater warmth
towards children, showed greater perception of children's
wishes and needs, were more flexible in meeting pupil
interests, gave greater encouragement to the free expression
of feelings, were less role orientated, manifested less need
for structure, were less punitive and less anxious about
being observed than more 'concrete' teachers" (Harvey et__
al., 1966, p.156).

In relation to innovation, Bridges and Reynolds (1968)
examined the effects of teacher belief systems upon their
receptivity to innovation in classrooms. As hypothesised,
teachers with more 'open' beliefs were significantly more
receptive to change than teachers with closed belief
systems.

Elsewhere in the field, efforts have been made to
define operationally the concept of 'Open' education.
Walberg and Thomas (1971) reviewed the literature regarding
'Open Education', analysed the notion in its component parts
and verified their analysis with 'Open' educators. From
here instruments were developed to measure Open Education.
When reviewing the concept of 'Open Education' they
observed, "a view of the child, especially in the primary
grades, as a significant decision-maker in determining the
direction, scope, means and pace of his education" (Walberg
& Thomas, 1972, p.198). Further "... Open educators hold
that the teacher and the child in complementary roles,
should share together the child's experience" (Walberg & Thomas, 1972, p.198). When making comparisons between the profiles of 'Open' and 'Traditional' educators, Walberg and Thomas (1972) found:

Open classes differ sharply from traditional on five out of eight criteria: provisioning; humaneness; diagnosis; instruction and evaluation. (Walberg & Thomas, 1972, p.206).

Overall, the notion of relatively 'Open-Closed' teacher belief systems has been associated with the possession of particular attitudes, a capacity for innovation, respective views about pupils, certain classroom behaviour, teacher warmth and general flexibility.

Elsewhere, research efforts have predominantly focussed on single teacher/pupil attitudes or single beliefs. One major area of pupil attitude research has concerned the basic notion of 'Self' in respect of home based (Brookover et al., 1967) and school-based (Purkey, 1970; et al) influences on its formation and subsequent pupil performance.

It soon becomes clear that there is a great deal of scope for using the notion of belief systems, particularly in regard to how teachers and pupils hold their beliefs (structure) and what they believe (content), in relation to what transpires in classrooms. There is a need to examine teacher beliefs in regard to both teacher-pupil behaviour and pupil outcomes. It seems that no one, as yet, has
examined the notion of teacher belief-behaviour 'consistency' in respect of pupil success in the classroom. Similarly research on the likely influence of one set of beliefs upon another and subsequent effects upon curricular choice, general teacher decision-making processes and pupil outcomes is sadly lacking. Likewise, teacher perceptions about the central notion of role have also been ignored when judgements have come to be made concerning the relative 'effectiveness' of particular teaching strategies.

If, as the above observations suggest, teacher belief systems do have a fundamental impact upon curricular choice, classroom transactions and pupil performance, then the holistic approach exemplified by the present research is fully warranted.

4. BELIEF SYSTEMS AND THE PRESENT STUDY

The present research concerns the use of drama in the hands of different primary teachers who may be seen to vary according to drama choices and held beliefs. The relative 'effectiveness' of particular belief systems may be examined in the light of pupil outcomes.

The research draws upon Rokeach's (1960, 1968) theory regarding notions of belief 'connectedness', 'centrality' and 'consistency'. Teacher beliefs about drama are seen to be linked to underlying beliefs about what curriculum 'is' and what it can do. Similarly, dispositions about learning
and how children 'ought' to be taught are connected to beliefs about the influences a teacher may bring to bear on the pupil to enhance learning. These 'influences' may be seen to derive from central notions about the nature of the teacher's role - the 'professional self'. Teachers may hold a number of beliefs in common with other educators, however, owing to the idiosyncratic nature of belief systems, views of 'role' may be interpreted and manifested by teachers in different ways.

Table 3.1 shown overleaf, presents a profile summary of major belief system differences evidenced so far in the present chapter. Belief systems 'A' and 'B' represent the opposite poles of an overarching dimension, open versus closed systems. It is apparent that a 'traditional' view of the teacher's role is likely to be more consonant with a 'B' orientated, rather than 'A' orientated, system. Emphasis is likely to be placed upon the notion of the teacher as the central authority in the classroom - with the pupil as an obedient follower. System 'B' is also compatible with a notion of the teacher as a provider of all 'worthwhile' knowledge and as a purveyor of "conventional values". Observation suggests that this particular view of the 'traditional' teacher is likely to facilitate those characteristics associated with the 'Authoritarian Personality' (Adorno et al., 1950).
### Table 3.1
A comparison of Open and Closed Belief Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Belief System A (Open)</th>
<th>Belief System B (Closed)</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. AUTHORITY</td>
<td>Not absolute</td>
<td>Absolute.</td>
<td>Rokeach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-submissive</td>
<td>Submissive towards</td>
<td>Adorno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>towards authority.</td>
<td>authority.</td>
<td>Adorno/Rokeach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prefers low control.</td>
<td>Prefers high control.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Critical of authority.</td>
<td>Non-critical.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aggressive towards</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>critics of,</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CONFORMITY</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High.</td>
<td>Adorno/Rokeach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strict adherence to</td>
<td>Rokeach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rules.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. COGNITIVE FUNCTIONING</td>
<td>Flexible.</td>
<td>Rigid.</td>
<td>Rokeach/Kahn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broad grasp of subjects.</td>
<td>Narrow grasp of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abstract reasoning</td>
<td>subjects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concrete reasoning.</td>
<td>Harvey et al.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. PERSONALITY</td>
<td>Tenderminded</td>
<td>Toughminded</td>
<td>Adorno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. CHANGE AND INNOVATION</td>
<td>Open towards change</td>
<td>Closed towards change</td>
<td>Rokeach/Kahn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and innovation</td>
<td>and innovation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. IMAGINATION</td>
<td>Encourages</td>
<td>Discourages</td>
<td>Adorno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. TEACHER WARMTH</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Cohen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. VIEW OF PUPIL</td>
<td>Non-Submissive</td>
<td>Submissive</td>
<td>Cohen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On the other hand, the respective roles of teacher and pupil outlined by Barth (1972) and Walberg and Thomas (1971) would appear to be consonant with belief system 'A'. The role differences, which may derive in part from corresponding variations between systems 'A' and 'B', further reflect certain ideological stances which teachers may adopt. Terms such as 'traditional-progressive', and others, are seen to be ideological and are therefore "peripheral" beliefs (Rokeach, 1960). These beliefs are seen to derive from central beliefs of Self and Authority.

It is observable that in terms of ideological orientation, 'drama' is often viewed by practitioners as a 'child-centred' activity. It is an experiential aspect of the curriculum which is, in theory, likely to sit more comfortably with teachers adhering to an 'A' rather than a 'B' belief system. However, in practice, there are many activities labelled 'drama' - some may be orientated towards system 'A' (for example, child invented plays) while others may be more towards system 'B' (for example, theatre). It remains to be seen how viable these options are in respect of producing intended pupil outcomes. In particular, some observation will be made of child-orientated drama in the hands of system 'B' -oriented teachers.

It may be seen that one cannot divorce the notion of drama choice from other dispositions within a teacher's belief system - all beliefs are viewed as 'connected'. 
Figure 3.1 serves to show the 'connectedness' between central views concerning the 'professional self' and other more peripheral beliefs regarding beliefs about drama and beliefs about education. Views about drama (or any other aspect of the curriculum) and education (teaching-learning) are seen to be reflective. For example, within the same belief system, beliefs about the role of the teacher in a general class setting (education) are likely to be directly related to beliefs about the role of the teacher in drama. Thus drama belief 'X' is seen to correspond to education belief 'X' - both derive from a common, central belief, 'X' regarding the notion of teacher role per se. Similarly, other central views about the teacher role, 'V', 'W', 'Y', and 'Z' may generate other peripheral beliefs - 'V1', 'V2', 'W1', 'W2', 'Y1', 'Y2', 'Z1', 'Z2', ... which influence, and are influenced by, more central beliefs.

The extent to which a teacher believes that notions of his/her role are supported by 'significant others' (colleagues and pupils) may have a bearing on what is done by teachers in classrooms, including drama. These and other beliefs about the nature of authority may act as constraints on what teachers believe is possible in their classrooms. Furthermore, a teacher's ability to be 'consistent' between held beliefs and classroom behaviour is likely to be mediated by these dispositions regarding 'others'. It may be seen that belief-behaviour 'consistency' can be a vital factor in terms of pupil success in the classroom.
Figure 3.1

Some characteristics of teacher belief systems

KEY:

- Central beliefs

- Peripheral beliefs derived from central beliefs
Overall, given the state of research in the area of drama (see Chapter 2) the belief systems of teachers provide a starting point for a methodological enquiry into the value of its use in schools. It is pertinent to note that when teachers are asked about the use of drama in schools, they tend to reply in terms of their own role perceptions, the role of the learner, colleague supportiveness and overall notions of what constitutes 'teaching'. It is in the nature of the teacher's role that greater emphasis may be placed upon the process of teaching than upon the process of 'learning'. It soon becomes clear that drama in schools may only be profitably viewed within the context of teacher belief systems.

5. SUMMARY

More attention has been paid to the theory of social attitudes than to belief systems per se. Thus work on the latter has been left in the hands of a few workers. Rokeach (1960) has proffered a view of belief systems as structured organised entities. The way(s) in which a belief system is organised has led Rokeach to speculate on important differences which may exist between systems. A fundamental difference between systems is seen to be that of Open-Closedness. 'Open' systems are deemed to have more input into other systems than closed entities.

The work of a number of researchers has been productive
in putting some notions of belief systems into practice. For instance, a major departure from the study of social attitudes has been the work of Adorno et al. (1950) on ideological authoritarianism ('The Authoritarian Personality') and Rokeach (1960) on dogmatism (general authoritarianism). The latter was derived from notion of 'Open-Closedmindedness'.

Workers make it clear that authoritarian characteristics of hostility and aggression may be possessed by all persons to a greater or lesser degree. Implicit within both major areas of study is the notion that different belief systems may give rise to corresponding differences in role enactments in social contexts. This notion is pursued in the examination of work by Kahn (1964) who has associated variations in role behaviour with differences in belief systems. Thus the notion of belief systems is seen to be successfully applied to the social context of role behaviour, beyond the area of cognitive functioning.

In the area of education, work on belief systems has been relatively sparse. Of the work which has been done, a number of workers have combined the Open-Closed nature of systems with, views of the teacher's role in relation to classroom behaviour (Harvey, 1966; et al.) and impressions regarding the 'ideal' pupil (Cohen). A number of other researchers have equated dogmatism in teachers with 'ineffectiveness' in the classroom. Overall, however, it is
clear that work on belief systems has been neglected in relation to an array of studies on teacher/pupil attitudes.

The present research is seen to draw upon certain aspects of belief systems theory outlined at the beginning of this chapter. One aim of the study is to examine the relative import that differences between systems may hold for drama choices, teacher behaviour and pupil outcomes. Central to a teacher's belief system are seen to be those dispositions regarding the role of the teacher. From this vantage point other beliefs concerning aims, priorities and strategies are deemed to emanate. Thus differences between systems are likely to engender differences in teacher role, teacher behaviour and subsequent pupil outcomes. Similar attention will be paid to shared beliefs among teachers and the influence that this 'climate' of opinion may have on drama use.

Drama is an experiential activity and its use may be profitably observed in the hands of teachers holding different beliefs and manifesting differing behaviour. Drama is a non-compulsory feature of the school timetable and thus it may serve to reveal teacher prejudices and their subsequent effects upon classroom behaviour and pupil success. It remains to be seen whether or not some belief systems may be deemed more 'effective' than others.

The present research will include observation of
hitherto neglected areas of teacher belief systems. In particular:

i. the nature of beliefs as constraints upon one aspect of the curriculum, drama; and

ii. the effect of belief-behaviour consistency upon pupil outcomes.

The conceptual notion of belief systems provides a framework in which the influences of different kinds of drama and variations in teacher behaviour can be profitably observed in the light of pupil outcomes. How these systems are observed, measured and examined, in relation to particular drama options, teacher behaviour and the educational outcomes of pupils, provides the basis for the next chapter.
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INTRODUCTION

The overall aim of the chapter is to discuss the research methods and strategies adopted in the present investigation. In order to justify the research methods and strategies chosen, the research area under investigation is outlined from its conceptual beginnings up to the formulation of researchable questions used in the present study. Then follows a detailed explanation of the research methods. By presenting the work in this way the process of selecting research strategies can be judged within the context of the kinds of questions being asked and their evolution.

A discussion is then given to the 'One Sample Pretest-Posttest' design (Campbell & Stanley, 1963) as used in the present work. In accordance with this theme, consideration is given to a number of 'extraneous factors' which may impinge on the validity of the research, and also the steps which were taken to reduce their likely effects. The final part of the chapter outlines the sampling procedures used in the present work.
1. THE RESEARCH DESIGN: AN EVOLUTIONARY PERSPECTIVE

1.1 Some beginnings

The present research was undertaken at a time when a number of Australian states had begun to introduce into primary and secondary schools a set of drama curriculum guidelines. A perusal of these documents suggests that the curriculum planner's views of drama are basically 'child-orientated'. How successful these guidelines are from the vantage point of teacher and pupils remains to be seen. It was thought at the outset of the present research that an investigation of drama use in schools might serve to throw some light on the likely success of these and other curricula exercises.

The present research was predominantly influenced by the professional background of the author. Work as a teacher, drama consultant and lecturer, and the significant influences of various drama protagonists (Slade, Bolton and Heathcote), prompted a desire to seek researchable questions regarding the use of drama in schools. Specialist training in the area of drama also served to influence perceptions of 'drama' and its concomitant value in education.

Allied to the quest for researchable questions was the need to locate appropriate research strategies. For various reasons research workers in the area of drama have demonstrated a preference for qualitative rather than quantitative methods of observation. It is apparent that a number of
workers hold the view that normative approaches to drama observation could well destroy the nature of what is, essentially, a qualitative experience. The author's own perceptions were in accord with this position when the present research was originally broached. However, growing confidence in the use of a variety of qualitative and quantitative measures encouraged the author to use a more holistic approach in the investigation of drama in schools.

Emphasis on predominantly qualitative approaches has resulted in many researchers being unable to generalise findings to a wider teacher-pupil population. Thus there was little empirical work upon which the present work could be based. Similarly there was an absence of reported empirical approaches that had been successfully employed in the drama area.

Given this state of affairs, the present research had to be formulated from some fundamental baseline. A logical starting point for an investigation of drama in education was with the opinions of teachers in schools.

1.2 An informal survey of teacher opinions

It was decided that an investigation of drama use should take place in the primary rather than secondary school since drama work was likely to be more abundant in the former. It was felt also that some benefit might be gained from viewing drama in relation to other teacher-pupil activities.
Initially, it was intended that the present study would concentrate on a comparison of the relative outcomes of pupils who were or were not exposed to drama. This approach would have enabled the testing of at least some of the many claims made in the literature about drama use. It would have involved a Static Comparison design as outlined in Campbell and Stanley (1963). However, discussions held with some sixty primary teachers, in local schools, led to the conclusion that most, if not all, were doing some form of drama, at some time within their classrooms. Thus, a representative sample of non-drama doers would have been extremely difficult to find. The notion was abandoned.

Owing to the amorphous nature of the term 'drama' initial steps were taken to find out what teachers meant when they employed its use. This was the beginning of a process of clarification which served to provide valuable information when teachers were observed and categorised according to held notions about 'drama'. Teachers admitted that drama was not a settled timetable issue and thus its use was more often spasmodic than systematic. This finding led to speculation about the presence of certain influences on drama use. Teachers were asked what factors might serve to encourage or discourage their drama efforts in schools. A survey of literature suggested that the concept of 'teacher styles' might well encapsulate many of the teacher-based drama influences on the resultant checklist. It was
thought that differences in styles might well account for variations in drama use and subsequent choices and outcomes. However, it soon became clear that 'teacher style' was an inadequate concept since it could not be used to cover a wide range of declared environmental influences. Thus the notion of teacher style was also abandoned.

From here the work was broadened to consider both personal and environmental factors likely to influence drama use. The checklist of influences on drama use had shown 'significant others' (pupils and colleagues) appeared to have a large part to play in governing the use of drama for many of the surveyed teachers. A common denominator in teacher responses concerning the influences on children of drama, was their frequent reference to other school-based beliefs regarding notions of the teacher and 'teaching'. It was to the nature of teacher beliefs that the study was subsequently directed.

1.3 A formal survey of teacher belief systems

The informal teacher survey had shown that when observing beliefs about drama in schools, it was necessary to take into account other school-based beliefs. When asked about drama, teachers had replied in terms of their own role, the role of the learner, the relationship between teaching and learning, and the significant part played by pupils and colleagues on their drama choice(s). That is, it
was seen to be essential to acknowledge the primacy of teacher belief systems on drama use in schools.

Literature relating to the relative 'open-closedness' (Rokeach, 1960) of belief systems served to generate in the present author a measure of curiosity about the likely effects that different systems might have on both drama choices and pupil outcomes. It was judged that teachers might be attracted to particular types of drama on the basis of relatively 'open-closed' systems. For example, teachers with predominantly 'closed' belief systems might well employ a kind of drama which readily invites a low degree of ambiguity and a high degree of pupil control.

Notions of 'Flexism-Fixism' were used to describe teachers with relatively open or closed belief systems respectively. In similar vein, the terms 'Flexorg-Fixorg' were used to illustrate the open-closedness of beliefs generated within the psychological environment of the school. The environment was viewed as ideological in nature and referred to as a climate of opinion. An index of this climate was seen to be the total collection of all teacher beliefs within the one school. It was decided that an individual teacher's beliefs might be viewed in relation to the climate of the school in which s/he operated. Thus it would be possible to examine the degree of likely (and perceived) support a teacher might receive when decisions about drama come to be made.
The Teacher Opinionnaire was devised in order to test out the influence of Flexist-Fixist belief systems and Flexorg-Flexorg school climates on the use of drama. The Opinionnaire (Appendix 3) consisted of belief statements derived from the 'Checklist of Drama Influences' (Appendix 1) and items from various literature sources. A representative sample of primary school teachers was chosen (see 3.1) to respond to belief statements on a Likert (1932) type scale. One purpose of the Opinionnaire was to locate individual teachers along a Fixist-Flexist dimension and identify the Fixorg-Flexorg nature of schools. Having done this it would be possible to observe the relative influence of various individual-school profiles on drama use.

The results of the Opinionnaire were somewhat surprising, at least to the researcher. Rather than revealing a Fixist-Flexist dimension of belief systems, it served to illustrate the existence of one aggregated teacher belief set which transcended notions of open-closedness. This overarching set of teacher beliefs, shared by most teachers, appeared to cut across all separate school 'climates' and subsequently to reveal a 'professional teacher climate' which might well have a bearing on many aspects of decision-making.

The formal survey also revealed other vital elements which were to give direction to the present research. Many teachers appeared to hold beliefs which were in disharmony
with the philosophical tenets of the kind of drama they had elected to pursue. For example, some teachers held relatively formal views regarding a declared decision to direct all classroom activities, while choosing to operate an informal or child-based drama. It may well be that this phenomenon was due to a view of drama as a separate curriculum entity, relatively free of teacher direction. That is, pupils would be given time to invent their own drama as a break from more formal activities. Alternatively, teachers might well be operating an informal drama option in a formal manner, thus giving support to Watkin's (1981) view that this is often the case in schools.

Further, a number of teachers appeared to hold beliefs that were inconsistent; that is, they held one or more beliefs that were in potential conflict with other held beliefs. There was a need to locate further beliefs that might explain these apparent inconsistencies.

Overall, it was clear that the relationship between teacher beliefs and drama choices required further clarification. With this in mind a number of teachers were selected for interview from among those who had completed the Opinionnaire.

1.4 The teacher interviews

Seventeen primary teachers were randomly selected as a sub-sample for interview on the basis of drama choice. The
Opinionnaire revealed that the most popular drama choices in middle and upper primary schools (42 schools) were theatre and child improvisation. The two types represented methods which have their roots in conflicting educational ideologies and thus were to provide an ideal basis for further teacher comparisons.

In the interview teachers were encouraged to enlarge upon their notions of drama and its perceived value and influences. Importantly, they were asked what they hoped to achieve by the employment of drama. These intended outcomes provided a valuable reference point when teachers came to be compared according to their choice of one option or the other. Given an obvious danger of teachers inventing intended drama outcomes, they were asked to refer to their daily, weekly, or term statements of intent which appeared to be well documented. Notably there was a high degree of consensus about the kind of aims the teachers were attempting to achieve in drama — all of which related to aspects of personal development. These aims were (most frequent):

. the development of pupil confidence/esteem (including the spread of this confidence to academic areas);
. creative development (verbal and non-verbal); and
. the fostering of pupil empathy.

Given the nature of these aims, steps were taken to ensure that teachers were only employing one kind of drama
when their aims were formulated. As this proved to be the case, it was clear that the teachers in the sub-sample were pursuing a set of common aims while employing two very different kinds of drama. It appeared sensible to find out what kind of drama 'works' and with which aims in mind.

Teachers in the sub-sample also clarified their stances on a number of issues relating to notions of teacher role and other statements on the Opinionnaire. Notably there was a high level of belief consensus between Opinionnaire responses and interview data although they had been administered some five months apart.

Derived from the Opinionnaire and the teacher interviews were three pertinent findings:

. notions of drama were consonant between measures;

. perceptions regarding the role of the teacher appeared to govern all aspects of drama choice; and

. beliefs, particularly those referring to pupils and colleagues, appeared to have a constraining influence on perceptions of drama choice.

The apparent mis-match between held beliefs and drama choice, evident in the present sample, was still left unresolved. It was considered unwise to proceed to compare teachers on pupil outcomes according to their drama choices and held beliefs alone. How teachers come to terms with their beliefs and drama choices in the classroom warranted investigation. Were teachers doing what they professed to
be doing? To find this out it was necessary to compare teacher beliefs with teacher actions.

1.5 Classroom observation

Various instruments were developed to report on classroom behaviour in both a qualitative and quantitative manner (Appendices 7 and 8). Observations soon revealed a number of apparent inconsistencies between beliefs and behaviour. Five out of the seventeen teachers were not doing the kind of drama they had professed. One person was not doing any drama at all. The remaining four teachers were not employing the child-based drama they had described earlier. Instead they were using a kind of drama exercise. Bolton's (1979) classification of drama activity (Bolton, 1979, pp. 1-12) was used to assign these four teachers to a separate 'Exercise' group, thus increasing the number of drama types under observation to three: child improvisation, theatre and drama exercise. (See 'Operational Definitions' for details.) All four teachers were convinced that the drama was child improvisation or dramatic play because pupils were able to invent or improvise their own work. However, a number of subsequent observations showed that pupils were not allowed to create their own work but had to follow the directions of teacher narratives throughout the drama sessions observed.

In short, some teachers believed they were doing one
kind of drama, but, when observed, were clearly doing another. Similarly, a number of teachers were acting in a manner which was not in accord with their professed beliefs. These two fundamental observations led to further speculation about the likely influences of teachers' drama choices and belief-behaviour consistency upon the drama outcomes of pupils.

Given the assumed primacy effect of teacher beliefs on drama choice, mentioned earlier, what options do teachers really have when making their drama choices? What are the likely consequences of these choices for pupil outcomes? How important is it that teachers should be consistent between held beliefs and behaviour? How viable are certain belief-behaviour combinations in respect of achieving desired ends? With these questions in mind, a research design was sought which would satisfy both the conceptual and the pragmatic requirements of the present investigation.

1.6 The comparison of pupil outcomes

1.6.1 Some alternative approaches

In order to investigate respective teacher influences on the promotion of pupil outcomes a number of research designs were considered. The main choice was between experimental and pre-experimental research designs reported in Campbell and Stanley (1963).

Experimental designs had been rejected on a number of
grounds. Firstly, given the independent variables of drama choice and the belief-behaviour characteristics of teachers, it would have proved difficult, and in some cases, impossible, to locate a suitable control group. Most teachers were reported to be doing some kind of drama. More pertinent is the fact that one cannot find teachers without beliefs!

Secondly, there was a need to observe the doing of drama within the naturalistic setting of schools and classrooms. It was thought that a manipulation of a particular kind of drama, one which had not been experienced before by the sample, might well result in a 'reactive' response (Campbell & Stanley, 1963). A number of earlier drama researchers had imposed particular kinds of drama on various samples and had run a risk of generating a Hawthorne effect. In order to manipulate drama treatments experimentally, it may have proved necessary to replicate drama experiences across treatment groups. Hence there may well have been a need to impose a view of drama upon the sample, probably unlike their own views, resulting in a threat to the validity of the study. For similar reasons the observation of teachers in naturalistic settings also meant that the researcher did not need to teach any drama; the risk of imposing personal values about drama thus being lessened.

It is also important to view drama within the setting
of school-based influences, such as teacher belief systems. Teacher beliefs provided the other main independent variable of the study. Suffice to say that attempts to manipulate either teacher beliefs and/or teacher behaviour is questionable on ethical grounds, and not a task that this author would have been willing to undertake.

Given the state of research in the drama area, it was not the intent of the present research to advance or build upon any particular theory. Instead there was a need to generate questions capable of being researched regarding the fundamental nature of teacher beliefs, teacher behaviour, drama choices and pupil outcomes. This was likely to be achieved best within the naturalistic settings of schools.

It was felt also that the use of an experimental approach might well serve to hinder the generalisability of the present research findings to other teacher-pupil populations. Thus, the idea of employing a technically experimental approach was discarded.

1.6.2 The pretest-posttest design

Among the pre-experimental alternatives, the One Sample Pretest-Posttest design (Campbell & Stanley, 1963) appeared to show the greatest amount of promise, with particular reference to notions of pupil gains on educational outcomes. Three hundred and seventy pupils from the classes of the teachers under scrutiny, were observed on two separate
occasions, nine weeks apart. On each occasion pupils were invited to respond to measures of personal development; that is, to indices of the claimed drama outcomes mentioned by teachers in the sub-sample.

Data derived from $O^1$ and $O^2$, and subsequent differences between the two observations, was categorised according to the kind of drama treatment, $X^1$ (child drama), $X^2$ (theatre) or $X^3$ (exercise) that pupils had experienced. (See Chapter 5 for drama definitions.) Observations were then made of the relative gains and losses of pupil groups according to the teacher's choice of drama.

Similarly, pupil data was also grouped in relation to the belief-behaviour characteristics of their teachers. Pupils' gains and losses on outcomes were examined in relation to this grouping. Thus it was possible to use a pretest-posttest design to observe the relative teacher influences of drama choice and belief-behaviour consistency on pupil outcomes.

From a conceptual vantage point the use of an '0$^1$ X 0$^2$', design accommodated notions of pupil growth. The concept of pupil growth is an inherent part of most, if not all, literature relating to the education benefits of drama. Moreover, it serves to conceptualise the kinds of outcomes that teachers were attempting to achieve with their pupils in drama, namely, personal development. Thus all the teachers in the sub-sample (n=16) were claiming to develop
pupils via the kinds of drama options and behaviour strategies they employed.

2. **EXTRANEOUS INFLUENCES ON RESEARCH VALIDITY**

In the present study, differences between $O^1$ and $O^2$ were hypothesised to be associated with pupil gains and losses on educational outcomes. However, with a pretest-posttest design there are several extraneous variables (reported in Campbell & Stanley, 1963) which are capable of providing alternative hypotheses to the $O^1-O^2$ differences attributed to the main treatments in the study. These extraneous factors may be divided into two main categories: those which may serve to influence the internal validity of the research and others that may exercise similar power on external validity. Thus attention is now given to these respective influences on the present study and the measures taken to reduce their effects.

2.1 **Factors associated with the internal validity of the study**

Campbell and Stanley (1963) note that with the 'One Sample Pretest-Posttest' design there are numerous "categories of extraneous variables left uncontrolled which thus become rival explanations of any differences between $O^1$ and $O^2$, confounded with the possible effects of X" (Campbell & Stanley, 1963, p.265). These are:
2.1.1 History

This variable refers to events that may have happened between $0^1$ and $0^2$ which have stimulated the effects attributed to $X$, the study treatment.

In the present research all teachers whose pupils were being measured on drama outcomes were given a 'Supplementary Sheet' (details in Appendix 15) to complete. Among other aims, it was devised in order to survey internal (classroom) and external (school) events that may have provided an alternative hypothesis to $0^1-0^2$ differences. Included on the 'Supplementary Sheet' were items such as:

Will your children be taking part in any public performance prior to the second measure?

Responses to this and other items suggested that there were no unusual events likely to occur and contaminate findings. It was not possible to control for pupil experiences in the affective domain other than drama. For example, work done in art classes could well have had some bearing on the performances of creativity tasks. Nonetheless, given that pupil outcomes were predominantly compared on a group-by-group basis, there was no reason to believe that any one group had been exposed to these outcome-type activities any more than any other. Subsequent talks with teachers, regarding timetable content, supported this notion.
2.1.2 Maturation

Another uncontrollable variable is that of 'Maturation'. It is described by Campbell and Stanley (1963) as "processes within the respondents operating as a function of the passage of time per se not specific to the particular events" (Campbell & Stanley, 1963, p.5). In the present study the time lapse between 01 and 02 was exactly nine weeks. This period was considered to be a reasonable amount of time for changes to occur in respect of pupil gains due to the treatment of X (drama). It was also felt that the nine week period was too short for 01-02 differences to be due to maturation alone, i.e., that one might except purely by chance. Once again, given the nature of group comparisons in the study, it was not thought that the presence, or absence of maturational effects would favour one group more than another.

2.1.3 Instrument decay

A further influence on the research was "Instrument decay", where differences between 01 and 02 might be attributed to variations of each measure set and their administration. In the present study, emphasis was placed on the need for content and administration of the tests to be identical between 01 and 02.* There was only one worker

* For a variety of reasons (see 6.2.5) it was not possible or desirable to administer identical creativity tasks between 01 and 02.
used on all administrations. A set of written instructions was devised (Appendix 11) for the administration and presentation of all measures and the same set was used on both observations. Finally, O2 measures were administered to pupils on the same day of the week and the same time of day as O1 measures given to pupils nine weeks earlier.

2.1.4 Statistical regression

This factor is particularly relevant to studies where samples are chosen on the basis of their extreme scores on pretests. By chance alone scores generated at the extreme end of the continuum tend, on subsequent testings, to gravitate towards more moderate scores closer to the mean. This was not the case in the present research, since the sample was chosen on the basis of drama preferences, not their extreme scores.

2.1.5 Mortality

A final factor to be considered in terms of internal validity is that of mortality where O1-O2 differences may be attributed to gains or losses of subjects between the two observations. A gain or loss might well change the characteristics of the O2 sample from that of O1, so one is left with two essentially different samples. In the present research the attrition rate of pupils between O1 and O2 was
7.3%, i.e., from a sample of n=399 to n=370. Given this relatively low level of attrition which appeared to favour no group (sex or drama type) in particular, it was not seen as a grave threat to the internal validity of the study.

It now remains to examine some possible influences on the external validity of the present study.

2.2 Factors associated with the external validity of the present research

2.2.1 Interaction of testing with factors hypothesised to be related to pupils' gains and losses

The very act of testing may be seen to influence \( O_1-O_2 \) differences, rivalling the research hypotheses of the study. In order to reduce effects of testing, measures in the study were chosen (or constructed) for their relative unobtrusiveness in the context of the classroom. The administration of the measures were done in accord with the ways in which any other pencil, paper or drawing activities might be given in the classroom. Further, test items were deemed by teachers to be non-threatening to their pupils and at the same time rather similar to the kinds of test activities pupils were normally asked to undertake.
2.2.2 Interaction of selection with factors hypothesised to be related to pupils' gains and losses

There was little control over the selection of pupils to the extent that they were chosen only because they happened to be taught by teachers in the sample. Thus, it was not possible to control for factors of pupil age, sex, I.Q., or socio-economic background. Whether or not these factors had a bearing on pupils' gains and losses in respect of creativity, self-esteem, empathy or academic self-image, could not be fully ascertained prior to 02, since research linking pupils' gains and losses with the characteristics mentioned above, appears somewhat tenuous. It is pertinent to note that the distribution of pupils according to age and sex, per drama group, did not appear to favour any one group when comparisons were made.

2.3 Tests for external validity of the present research

The degree to which any research findings may be wholly transferable to other populations remains a matter of doubt. This may be particularly so in the area of education where many differences may exist between schools, classrooms, teaching strategies and objectives. However, given the size of the teacher-pupil sample and the representative sampling procedures adopted in the present study, there is strong reason to suggest that the subjects herein may be
regarded as typical of a wider primary teacher-pupil population.

2.4 **Summary of the discussion concerning the research design**

The choice of a pretest-posttest design was seen to meet a number of relevant, conceptual and pragmatic considerations deemed appropriate to the present research. The effects of a number of extraneous variables were examined which were capable of rivalling the research hypotheses of the present study. Moreover, steps taken to reduce the potency of these influences were also discussed.

Attention must now be given to the characteristics of the research sample and the means by which it was derived.

3. **THE SAMPLE**

The overall purpose of the sampling procedure was to locate a representative group of full time primary school teachers, and their subsequent pupils, from whom the most productive information might be gathered. In the course of the research, sampling was done in two stages.

Stage one involved the identification and location of an outer sample. This relatively large group of primary school teachers (n=235) was selected in order to reveal the probable relationship between teacher beliefs and a variety of teacher, and school-based, characteristics. In total
these teacher beliefs were seen to espouse a climate of teacher opinion. Beyond its immediate value the climate provided a reference point to which the beliefs and actions of the inner sample could be referred.

Stage two of the sampling procedure involved the extraction from the outer sample of a relatively small, inner sample of teachers (n=17) referred to earlier as the sub-sample of teachers. A small sub-sample was chosen in order to facilitate detailed observation of teacher beliefs, teacher behaviour and drama choices, and their probable influences on pupil outcomes.

3.1 Selection of the Outer Sample

Several sampling procedures were considered and rejected. The first approach to be considered was a random sampling technique which would have the advantage of providing a high degree of representativeness. However, whether the sample had been chosen from a population of all New South Wales teachers, or the local South Coast area, large geographical distances were likely to inhibit immediate administration of measures and later observation of teacher-pupil behaviour. Further, a randomized approach to sampling would identify only one or two teachers per school at most. Given the need to identify the beliefs of all teachers within selected schools, this particular approach was abandoned.
Another alternative was to identify and match teachers in different schools. This would have made administration easy and observation of teacher-pupil relationships possible. Added to this was the potential advantage of a high recovery rate for all measures. However, the overall representativeness to other teacher populations might well have been low in terms of the differences which may exist between schools according to their size, geographical area and occupants.

A more productive sampling approach was to locate one collective, or 'inspectorate', of schools which might satisfy a number of research criteria. One inspectorate can contain up to thirty infant-primary schools and thus be likely to possess a wide variety of teacher-based and school-based beliefs. Administration of tests would appear to be relatively straightforward and the chances of a high recovery rate could be deemed likely. However, for economic reasons, sampling procedures were limited to the South Coast region of New South Wales - approximating in area from Sydney in the north to the Victorian border in the south and parts of the Great Dividing Range in the west.

Although there was no one school inspectorate that could be claimed to represent all features found in inspectorates around Australia, it was found that a combination of two inspectorates, adjoining a common border, did achieve very good representation of characteristics of
primary schools relevant to the present study. For example, sex of teachers, age of teachers, ratio of infant to primary teachers, and a number of school variables, e.g., size and type of catchment area could be accounted for quite well. Combined, the two inspectorates constituted 19% of the total teacher population of the South Coast Region of New South Wales. The two inspectorates were accessible in terms of administration, observation, test development and recovery, and case study access, if required. Added to these pragmatic requirements was the apparently high level of representativeness in relation to the South Coast Region of two thousand teachers.

It is also possible to view the combined inspectorate sample as being a 'typical' teacher group. The region has a wide variety of rural-urban, large-small schools, containing teachers whose characteristics are typical of, and distributed similarly to, schools throughout the state of New South Wales and Australia. Moreover, the teachers of the South Coast Region live and work within the hinterland or on the coastal fringes, as does the greater part of the Australian population. Thus the Outer sample, constituting all full time primary school teachers within the combined school inspectorate (n=235), may be seen as a 'typical' sample of Australian primary school teachers.
3.2 Selection of the Inner Sample

Having assessed the responses of the Outer sample (n=235), on a measure of teacher beliefs, (The Teacher Opinionnaire), a second sampling procedure was employed. From the ranks of the Outer sample an Inner sample was chosen with a view to making more detailed observations of teacher beliefs, recording classroom behaviour and assessing the outcomes of pupils.

Teachers of the Inner sample were selected on the basis of their drama preferences in classrooms. Among other findings the Opinionnaire revealed that the most popular kinds of drama used within the classrooms of the Outer sample were child drama and theatre. The two drama options were seen to represent a conflict among teachers regarding notions of what drama 'is' and how it 'should' be done. A major task of the present research was to observe teacher belief systems in relation to drama choices, teacher behaviour and pupil outcomes. Thus, for purposes of comparison, teachers operating one or the other (but not both) of these drama options were selected for scrutiny. The choice of the Inner sample of teachers was made via the random selection of schools and their occupants, rather than a randomization of individual teachers. This was done with a view to making within-and-between school comparisons of teachers according to held beliefs and drama choices.

In the selection process, a sub-sample of child drama
(dramatic play) and theatre teachers was chosen for observation on a random school-by-school basis. The sampling of schools continued until 15 to 20 teachers were on the list. This sample size was considered reasonable in terms of the minimum-maximum number of teachers capable of being observed by one researcher in respect of beliefs, behaviour and pupil outcomes.

In all, 17 primary school teachers were selected as part of an 'Inner' sample; they were derived from ten schools which were seen to exemplify a range of characteristics including school size, socio-economic area and geographical position. Observation of the Inner (n=17) sample revealed that one teacher was not operating any kind of drama and also was due to take maternity leave, so this individual case was excluded from the final Inner sample.

Thus the final Inner sample comprised 16 full time primary school teachers, of whom 6 were female and 10 were male. All members of the sub-sample professed to be doing either child drama (dramatic play) or theatre with their pupils.

Overall, sampling procedures in the investigation were based on two stages found necessary because of the developmental work that had to be carried out both at the conceptual level and at the level of test construction.
4. **A CHAPTER SUMMARY**

A description was given of the evolutionary nature of the present investigation in order to gain some perspective on the kinds of research questions being pursued and the subsequent methods employed in view of these. The choice of a pretest-posttest design was seen to be appropriate to the requirements of the research; other designs were given consideration, but rejected. A number of uncontrollable variables likely to influence the validity of the research were discussed, and included an outline of measures taken to reduce their possible effects.

Finally, attention was given to the two-stage sampling process used in the investigation where some estimate was made of the ability to generalise from the characteristics of the research sample(s) to a wider population of teachers and pupils. Having examined the path taken by the present research, including the employment of concepts, questions, designs and sampling techniques, emphasis must now be placed on the means by which the independent and dependent variables of the enquiry were measured.
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CHAPTER FIVE

THE MEASUREMENT OF TEACHER AND PUPIL VARIABLES

INTRODUCTION

This chapter aims to describe the characteristics of the instruments, adopted or invented, which were used to generate data for the testing of the research hypotheses.

Parts One to Three of the chapter examine the indices used to measure teacher beliefs, drama choices and teacher behaviour, i.e., the independent variables used in the investigation. Parts Four to Seven describe the measurement of pupil outcomes, namely: self-esteem, academic self-image, creative thinking and empathy, i.e., the criterion variables.

Part Eight of the chapter constitutes a summary of variables and their associated working definitions. Finally a summary is given of the whole chapter.

1. THE TEACHER OPINIONNAIRE

The overall purpose of the 'Opinionnaire' is to identify the nature of the 'Teacher Belief Climate' in which classroom drama is deemed to operate. The instrument also aims to:

. identify the relative 'openness' of the Climate;
. survey teacher responses regarding a wide variety of school-based issues;
locate teacher attitudes towards classroom drama;
locate teacher views about what drama 'is'; and discover the kinds of drama, if any, that teachers choose to do.

A survey of literature soon reveals that the majority of measures, designed as indices of teacher beliefs, are predominantly concerned with the measure of one or more singular attitudes (Koch et al., 1934; Cook, Leeds & Callis, 1951; Kerlinger & Kaya, 1959), or with one set of beliefs to the exclusion of others (Ryans, 1960; and many others). For present research purposes, a measure was required which would generate teacher responses to a wide variety of school-based beliefs. The purpose of this approach was to provide a 'picture' of the 'Teacher Belief Climate', within which teacher behaviour, decisions about drama and subsequent pupil outcomes could be observed.

1.1 Construction of the Teacher Opinionnaire

A priority task in the construction of the measure was to locate those beliefs most likely to influence drama use and subsequent pupil outcomes. Belief statements were gathered from three main sources. Drama literature, in particular the work of Slade (1954), Way (1967) and Bolton (1979), provided a number of items which could be seen to constitute some antecedents of drama use.
An informal survey of sixty primary school teachers provided views about what drama 'is' to them, and also what influences might encourage/discourage drama activity in their classrooms. Many of these responses were given in relation to other beliefs regarding notions of teacher role, pupil role, the organisation of learning and the influence of significant others. These replies prompted the third source of belief statements.

Literature derived from various aspects of education served to provide an array of educational belief statements. In particular, use was made of material concerned with child-centredness vs. teacher-centredness; curricular change vs. sameness (Taylor, 1974); use of pupil ideas (Nash, 1973); competition vs. cooperation (Deutsch, 1949); pupil mobility (Barker Lunn, 1970 and Bennett, 1976 and Hamilton, 1978); teacher expectations regarding pupil behaviour (Goodacre, 1968); teacher aims (Ashton, Kneen and Davies, 1975); and belief preferences relating to the notions of the 'Professional Self' (Murray, 1938, 1951, and Stern, 1969).

From these three main sources above one hundred and twelve items were gathered. In order to construct a pilot version of an Opinionnaire the hundred and twelve items were given to seven judges whose task was to select approximately half the items which they thought would (if agreed/disagreed upon by teachers) serve to influence drama use. The selected items formed the basis for a pilot measure.
1.2 The Pilot Opinionnaire

Thirty-five full time primary school teachers were invited to respond to the Pilot Opinionnaire which was divided into four sections (Appendix 2). Section One consisted of belief items related to role preferences. Section Two was made up of a variety of beliefs about educational philosophy and the psychological environment of the school. These items were preceded by "I believe that ...". Section Three consisted of belief statements regarding the use and nature of classroom drama, and were preceded by "Classroom drama is ...". These first three sections consisted of fifty-five selected statements to which teachers were invited to respond on a five-point Likert (1932) scale (1=Strongly agree; 2=Agree; 3=Uncertain; 4=Disagree; 5=Strongly Disagree). A number of items were 'reversed' in order to avoid 'response set'.

The final section invited teachers to indicate the kind of drama they would ideally wish to do, and to show the type of drama, if any, that they find possible to do. This procedure was adopted so that teachers would not be tempted to give 'ideal' responses in place of 'actual' ones when being asked about drama.

Following the administration of the Pilot Opinionnaire, it was decided to reduce the number of belief items from fifty-five to forty-three. This modification included the removal of a number of ambiguous statements. Because the
Opinionnaire is not designed as a scale, analysis is done on a statement-by-statement basis, rather than yielding a total score. Thus, the resultant belief statements may be organised into belief sets as part of a group or individual profile. One individual set of beliefs may be compared with overall or sub-group norms.

1.3 Validity of the Opinionnaire

As with Ryan's (1960) study of teacher beliefs and teacher characteristics, there were no means available in this study by which the validity of the Opinionnaire could be tested against external criteria of 'beliefs'. However, it was believed that the teachers' anonymous expression of their beliefs, expressed in the absence of any external pressures, was likely to be a valid indication of actual beliefs.

Throughout the administration of the pilot Opinionnaire, and subsequent renderings of the final format, teachers were asked not to discuss their responses with others. Observation showed that respondents complied with this request and thus explicit group pressure on individual responses was deemed to be low.

2. THE DRAMA INVENTORY

This instrument was invented for the purpose of observing teacher-pupil behaviour within the context of classroom drama. The Inventory (Appendix 7) allows an observer to
verify the extent to which teachers are behaving in accord with their professed beliefs as declared in the Teacher Opinionnaire and during teacher interviews.

A survey of literature soon reveals that research in the drama area has mainly centred upon qualitative approaches to the observation of classroom drama (see Chapter 2). Thus, the output of data has been predominantly descriptive in nature. Observations may only have been made by one researcher. One evident danger of these anecdotal approaches is that they are likely to give free reign to the prejudices and values of the observer. This is not to assume that empiricist approaches are exempt from researcher subjectivity, but merely to suggest that qualitative methods may be more susceptible than most to observer bias. Further, if the criteria for observation remain at an implicit level, then it becomes virtually impossible to replicate findings, or to generalise these results to other populations and contexts. Thus, no ready-made instruments were available that might be used to render a reliable assessment of teacher behaviour in drama, either on an individual or group basis.

2.1 Construction of the Drama Inventory

Given an overall purpose of verifying the consistency of teacher behaviour with professed beliefs, it was essential that an instrument be devised that could be used
with reliability across a range of teacher-drama contexts. One way of facilitating the transferability of the instrument, from one classroom context to another, was to select a number of predetermined observational criteria. It was hoped that the act of making criteria explicit in this way might go some way in reducing the influence of the observer's values on classroom perceptions. These predetermined criteria are listed in Figure 5.1.

The first criterion in Figure 5.1, "Drama Option observed", was determined by referring to Bolton's (1979) "Classification of dramatic activity" (Bolton, 1979, pp.1-11). Bolton outlines four main types of drama activity in classrooms. These are Type 'A' (drama exercise); Type 'B' (dramatic play/child drama); Type 'C' (theatre); and Type 'D' (Bolton's ideal drama type). The first three kinds of drama are seen to account for the majority of options available in classrooms. This typology was used to decide whether teachers were doing the kind of drama they professed. Bolton (1979) admits that these drama options may not be fully exclusive. However, for the purposes of the present study, they provided sufficient 'differences between types' to warrant their use as a means of drama classification.

The remaining nine observational criteria were derived from stated teacher beliefs and were chosen because they lent themselves readily to verification of classroom practice. These criteria were to provide guidelines for a
**Figure 5.1**

Predetermined Criteria Used for Drama Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion:</th>
<th>(Tick where applicable:)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Drama Option Observed:</td>
<td>Exercise ____ Theatre ____ Child ____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other ____ None ____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teacher allows for pupil direction:</td>
<td>Yes ____ No ____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teacher uses pupil ideas:</td>
<td>Yes ____ No ____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teacher keeps to set lesson plans:</td>
<td>Yes ____ No ____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Teacher insists pupils are kept quiet</td>
<td>Yes ____ No ____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all of the time:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Teacher is the centre of all action:</td>
<td>Yes ____ No ____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. All pupils able to participate:</td>
<td>Yes ____ No ____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Pupils are involved in decision-making: Yes ____ No ____</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Pupils have to compete for parts:</td>
<td>Yes ____ No ____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Pupils able to use class space:</td>
<td>Yes ____ No ____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
descriptive account of the drama lesson. Although the set
criteria were seen to contribute towards a quantitative data
base, added description by the observer allowed for the
unique features of a teacher's drama session to be
recorded. It was hoped that this idiosyncratic data might
contribute further insights concerning research findings,
and prove useful when alternative hypotheses were broached.

2.2 The Pilot Inventory

The Pilot instrument appears in Appendix 6. It
consists of a list of criteria seen in Figure 5.1. The
remaining part of the inventory was left blank to allow
observations to be made verbatim.

The Drama Inventory was subjected to trial in three
stages. In the first stage, two observers watched the same
class of pupils (n=26) doing drama with their teacher.
Following this observation the two researchers discussed the
nature of the instrument and their respective findings.
Both observers expressed substantial degree of difficulty in
trying to follow the set criteria whilst attempting to
record classroom events. It was decided that the criteria
should be outlined in the form of a checklist as before, but
agreed that a series of boxes should be added. The boxes at
the end of each criterion would allow observers to record
particular aspects of each criterion. In respect of
criterion 3 (Appendix 6), for example, if the teacher was to
use the ideas of the pupils in the drama session then the "yes" space was ticked.

The second stage was conducted with a different class of pupils (n=22, grade four pupils). After this observation, the researchers decided to retain the criteria with boxes, but decided that they would not be completed until after the drama session had been observed. This decision was made in order to reduce the distractions noted in the first stage. It was further agreed that the criteria should be memorised prior to observation so that the ground rules for observation still remained. It was in this form that the third and final stage of testing occurred.

A final trial was held without any discussion by the two observers. This took place with a class of twenty-seven grade five pupils. The results of using the Pilot Inventory in its final form provided the basis for a check on inter-observer reliability.

2.3 Reliability of the Drama Inventory

Although it would have been possible to analyse the content of the descriptive drama accounts, in order to obtain inter-observer reliability, a simpler approach was adopted. Given that the predetermined criteria formed the major points of observation, the adjacent spaces (ten) were used to check on the percentage agreement between the two observers. Although one might have expected some degree of
disparity between the two observers, this was not the case. Table 5.1 shows the percentage agreement on each criterion to be 100%.

Table 5.1

Percentage agreement on paired observations of drama using the Drama Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion:</th>
<th>Percentage Agreement:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Drama Option</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teacher-Pupil Direction:</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Use of Pupil Ideas:</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teacher Flexibility:</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pupil Control:</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Teacher Centredness:</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Pupil Participation:</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Pupil-teacher input:</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Competition:</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Pupil Mobility:</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The surprisingly high figure of 100% might be due to having three trials where one might expect observer agreement to increase. It may also be the result of having few categories per item, thus reducing the likelihood of disagreement.
3. THE CLASSROOM OBSERVATION SCHEDULE

This instrument (Appendix 8), like the Drama Inventory, was designed to record selected aspects of teacher behaviour. Whereas the Drama Inventory was concerned with only one aspect of the curriculum, the Classroom Observation Schedule was made to generate data in relation to the general classroom setting. It was intended that data from this source should supplement other information regarding the individual behaviour of teachers.

3.1 Construction of the Schedule

A review of the literature reveals that many observation schedules have been designed to record various aspects of teacher-pupil behaviour in classrooms.* In the present research four components of teacher behaviour were selected for observation. It was believed that each component might have some bearing on an individual teacher's choice of drama option. These components were:

- teacher warmth - the teacher's ability to reduce interpersonal tension;
- teacher target - persons whom the teacher addresses in the classroom;
- person talking - who is talking at any one given time; and

* A review of these instruments is given in Simon and Boyer (1970), "Mirrors for Behaviour".
praise/blame - the teacher's use of negative-positive behaviour reinforcement.

Each component was given a code letter. Those with sub-categories were given further letters. This was done so that a recording of a particular aspect of behaviour could be quickly made. A time sampling procedure popularised by Flanders (1963) and others, was adopted for use in the present research.

It was decided that a set of one hundred time squares would be used to record teacher behaviour. At twenty-five second intervals the observer's task would be to mark four letters in one time square. Each letter would correspond to one of the four behavioural components under scrutiny. Moreover, each time square, or unit, would be completed during a five second time period - following an agreed signal to commence observation.

3.2 The Pilot Schedule

A pair of observers went into the same classroom and, using a wall clock (unseen by the class teacher) as an agreed time signal, coded the same teacher and pupils (n=27 grade four pupils). As with the Drama Inventory a number of instrument trials were held culminating in a test of inter-observer reliability.

The administration of this instrument was more complicated than the Drama Inventory, so it was agreed that
the trials should begin with a small time span, increasing the number of time squares with each consecutive trial until the 100 time square period was reached.

The trial observations consisted of:

- 4 periods of 4 time squares;
- 2 periods of 10 time squares;
- 1 period of 20 time squares; and
- 1 period of 30 time squares.

Before the time squares were increased, two problems had to be sorted out. One major difficulty was observer recognition of 'teacher warmth'. Teachers were deemed to be either 'warm', 'neutral' or 'cold'. In the earlier trials, the two observers tended to disagree over notions of 'warm' and 'neutral', more so that 'neutral-cold', or 'warm-cold'. It was agreed that the criteria for 'warmth' should be the teacher's facial signals, tone of voice, and eye contact; i.e., that they served to constitute a reduction in interpersonal tension in the classroom.

The other problem concerned the term 'dialogue dominance' which was replaced by 'person talking'. This was done when observers failed to agree on notions of 'dominance' in speech.

Discussions between observers were followed by two more trials in the same classroom as before. The first of these final trials consisted of one 50 time square. There was no apparent disagreement between observers, so later in the day
the final trial was held. There were no discussions held between observers so that inter-observer influence would be overtly low. The final trial was used for purposes of testing inter-coder reliability.

3.3 Reliability of the Schedule

Because the Classroom Observation Schedule consisted of four mutually exclusive sets of behaviour, it was decided that tests of inter-observer reliability should be reported for each separate set, i.e., teacher warmth, teacher target, person talking and praise-blame.

In the case of teacher warmth, assuming the nominal scale of data, Scott's (1955) Coefficient of Reliability was used as an appropriate measure of inter-coder reliability. Observers agreed upon 81% of teacher warmth recordings and a coefficient of 0.74 was recorded.

In terms of teacher target, observers had to decide if the teacher was addressing one pupil or a group of pupils within the time period allotted. Since there were only two categories, the percentage of inter-observer reliability was 100%.

With reference to person talking, there were four categories: teacher, child, both and silence. Assuming data to be at the nominal level of scaling, Scott's (1955) Coefficient of Reliability was employed. Observer agreement was 86% and a Coefficient of 0.80 was reported.
The final behaviour set on the Classroom Observation Schedule is **praise-blame** which requires observers to mark 'p' or 'b' on the coded sheet, if teachers use either praise or blame during the specified time period. Both observers agreed that throughout the extent of all the trials neither 'praise' nor 'blame' had been used by the teacher. Beyond an agreement on the absence of events in this category there were no recordings to facilitate observer comparisons.

It is now necessary to examine the instruments used to measure pupil outcomes - the criterion variables of the present research.

4. THE COOPERSMITH SELF-ESTEEM INVENTORY

The Short Form of Coopersmith's Self-Esteem Inventory (1967) was used as an established measure of pupil self-esteem. Coopersmith states that the operational definition of 'self-esteem' is:

> the evaluation a person makes, and customarily maintains of him - or herself, that is, overall self-esteem is an expression of approval or disapproval, indicating the extent to which a person believes him- or herself to be competent, successful, significant and worthy. Self-esteem is a personal judgement of worthiness expressed in the attitude a person holds towards the self. (pp.1-2).

The Short Form is a reduced version (items=25) of the School Form. The shortened version provides an alternative to the longer School Form when limitations on time prevent
the use of the latter. Both the long and short versions of the Self-Esteem Inventory serve to yield a total score of self-esteem. Items are designed to discriminate between pupils with high self-esteem and pupils with low self-esteem.

4.1 Administration of the Short Form

The instrument was administered as part of a booklet of other test activities for pupils. The same measure was used in both the Pretest (Booklet A) and the Posttest (Booklet B). Following each of the twenty-five self-esteem items on the inventory are two boxes. Pupils either place a tick/cross in the first box, entitled "Like Me", or a tick/cross in the second box, "Unlike Me". The box which pupils indicate is assumed to be an expression of their agreement/disagreement regarding the congruency between the self-esteem item and the pupil's view of his/her own self-esteem.

One evident danger of using pencil and paper tasks with pupils, particularly younger ones, is the possibility that the pupil respondents may not be able to read the items. In order to reduce this potential risk, the researcher read out each item in turn while pupils followed and read the items silently. Teachers were on hand to help those pupils likely to encounter difficulty with these kind of measures. Teachers were asked to give sufficient help to pupils
without infringing on the latter's liberty to respond in a forthright way. Although there was a slight risk of teachers influencing pupil responses, this was considered to be a more acceptable risk than abandoning pupils to their own devices.

4.2 Reliability of the Short Form

The Short Form version of the Self-Esteem Inventory was designed by Coopersmith (1967) for use with pupils between the ages of eight and fifteen years. The Short Form does not contain the Lie Scale and does not elicit subscales, as with the longer School Form.

A test-retest reliability analysis carried out by Bedeian, Teague and Zmud (1977) using the Short Form with older students yielded coefficients of stability of .80 and .82, with males and females respectively.

Coopersmith (1967) reports a coefficient of .86 between the Short School Form and the longer version from which it was derived.

5. THE ACADEMIC SELF-IMAGE SCALE

A number of drama authors (Slade, 1954 and Way, 1967; et al.) as well as teachers in the sub-sample (n=17), lay claim to drama as a means of enhancing the academic self-image of pupils. They hold that drama has a positive effect on a pupil's self-image per se, and that these influences
are generalised to encompass the image a pupil has of him/herself in relation to school work. Thus, it is believed that positive gains in one area of self-image (e.g., in drama), will accrue similar gains in other areas (e.g., academic self). Whether or not drama does serve to enhance a pupil's academic self-image remains to be seen. It is notable that the notion of the generalisability of self-image, i.e., one area influencing another, is given support by Diggory (1966), Ludwig and Maehr (1967) and Purkey (1970).

The Academic Self-image Scale (A.S.I.S.) was developed by Barker-Lunn (1969, 1970) in order to measure pupil self-image in respect of school work. The A.S.I.S consists of nine items. Pupils are invited to place a cross/tick in one of three boxes corresponding to each item. A score is given for each box ticked/crossed per item. A score of 2 is given for a positive A.S.I. response, 1 is given for a neutral stance and 0 is given for a low A.S.I. response. A score key is used to sum the total score for each pupil, the higher the score, the more positive is the A.S.I. of the pupil. Conversely, the lower the score, the more negative the A.S.I. of the pupil. The Academic Self-image Scale was administered as part of Booklets A and B.
5.1 Reliability of the Scale

The development of the A.S.I.S., and associated tests of reliability, are reported in Barker-Lunn (1969). An alpha coefficient (Cronbach, 1951) of 0.88 was reported for the A.S.I.S.

6. MEASUREMENT OF PUPIL CREATIVITY

All of the teachers in the sub-sample (n=16), appeared convinced that their particular drama approach was instrumental in furthering their pupils' creative thinking abilities. A survey of literature soon reveals that there are many problems associated with the measurement of creative thinking,* not the least of which is the unresolved issue regarding the definition of creativity. One consequence of this unsettled issue is that the term 'creativity' is often used by researchers and educationalists alike as a catch-all term to describe a variety of human activity.

It is relevant that the teacher sample (n=16) tended to use the term 'creative thinking' synonymously with 'divergent thinking'. Thus, it was to divergent thinking measures that attention was paid. Barker-Lunn (1970), when using the Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking, described

* See Treffinger et al., 1971.
them as measures of divergent thinking, and inspection here shows this to be the case.

6.1 The Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking and drama outcomes

In the process of selecting the Torrance Tests (1962), a reasonable degree of confidence had to be placed in the ability of the tasks to measure the kinds of pupil qualities associated with drama outcomes. Three tasks per Booklet were selected; two verbal and one non-verbal (figural).

In the first activity, 'Unusual Uses', pupils were encouraged to write down as many uncommon uses as they could for an everyday object. The object could be perceived as large as the pupil wished, and a number of these objects could be used to contribute some specific use. Torrance (1962) views this task as "... a test of ability to free one's mind of a well established set" (Torrance, 1962, p.73).

The second verbal task given to pupils was 'Just Suppose'. Here pupils were confronted with an improbable situation and asked to predict the probable outcomes (as many as possible) of this element.

The final task was a non-verbal activity. Pupils were given a page or more of identical geometric shapes, e.g., circles. They were asked to add lines to each identical shape in order to create a drawing. Pupils were also
encouraged to create as many different drawings as possible.

It is clear that all three tasks warrant the use of divergent thinking properties by pupils. Given a lack of research in the drama area, there appears to be little empirical support, if any, for a relationship between the divergent properties reported to be measured by the Torrance tests, and drama. However, one may observe that some approaches to drama do appear to lend themselves to the exercise of divergent thinking. All three Torrance tasks call upon the respondent to transform the mundane objects and contexts found in everyday living into more imaginative, speculative forms. Similarly, drama may involve pupils working at a real and a symbolic or imaginative level (Bolton, 1979). Given the encouragement by some teachers for pupils to transform the 'real' into the imaginative, and thus solve problems on two levels, it may well be that pupils who have experienced these kind of activities may be in a superior position, on Torrance Tests, to peers who have not shared these activities. Some kind of drama activities are more divergent-orientated than others.

The link between drama experience and pupil benefits of divergent thinking practice, remains a tentative one. Whether or not one kind of drama is more facilitative than another in stimulating pupils' gains on creativity tasks remains to be seen.

It needs to be noted that drama is only one tool that
may provide some means of developing the divergent thinking abilities of pupils; teachers may or may not employ others. Drama may also be used in such a way as to encourage actively convergent thinking only. Drama, as employed in the present research context, is seen to reflect the teacher's total belief system and as such is likely to influence, and be influenced by, all other components of the teacher's repertoire, which may serve to promote or inhibit the divergent thinking abilities of pupils.

Overall, given the drama claims of teachers regarding the promotion of divergent thinking, the Torrance Tests of Creative Ability were seen to provide a basic means by which these claims could be tested.

6.2 Scoring of the Torrance Tests

The three tasks given to pupils claim to measure four underlying creative abilities of pupils. These are fluency, flexibility, originality and elaboration.

**Fluency** reflects the test taker's ability to produce a large number of ideas. The fluency score is obtained by adding up the total number of relevant responses to each item. A response is considered irrelevant if it appears to bear no relation to the problem, or task at hand.

**Flexibility** represents a respondent's ability to produce a variety of kinds of ideas, "to shift from one approach to
another, or to use a variety of strategies" (Torrance, 1962, p.73). The flexibility score is obtained by summing the total number of categories into which the responses for each item fall.

Originality reflects the subject's ability to generate ideas that are "away from the obvious, commonplace or banal" (Torrance, 1962, p.74). The originality scoring guide produced by Torrance (1962) was based on the responses of one or more American pupil samples. Inspection of the Originality Scoring Guide suggests that if the scoring guidelines are followed, then the scores of the present Australian sample (n=370) of pupils is likely to be distorted. This perceived distortion is due to cultural-linguistic differences between the American and Australian pupil samples. Thus, it was decided to follow the advice of both Torrance (1962) and Barker-Lunn (1970) and derive originality scores from the statistical infrequency of responses given by one's own sample. The scoring procedure detailed in Barker-Lunn (1970) was followed, that is:

- Responses given by 5% or more of the sample, score = 0
- Responses given by 2% to 4.99% of the sample, score = 1
- Responses given by less than 2% of the sample, score = 2

Elaboration (non-verbal tasks only) reflects a pupil's ability to "develop, embroider, embellish or elaborate upon
ideas" (Torrance, 1962, p. 74). The non-verbal ('figural') elaboration score was obtained by summing up the total number of additions made by pupils to each basic drawing.

For each observation, pretest and posttest, verbal factors of fluency, originality and flexibility were summed to render one overall verbal score. Similarly, figural factors of fluency, originality, flexibility and elaboration were also summed to provide one overall non-verbal score.

A drawback to the use of the Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking with a pretest-posttest design is that the content of $O^1$ cannot be repeated for $O^2$. In order for pupils to respond in a fresh, creative way to $O^2$, having experienced $O^1$, it is necessary to change the content, but not the structure, of the $O^1-O^2$ tests. It follows that if the content is left unchanged then originality and other scores will be confounded. In order to avoid the risk of employing two different creativity instruments for $O^1$ and $O^2$, and attributing possible score variations to the effects of study treatments, raw scores for measures $O^1$ and $O^2$ were converted to 'T-scores' (Appendix 16). This procedure was in keeping with the strategies adopted by Torrance (1962).

6.3 Reliability of the Torrance Tests

The development, reliability and validity of the Torrance creativity tasks are reported fully in Torrance (1962).
7. THE EMPATHY SCALE

High on the teacher sample's (n=16) list of intended drama outcomes was the development of pupils' empathic abilities. As with the concept of 'creative thinking', notions of 'empathy' attract the same inexactitude of researcher definition. A critical review of the methodological problems concerning the measurement of empathy has been carried out by Cronbach (1955). He concluded that one major problem in the area has been the lack of agreement among different researchers as to what constitutes 'empathy'.

Mood (1973) observes that 'empathy' has been defined in two major ways in the literature:

- As "the intellectual identification with, or vicarious experience of the feelings, thoughts or attitudes of another" (Mood, 1973, p.1); and
- As a "vicarious emotional response of a perceiver to the emotional experience of another person" (Mood, 1973, p.2).

7.1 The measurement of empathy

One 'typical' approach to the measurement of pupil empathy (reviewed in Mood, 1973), is to present pupils with one or more pictures, each accompanied by a verbal description of a situation, or a picture of a person with a specific facial expression, or both.
Mood (1973) observes that "if cognitive empathy is being assessed then the child is asked: 'What is the child in the story feeling?'. If affective empathy is being assessed, the child is asked, 'How do you feel?'"

Given these, and other, approaches to the measurement of pupil empathy, two fundamental decisions were made in respect of the present research. Firstly, an operational definition should be used which facilitates both cognitive and affective perspectives on pupils' empathic abilities. Thus, the following working definition of 'empathy' was selected. 'Empathy' was deemed to be:

*the intellectual or imaginative apprehension of another's condition or state of mind. (Hogan, p.308, 1969).*

Use of the term, "imaginative apprehension" seemed to be pertinent to the kinds of claims made by the teacher sample (n=16), and others, regarding the empathic development of pupils via 'imaginative' drama experiences.

Secondly, it was decided that the kinds of pupil empathy measures reviewed by Mood (1973), i.e., the use of pictures, was impractical for present purposes. Other measures in the pretest-posttest booklets were of the pencil, paper and drawing variety: it was thought that a measure of pupil empathy should merge in with these other instruments. Thus, a pencil and paper approach was adopted towards the measurement of pupil empathy.

Given that there were four other measures in the same
booklet, it was agreed that the empathy scale should be concise. Allied to this decision was the view that the examination of pupil empathy in the present research did not warrant a large number of items.

A pool of twenty-five items was obtained from literature in the area of pupil empathy. Because many of the items were originally designed for older pupils, all items were rewritten. Following a procedure outlined and developed by King (1973), the items, and the working definition of 'empathy', were given to seven judges. The judges, all primary teachers, were asked to select twelve items from the twenty-five items given, for the construction of an Empathy Scale. While doing this they were asked to consider the dual nature of each item; that is, pupil agreement-disagreement with an item should reflect high-low empathy respectively. Seven out of the twelve derived items were 'reversed' to avoid response set. The face validity of the twelve item scale was given credence by the unanimous agreement on items by the seven judges.

Owing to the pressures of time beyond the control of the researcher, it was not possible to pilot the Empathy Scale prior to its administration during 0\(^1\) and 0\(^2\). The risk of the results being confounded by the presence of irrelevant items on the scale could not be avoided. It was not possible to predict accurately the effects that possible irrelevant items might have on pupil responses. With this
difficulty in mind the Empathy Scale was piloted at the very first opportunity following the 01-02 administrations with a view to removing irrelevant items.

7.2 The Pilot Empathy Scale

An opportunity sample of 100 pupils aged between eight and twelve years was invited to respond to the twelve item Empathy measure on a three point scale: Yes True (score 2); Not True (score 1); No (score 0). It was believed that younger pupils might have some difficulty in responding to a full, five point, Likert (1932) type scale. When 'reversed' items had been taken into account, a score of 2 on an item indicated high empathy, a score of 1 shows a neutral stance, and a score of 0 reveals low empathy. All items were summed for each respondent to yield a total empathy score.

Analysis of responses was in accord with approaches outlined by King (1973). S.P.S.S. (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) computer subprograms, "Frequencies", "Condescriptive" and "T-test" were employed to reveal:

1. Total scores obtained by each pupil;
2. The frequency distribution of the scores;
3. The mean, standard deviation and split-halves reliability of the scores;
4. Percentage of respondent agreement/disagreement with each statement;
5. The Edward's t-value and allied probability value for each statement; and
A Coefficient of Reproducibility — made possible by a second administration of the twelve item scale nine weeks after the first.

The percentage of pupil agreement/disagreement with each statement was used as an initial indicator of item discrimination. Those statements which served to attract high levels of agreement/disagreement could not be expected to discriminate between 'high empathisers' and 'low empathisers'.

The Edward's (1957) t-value was used to facilitate discriminatory analysis on each separate item. A measure of discriminatory power is derived from the difference in mean scores between the 27% of pupils receiving the highest scores on the Empathy Scale and the 27% of subjects receiving the lowest scores. High t-values on an item show that the particular statement is serving to discriminate successfully between high and low 'empathisers'. Low t-values reveal poor discriminatory power of an item. An Edwards t-value of 1.75 was accepted as the lowest limit at which an item would be included in the scale. This value has an associated alpha level of less than .05.

Using this prescribed form of discriminatory analysis on items it was discovered that all twelve items contributed by the judges could be accepted on the final Empathy Scale. Table 5.2 lists the Empathy items, percentage of pupil agreement, the Edward's (1957) t-values and their associated probabilities.
Table 5.2

Discriminatory Analysis of Items on Empathy Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Empathy Item</th>
<th>Percentages in Agreement</th>
<th>Edward's t</th>
<th>p.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>---</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pupils High</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pupils Low</strong></td>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I like to get my own way in class. (r)</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I would try to help a younger child if they were being bullied.</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I wouldn't share my lunch with anyone even if they were hungry. (r)</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I like helping people as much as I can.</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I'd give away my best toy to someone who needed it.</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I like doing the things I want, not what others want. (r)</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I like to think about people's feelings before I do anything.</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I don't like going out of my way to help others. (r)</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. It's fun to play jokes on people even if they don't like it. (r)</td>
<td>81.4%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I don't mind pushing in a line if it means that I get to the front first. (r)</td>
<td>96.2%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I can often tell what other people are thinking.</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I don't like helping out at home. (r)</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(r) = reversed item.
It may be seen that the lowest t-value recorded was 2.81 (Item 11). Furthermore, eight out of the twelve items attracted a probability value of less than .0001. Due to these findings all twelve items of the Empathy Scale were retained when the results of the pretest-posttest booklets were analysed.

7.3 Reliability of the Empathy Scale

A split-halves (odd-even) reliability coefficient of .60 was recorded. The Spearman-Brown formula was used as a correction factor, rendering a final coefficient of .75. A coefficient of reproducibility of .93 was recorded, following two administrations of the Empathy Scale nine weeks apart, given to the same pupil sample.

8. SUMMARY OF THE VARIABLES AND OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS

8.1 Teacher Belief Climate refers to the dispositions of teachers (n=235) agreed upon by more than 55% of all responses on the 'Teacher Opinionnaire'. Further, the 'Climate' is seen to contain certain normative characteristics; that is, beliefs which may be held by particular groups of teachers categorised according to sex, age, type of training, length of training, length of teaching experience, size of school and catchment area of school.
8.2 Teacher belief-behaviour 'consistency' concerns the ability of one or more teachers to match their behaviour with professed beliefs in drama. This ability is observed on the following belief-behaviour variables:

Teacher-pupil direction refers to the extent to which pupils are allowed input on their own direction in drama.

Use of pupil ideas refers to teacher beliefs and/or actions which allow for pupil ideas to be used in drama.

Teacher flexibility refers to the degree to which teachers are able to tolerate a departure from set plans.

Pupil control refers to a teacher's reliance upon external and/or internal modes of pupil control.

Pupil dependence-autonomy refers to the extent to which pupils are given responsibility in drama.

Expectations of teachers for less able pupils refers to the extent to which less able pupils are deemed by teachers to be capable of participating in drama.

Teacher centredness refers to the extent to which teachers find it necessary to be out-front, directing the drama work of pupils.
Pupil mobility refers to the opportunities which pupils are given to move around the classroom in drama.

Pupil competition used in the context of drama refers to the necessity for pupils to compete in order to participate.

8.3 General Classroom Observation

General Classroom Observation refers to four sets of teacher behaviour. These are:

Teacher warmth, that is, the teacher's apparent ability to reduce interpersonal tension in the classroom.

Teacher target, that is, the person(s) whom the teacher is addressing at any given moment.

Person talking, that is, the person(s) who is observed talking at set time periods in the classroom - teacher, child, both or no-one.

Praise/blame, that is, the teacher's use of praise/blame as a means of behavioural reinforcement of pupils.

8.4 Drama

"Drama" refers to an activity which is defined in the Oxford Dictionary as meaning to 'act', 'do', 'perform'.

There are four major drama components outlined by Tate, Robinson and McGregor (1977). These are:

- Social interaction: pupils are encouraged to act on both real and symbolic levels within a social context;
- Content: drama is often based on problems and issues. The content is seen to be at the level of human behaviour and interpersonal response;
- Forms of Expression: Participants explore problems of meaning. In child drama this 'meaning' is often their own; in theatre 'meaning' may be someone else's; and
- Use of Drama Media: All options encourage and involve the use of drama skills. (McGregor et al., 1977, pp.23-24)

8.5 Drama choice or drama option refers to a teacher selection of one or more drama types specified below:

Theatre, theatre skills, plays before an adult audience refers to the adult art form of theatre. When used in schools it often involves actors, usually pupils, attempting to communicate dramatic meaning, via a script, to an adult audience. 'Audience' here refers to spectators drawn from other areas of the school or community - beyond the immediate classroom. The activity usually takes place on a raised, proscenium stage and requires actors to exercise certain voice skills, projection techniques and role sustainment.
Role playing refers to pupils being given a role to play within the context of one or more predetermined social issues - deemed relevant to the lives of pupils.

Mime refers to some kind of expressive use of the body which does not usually involve speaking. In order for the activity to be labelled 'drama', it has to involve the adoption of roles within dramatic contexts.

Drama games refers to the involvement of pupils in the adoption of dramatic roles within the context of games. The purpose of the games is usually to improve interpersonal relationships. Rules are often well defined prior to the commencement of the activity.

Child invented plays/child improvisation, dramatic play are names given to a dramatic activity in which pupils are allowed by teachers to invent their own words, plot and actions. In some cases teachers may provide some initial stimulus for dramatic action, but the remainder of the activity is usually determined by the pupil participants themselves. Often the work is done in groups and there is no intention of working towards a performance. Slade (1954) has labelled this kind of activity Child Drama.

Drama exercise is one overarching drama option that has been identified by Bolton (1979). It is seen to include Drama
games, certain theatre skills, e.g., sword practice, and class mime to the teacher's narration.

8.6 **Pupil outcomes** refer to those benefits claimed by teachers to be derived from drama use. These outcomes are measured in the present research, via the administration of two booklets: 'A' (Pretest) and 'B' (Posttest). Pupil outcomes of drama are deemed to be self-esteem, academic self-image, creativity and empathy.

**Self-esteem** refers to the worth placed by a pupil on the value of his/herself. Pupils who see themselves as worthy, and of value, are deemed to possess high self-esteem. Other pupils who reject their view of self, as unworthy or valueless, are seen to have low self-esteem.

**Academic self-image** refers to the image a pupil holds of his/herself in relation to school work.

**Creativity** refers to a pupil's ability to think in divergent ways. That is, pupils are seen to exercise divergent thinking abilities to a greater or lesser degree. These qualities may be expressed in verbal or non-verbal ways. It is not assumed that all creative thinking is of the divergent kind. It may well be that one needs to converge at some particular stage of the 'creative process'.

However, the terms 'divergent' and 'creative' were used synonymously by the present teacher sample. Thus they are used and tested in the same way within the present study.

Empathy refers to "the intellectual or imaginative apprehension of another's condition or state of mind" (Hogan, 1969, p.308).

9. SUMMARY OF THE CHAPTER

This chapter has served to reveal the characteristics of the measures employed in the present research. Where no measures were available for use they were invented. It may be seen that a wide range of instruments were used to generate data necessary for hypotheses testing. Attention was also given to a summary of the variables used in the present research and their concomitant, working definitions.
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INTRODUCTION

The hypotheses are divided into seven main areas, each of which relates to a predicted association between two or more variables. Three matters have had a bearing on the formulation and presentation of the hypotheses. These matters concern the expression of the hypotheses in null form, the use of the pretest-posttest design reported in Chapter Four, and the use of t-tests for the subsequent testing of hypotheses.

1. SOME PERSPECTIVES ON NULL AND DIRECTIONAL HYPOTHESES

A decision to express research hypotheses in the form of either null or directional statements, is related to the kinds of risks that researchers are willing to take in committing Type 1 or Type 2 errors. Thus the decision will serve to determine whether a researcher will fix attention upon an alpha or beta level in hypotheses testing. The acceptance of $H^1$, or 'directional' hypotheses, suggests researcher confidence, not only in the rejection of $H^0$, but also in the rejection of alternative hypotheses. Conversely, the acceptance of $H^0$ suggests that $H^1$ and other alternative hypotheses should be rejected. It appears to be
commonplace for researchers to express \( H^0 \) with a view to its predicted rejection and the subsequent acceptance usually of \( H^1 \). However, in the present research, all hypotheses are in the null form. If \( H^0 \) is rejected, then by implication, a number of alternative hypotheses, \( H^1 \ H^2 \ldots H^n \) may be given equal consideration in the light of research findings.

The procedure of expressing all hypotheses in null form is based on the same premise outlined by King (1973) who notes two pertinent dangers associated with this approach:

i. the absence of directional hypotheses may serve to obscure the hunches of the researcher; and

ii. the approach may serve to facilitate spurious claims to objectivity.

Although these risks were noted, they had to be courted in view of other research considerations. There is insufficient evidence to predict a direction in the relationship between teacher characteristics and held beliefs and so a null form of hypothesis is appropriate.

In regard to hypotheses about the relationship between drama choice and pupil growth, all teachers were of the opinion that their particular choice of drama would promote desired pupil growth. That is, they believed:

(1) child-based drama would promote pupil growth on educational outcomes;

(2) theatre would promote pupil growth on educational outcomes; and
(3) drama exercise would promote pupil growth on educational outcomes.

Given the lack of empirical research in the drama area, there is no reason to deny that each drama stance adopted by teachers might have equal potential to promote substantial pupil gains. Again, an expression of null hypotheses is appropriate to the nature of the problem.

In the relationship between the belief-behaviour consistency of teachers and pupil growth, each belief and behaviour combination revealed four alternative teacher stances:

A. Believes in 'x' (not 'y') and does 'x' (not 'y');
B. Believes in 'y' (not 'x') and does 'y' (not 'x');
C. Believes in 'x' (not 'y') and does 'y' (not 'x'); and
D. Believes in 'y' (not 'x') and does 'x' (not 'y').

Common to all four stances on belief-behaviour is a shared conviction, by experiencing teachers, that their own dispositions and their own actions are aptly designed to promote optimum pupil growth. There is no reason for one to deny that any of the four belief-behaviour combinations possesses equal potency in promoting pupil gains. In short, in this kind of exploratory study, it is appropriate to express hypotheses in the null form.
2. SOME PERSPECTIVES ON THE USE OF A PRETEST-POSTTEST DESIGN

During the research it was only possible to obtain one pretest-posttest measure on each of the criterion variables rather than a series of observations over time. As a consequence, no subtle or marked differentiation in the gradients between tests A (pretest) and B (posttest) are revealed. Work done by King (1973), concerning pupils' gains and losses on creativity tests, provides one example where there are marked fluctuations of gradients between first and final tests on the criterion variables. Fluctuations of gradient recorded during a series of observations can serve to reveal subtle changes in the influence of study "treatments" or show marked differences in the academic performance of pupils at various ages.*

With reference to the present work, the use of a pretest-posttest design may have served to obscure pupil changes that might have been noted had more observations been made. However, given the constraints of time, the restrictions on access to classrooms, and the use of only the author for observations, it was not possible to increase the number of observations made.

The employment of a pretest-posttest design has implications for the main variables as treatments. In respect of drama as a treatment, it has to be recognised

* See for instance Barker-Lunn (1970) 'Streaming in the Primary School'.
that the experiences of pupils in this area tend to be very short. As such the drama options under scrutiny are likely to constitute a minimal treatment by almost any standards. Further, because there is no subsequent measure following the withdrawal of the "treatment", no view can be advanced as to whether any significant gain or loss associated with a drama treatment would be sustained or would regress quickly to pretest levels. With regard to belief-behaviour consistency (as a treatment variable) this element may also be seen as minimal because teachers were deemed to be consistent/inconsistent on one occasion only. A series of observations might well have led to the placement of teachers in different (if not opposite) groupings on this main variable. However, it is the view of the author that a characteristic such as belief-behaviour consistency was likely to have remained stable since subsequent observations would have been made during the same curriculum activity, that is, drama. If, as data from teacher interviews suggest, teachers tend to employ the same kind of drama strategies during each session then it can be assumed that the belief-behaviour characteristics of teachers in drama would also remain the same.
3. **SOME PERSPECTIVES ON THE USE OF THE STATISTICAL T-TEST**

The use of t-test as the main statistical tool for the testing of H3.1 onwards requires some explanation.

Because of the exploratory nature of the present work it was decided to maintain the data in its crudest form organised around simple significance testing. This decision was deemed justifiable since the work was proceeding within a little researched area without any highly supported hypotheses. As a consequence of this decision, the t-test (correlated data) was used as a basic statistical means by which significant gains and losses of pupils between Time A (pretest) and Time B (posttest) could be identified on each criterion variable. One outcome of this approach is that statistical comparisons can only be made of pupils' gains and losses of teachers within groups. That is, teachers can only be compared on their own abilities to produce pupils' gains/losses between pre- and posttests. Statistical comparisons cannot be made of pupils' gains and losses between teacher groups when the latter are categorised according to a study treatment, for example, drama. Although the use of t-tests has proved to be a time consuming approach, the decision to use the strategy was a deliberate one in view of the path taken by the present work. However, had the study not been of an evolutionary nature, or if a fresh investigation was about to be made
using the same data base, then an analysis of covariance would have been employed to obtain a more sensitive measure of pupils' gains and losses than that afforded by the t-test procedure. Ready opportunities are seen also for the possibility of having based the present work on the use of multiple regression and other sets of methodological approaches using cluster analysis (e.g. in the context of drama teacher characteristics). Further, more innovative methods such as fuzzy sets might also have been used. It was not until the evolutionary path of the present study had been followed that the work could be viewed in its entirety; thus decisions regarding the use of more sophisticated statistical methods than those employed in the study can only be viewed in hindsight.

4. STATEMENT OF HYPOTHESES

4.1 Hypotheses relating to teacher characteristics and held beliefs

A note on the term 'held beliefs'

The term 'held beliefs' as used in the following nine hypotheses (1.1 to 1.9), refers to 43 separate beliefs derived from the Teacher Opinionnaire (Appendix 3). Each of the nine hypotheses may be viewed as a summary of the 43 hypotheses that were subsequently tested. For purposes of brevity, only the range of the 43 subsumed hypotheses is
given here and is indicated in parenthesis after each summarised hypothesis. The final figure given or implied within the range of subsumed hypotheses, for example 1.1.1, refers to a particular belief item as it appears on the Teacher Opinionnaire.

Hypothesis 1.1 There is no significant difference in respect of held beliefs among teachers who are grouped according to age. (1.1.1 to 1.1.43)

Hypothesis 1.2 There is no significant difference in respect of held beliefs among teachers who are grouped according to sex. (1.2.1 to 1.2.43)

Hypothesis 1.3 There is no significant difference in respect of held beliefs among teachers who are grouped according to type of teacher training. (1.3.1 to 1.3.43)

Hypothesis 1.4 There is no significant difference in respect of held beliefs among teachers who are grouped according to length of teacher training. (1.4.1 to 1.4.43)

Hypothesis 1.5 There is no significant difference in respect of held beliefs among teachers who are grouped according to length of teaching experience. (1.5.1 to 1.5.43)
Hypothesis 1.6 There is no significant difference in respect of held beliefs among teachers who are grouped according to grade of pupils taught. (1.6.1 to 1.6.43)

Hypothesis 1.7 There is no significant difference in respect of held beliefs among teachers who are grouped according to size of school. (1.7.1 to 1.7.43)

Hypothesis 1.8 There is no significant difference in respect of held beliefs among teachers who are grouped according to catchment area of school. (1.8.1 to 1.8.43)

Hypothesis 1.9 There is no significant difference in respect of held beliefs among teachers who are grouped according to choice of drama option. (1.9.1 to 1.9.43)

4.2 Hypotheses relating to actual and ideal drama choices of teachers

Hypothesis 2.0 There is no significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of the total teacher sample (n=235).

Hypothesis 2.1.1 There is no significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of teachers in the 20 to 30 year old age group.

Hypothesis 2.1.2 There is no significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of teachers in the 31 to 40 year old age group.
Hypothesis 2.1.3 There is no significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of teachers in the 41 years and over age group.

Hypothesis 2.2.1 There is no significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of female teachers.

Hypothesis 2.2.2 There is no significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of male teachers.

Hypothesis 2.3.1 There is no significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of infant teachers.

Hypothesis 2.3.2 There is no significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of infant/primary teachers.

Hypothesis 2.3.3 There is no significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of primary teachers.

Hypothesis 2.4.1 There is no significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of two year trained teachers.

Hypothesis 2.4.2 There is no significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of three year trained teachers.

Hypothesis 2.4.3 There is no significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of four year trained teachers.
Hypothesis 2.5.1 There is no significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of teachers who have one to ten years teaching experience.

Hypothesis 2.5.2 There is no significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of teachers who have eleven to twenty years teaching experience.

Hypothesis 2.5.3 There is no significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of teachers who have twenty-one or more years teaching experience.

Hypothesis 2.6.1 There is no significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of teachers who have lower primary classes.

Hypothesis 2.6.2 There is no significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of teachers who have middle primary classes.

Hypothesis 2.6.3 There is no significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of teachers who have upper primary classes.

Hypothesis 2.7.1 There is no significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of teachers who are based in small* schools.

---

* 1 to 180 pupils (Classes 3 and 4) = small schools
Hypothesis 2.7.2 There is no significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of teachers who are based in medium-sized** schools.

Hypothesis 2.7.3 There is no significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of teachers who are based in large*** schools.

Hypothesis 2.8.1 There is no significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of rural teachers.

Hypothesis 2.8.2 There is no significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of urban teachers.

4.3 Hypotheses relating to drama choice of teachers and pupil outcomes

Hypothesis 3.1 There will be no significant gain or loss on a measure of verbal creativity between* Time A and Time B where:

3.1.1 dramatic play was used;
3.1.2 drama exercise was used; and
3.1.3 theatre was used.

** 181 to 500 pupils (Class 2) = medium schools
*** 501+ pupils (Class 1) = large schools
(All from N.S.W. Classification of schools)
+ The period between Time A and Time B was 9 weeks.
Hypothesis 3.2  There will be no significant gain or loss on a measure of figural creativity between Time A and Time B where:
3.2.1 dramatic play was used;
3.2.2 drama exercise was used; and
3.2.3 theatre was used.

Hypothesis 3.3  There will be no significant gain or loss on a measure of empathy between Time A and Time B where:
3.3.1 dramatic play was used;
3.3.2 drama exercise was used; and
3.3.3 theatre was used.

Hypothesis 3.4  There will be no significant gain or loss on a measure of self-esteem between Time A and Time B where:
3.4.1 dramatic play was used;
3.4.2 drama exercise was used; and
3.4.3 theatre was used.

Hypothesis 3.5  There will be no significant gain or loss on a measure of academic self-image between Time A and Time B where:
3.5.1 dramatic play was used;
3.5.2 drama exercise was used; and
3.5.3 theatre was used.
4.4 Hypotheses relating to teacher beliefs and pupil outcomes

A note on the term - 'each measure of pupil outcome'

The term 'each measure of pupil outcome' refers to the five criterion variables of the study, namely, verbal creativity, figural creativity, empathy, self-esteem and academic self-image. Each separate pupil outcome is denoted by /number code following statements of hypotheses. For example (4.1.1/1) is a hypothesis that relates to a pupil measure of verbal creativity as revealed in the following guide to coding:

/1 = verbal creativity
/2 = figural creativity
/3 = empathy
/4 = self-esteem
/5 = academic self-image

For purposes of brevity only the range of pupil outcomes is given, for example 7.1.1/1 to 7/1/1/5, and is indicated in parenthesis after each summary of hypothesis.

Hypothesis 4.1 There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time and Time B where teachers:
4.1.1 like* directing the work of others (4.1.1/1 to 4.1.1/5); and
4.1.2 do not like directing the work of others (4.1.2/1 to 4.1.2/5).

Hypothesis 4.2
There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time and Time B where teachers:
4.2.1 believe in making use of pupil ideas in drama (4.2.1/1 to 4.2.1/5); and
4.2.2 do not believe in making use of pupil ideas in drama (4.2.2/1 to 4.2.2/5).

Hypothesis 4.3
There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time and Time B where teachers:
4.3.1 believe in the value of spontaneous teaching strategies (4.3.1/1 to 4.3.1/5); and
4.3.2 do not believe in the value of spontaneous teaching strategies (4.3.2/1 to 4.3.2/5).

* The word 'like' is used in reference to a belief about self. That is, Teacher X believes that s/he likes to direct the work of others.
Hypothesis 4.4 There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time and Time B where teachers:

4.4.1 believe that pupil control is a high priority (4.4.1/1 to 4.4.1/5); and

4.4.2 do not believe that pupil control is a high priority (4.4.2/1 to 4.4.2/5).

Hypothesis 4.5 There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time and Time B where teachers:

4.5.1 believe that pupils prefer dependence to autonomy (4.5.1/1 to 4.5.1/5);

4.5.2 do not believe that pupils prefer dependence to autonomy (4.5.2/1 to 4.5.2/5).

Hypothesis 4.6 There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time and Time B where teachers:

4.6.1 believe that less able pupils can be creative (4.6.1/1 to 4.6.1/5);

4.6.2 do not believe that less able pupils can be creative (4.6.2/1 to 4.6.2/5).
Hypothesis 4.7 There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time and Time B where teachers:

4.7.1 believe that the most effective teaching is done 'out front' (4.7.1/1 to 4.7.1/5);

4.7.2 do not believe that the most effective teaching is done 'at front' (4.7.2/1 to 4.7.2/5).

Hypothesis 4.8 There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time and Time B where teachers:

4.8.1 believe that drama provides a welcome chance for pupil mobility (4.8.1/1 to 4.8.1/5);

4.8.2 do not believe that drama provides a welcome chance for pupil mobility (4.8.2/1 to 4.8.2/5).

Hypothesis 4.9 There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time and Time B where teachers:

4.9.1 believe in the value of competition between pupils (4.9.1/1 to 4.9.1/5);

4.9.2 do not believe in the value of competition between pupils (4.9.2/1 to 4.9.2/5).
4.5 Hypotheses relating to teacher behaviour and pupil outcomes

Each of the following nine hypotheses (5.1 to 5.9) encompasses one aspect of teacher behaviour derived from the nine observational criteria on the Drama Inventory (Appendix 7).

Hypothesis 5.1

There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers:

5.1.1 allow pupils to direct their own work in drama (5.1.1/1 to 5.1.1/5);

5.1.2 do not allow pupils to direct their own work in drama (5.1.2/1 to 5.1.2/5).

Hypothesis 5.2

There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers:

5.2.1 make use of pupil ideas in drama (5.2.1/1 to 5.2.1/5);

5.2.2 do not make use of pupil ideas in drama (5.2.2/1 to 5.2.2/5).

Hypothesis 5.3

There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers:

5.3.1 keep to set plans in drama (5.3.1/1 to 5.3.1/5);

5.3.2 do not keep to set plans in drama (5.3.2/1 to 5.3.2/5).
Hypothesis 5.4  There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers:
5.4.1 attempt to maintain pupil silence in drama (5.4.1/1 to 5.4.1/5);
5.4.2 do not attempt to maintain pupil silence in drama (5.4.2/1 to 5.4.2/5).

Hypothesis 5.5  There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers:
5.5.1 allow pupils to make decisions* in drama (5.5.1/1 to 5.5.1/5);
5.5.2 do not allow pupils to make decisions in drama (5.5.2/1 to 5.5.2/5).

Hypothesis 5.6  There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers:
5.6.1 allow less able pupils to participate in drama (5.6.1/1 to 5.6.1/5);
5.6.2 do not allow less able pupils to participate in drama (5.6.2/1 to 5.6.2/5).

* Those 'decisions' regarding choice of dramatic character and/or plot
Hypothesis 5.7  There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers:
5.7.1 maintain a central position in drama (5.7.1/1 to 5.7.1/5);
5.7.2 do not maintain a central position in drama (5.7.2/1 to 5.7.2/5).

Hypothesis 5.8  There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers:
5.8.1 do not restrict pupil mobility in drama (5.8.1/1 to 5.8.1/5);
5.8.2 restrict pupil mobility in drama (5.8.2/1 to 5.8.2/5).

Hypothesis 5.9  There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers:
5.9.1 encourage the use of competition between pupils in drama (5.9.1/1 to 5.9.1/5);
5.9.2 do not encourage the use of competition between pupils in drama (5.9.2/1 to 5.9.2/5).
4.6 Hypotheses relating to 'belief-behaviour characteristics' of teachers and pupil outcomes

A note on the term 'belief-behaviour characteristics' of teachers

Within the term 'belief-behaviour', the belief element refers to those beliefs mentioned in hypotheses 4.1 to 4.9; the behaviour element refers to aspects of teacher behaviour cited in hypotheses 5.1 to 5.9. Each belief item has a corresponding behaviour element. Four combinations of belief-behaviour were identified and cited in Section 1 of this chapter.

Hypothesis 6.1 There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers:

6.1.1 like directing the work of others and do not allow pupils to direct their own work in drama (6.1.1/1 to 6.1.1/5);

6.1.2 like directing the work of others and allow pupils to direct their own work in drama (6.1.2/1 to 6.1.2/5);

6.1.3 do not like directing the work of others and do not allow pupils to direct their own work in drama (6.1.3/1 to 6.1.3/5);
Hypothesis 6.2

There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers:

6.2.1 believe in making use of pupil ideas and use them in drama (6.2.1/1 to 6.2.1/5);
6.2.2 believe in making use of pupil ideas but do not use them in drama (6.2.2/1 to 6.2.2/5);
6.2.3 do not believe in making use of pupil ideas but use them in drama (6.2.3/1 to 6.2.3/5);
6.2.4 do not believe in making use of pupil ideas and do not use them in drama (6.2.4/1 to 6.2.4/5).

Hypothesis 6.3

There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers:

6.3.1 believe in the value of spontaneous teaching strategies and do not keep to set plans (6.3.1/1 to 6.3.1/5);
6.3.2 do not believe in the value of spontaneous teaching strategies and keep to set plans (6.3.2/1 to 6.3.2/5);

6.3.3 do not believe in the value of spontaneous teaching strategies and do not keep to set plans (6.3.3/1 to 6.3.3/5);

6.3.4 do not believe in the value of spontaneous teaching and keep to set plans (6.3.4/1 to 6.3.4/5).

Hypothesis 6.4 There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers:

6.4.1 believe in the need for high pupil control and attempt to maintain pupil silence in drama (6.4.1/1 to 6.4.1/5);

6.4.2 believe in the need for high pupil control but do not attempt to maintain pupil silence in drama (6.4.2/1 to 6.4.2/5);

6.4.3 do not believe in the need for high pupil control but attempt to maintain pupil silence in drama (6.4.3/1 to 6.4.3/5);
6.4.4 do not believe in the need for high pupil control and do not attempt to maintain pupil silence in drama (6.4.4/1 to 6.4.4/5);

Hypothesis 6.5 There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers:

6.5.1 believe that pupils prefer dependence to autonomy and do not allow pupils to make decisions in drama (6.5.1/1 to 6.5.1/5);

6.5.2 believe that pupils prefer dependence to autonomy and allow pupils to make decisions in drama (6.5.2/1 to 6.5.2/5);

6.5.3 do not believe that pupils prefer dependence to autonomy and do not allow pupils to make decisions in drama (6.5.3/1 to 6.5.3/5);

6.5.4 do not believe that pupils prefer dependence to autonomy and allow pupils to make decisions in drama (6.5.4/1 to 6.5.4/5);

Hypothesis 6.6 There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers:

6.6.1 believe that less able pupils can be creative and allow them to
participate in drama (6.6.1/1 to 6.6.1/5);

6.6.2 believe that less able pupils can be creative but do not allow them to participate in drama (6.6.2/1 to 6.6.2/5);

6.6.3 do not believe that less able pupils can be creative but allow them to participate in drama (6.6.3/1 to 6.6.3/5);

6.6.4 do not believe that less able pupils can be creative and do not allow them to participate in drama (6.6.4/1 to 6.6.4/5).

Hypothesis 6.7 There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers:

6.7.1 believe that the most effective teaching is done 'out-front' and maintain a central position in drama (6.7.1/1 to 6.7.1/5);

6.7.2 believe that the most effective teaching is done 'out-front' and do not maintain a central position in drama (6.7.2/1 to 6.7.2/5);

6.7.3 do not believe that the most effective teaching is done 'out-front' and maintain a central
position in drama (6.7.3/1 to 6.7.3/5);

6.7.4 do not believe that the most effective teaching is done 'out-front' and do not maintain a central position in drama (6.7.4/1 to 6.7.4/5).

Hypothesis 6.8 There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers:

6.8.1 believe that drama provides a welcome chance for pupil mobility and do not restrict pupil mobility in drama (6.8.1/1 to 6.8.1/5);

6.8.2 believe that drama provides a welcome chance for pupil mobility but restrict pupil mobility in drama (6.8.2/1 to 6.8.2/5);

6.8.3 do not believe that drama provides a welcome chance for pupil mobility but do not restrict pupil mobility in drama (6.8.3/1 to 6.8.3/5);

6.8.4 do not believe that drama provides a welcome chance for pupil mobility and restrict pupil mobility in drama (6.8.4/1 to 6.8.4/5).
Hypothesis 6.9 There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers:

6.9.1 believe in the value of competition between pupils and employ it in drama (6.9.1/1 to 6.9.1/5);
6.9.2 believe in the value of competition between pupils but do not employ it in drama (6.9.2/1 to 6.9.2/5);
6.9.3 do not believe in the value of competition between pupils but employ it in drama (6.9.3/1 to 6.9.3/5);
6.9.4 do not believe in the value of competition between pupils and do not employ it in drama (6.9.4/1 to 6.9.4/5).

4.7 Hypotheses relating to the belief-behaviour characteristics of teachers, drama choices and pupil outcomes

Hypothesis 7.1 There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where dramatic play teachers:

7.1.1 like directing the work of others and do not allow pupils to direct their own work in drama (7.1.1/1 to 7.1.1/5);
7.1.2 like directing the work of others and allow pupils to direct their own work in drama (7.1.2/1 to 7.1.2/5);

7.1.3 do not like directing the work of others and allow pupils to direct their own work in drama (7.1.3/1 to 7.1.3/5);

7.1.4 do not like directing the work of others and do not allow pupils to direct their own work in drama (7.1.4/1 to 7.1.4/5).

Hypothesis 7.2 There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where drama exercise teachers:

7.2.1 like directing the work of others and do not allow pupils to direct their own work in drama (7.2.1/1 to 7.2.1/5);

7.2.2 like directing the work of others and allow pupils to direct their own work in drama (7.2.2/1 to 7.2.2/5);

7.2.3 do not like directing the work of others and allow pupils to direct their own work in drama (7.2.3/1 to 7.2.3/5);
7.2.4 do not like directing the work of others and do not allow pupils to direct their own work in drama (7.2.4/1 to 7.2.4/5).

**Hypothesis 7.3**

There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers of theatre:

7.3.1 like directing the work of others and do not allow pupils to direct their own work in drama (7.3.1/1 to 7.3.1/5);

7.3.2 like directing the work of others and allow pupils to direct their own work in drama (7.3.2/1 to 7.3.2/5);

7.3.3 do not like directing the work of others and allow pupils to direct their own work in drama (7.3.3/1 to 7.3.3/5);

7.3.4 do not like directing the work of others and do not allow pupils to direct their own work in drama (7.3.4/1 to 7.3.4/5);

**Hypothesis 7.4**

There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers of dramatic play:
7.4.1 believe in making use of pupil ideas and use them in drama (7.4.1/1 to 7.4.1/5);

7.4.2 believe in making use of pupil ideas but do not use them in drama (7.4.2/1 to 7.4.2/5);

7.4.3 do not believe in making use of pupil ideas but use them in drama (7.4.3/1 to 7.4.3/5);

7.4.4 do not believe in making use of pupil ideas and do not use them in drama (7.4.4/1 to 7.4.4/5).

Hypothesis 7.5 There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers of drama exercise:

7.5.1 believe in making use of pupil ideas and use them in drama (7.5.1/1 to 7.5.1/5);

7.5.2 believe in making use of pupil ideas but do not use them in drama (7.5.2/1 to 7.5.2/5);

7.5.3 do not believe in making use of pupil ideas but use them in drama (7.5.3/1 to 7.5.3/5);
Hypothesis 7.6
There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers of theatre:

7.6.1 believe in making use of pupil ideas and use them in drama (7.6.1/1 to 7.6.1/5);
7.6.2 believe in making use of pupil ideas but do not use them in drama (7.6.2/1 to 7.6.2/5);
7.6.3 do not believe in making use of pupil ideas but use them in drama (7.6.3/1 to 7.6.3/5);
7.6.4 do not believe in making use of pupil ideas and do not use them in drama (7.6.4/1 to 7.6.4/5).

Hypothesis 7.7
There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers of dramatic play:

7.7.1 believe in the value of spontaneous teaching strategies and do not keep to set plans (7.7.1/1 to 7.7.1/5);
7.7.2 believe in the value of spontaneous teaching and keep to set plans (7.7.2/1 to 7.7.2/5);
7.7.3 do not believe in the value of spontaneous teaching and do not keep to set plans (7.7.3/1 to 7.7.3/5);
7.7.4 do not believe in the value of spontaneous teaching strategies and keep to set plans (7.7.4/1 to 7.7.4/5).

Hypothesis 7.8 There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers of drama exercise:
7.8.1 believe in the value of spontaneous teaching strategies and do not keep to set plans (7.8.1/1 to 7.8.1/5);
7.8.2 believe in the value of spontaneous teaching and keep to set plans (7.8.2/1 to 7.8.2/5);
7.8.3 do not believe in the value of spontaneous teaching and do not keep to set plans (7.8.3/1 to 7.8.3/5);
Hypothesis 7.9

There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers of theatre:

7.9.1 believe in the value of spontaneous teaching strategies and do not keep to set plans (7.9.1/1 to 7.9.1/5);

7.9.2 believe in the value of spontaneous teaching and keep to set plans (7.9.2/1 to 7.9.2/5);

7.9.3 do not believe in the value of spontaneous teaching and do not keep to set plans (7.9.3/1 to 7.9.3/5);

7.9.4 do not believe in the value of spontaneous teaching strategies and keep to set plans (7.9.4/1 to 7.9.4/5).

Hypothesis 7.10

There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers of dramatic play:

7.10.1 believe in the need for high pupil
control and attempt to maintain pupil silence in drama (7.10.1/1 to 7.10.1/5);

7.10.2 believe in the need for high pupil control but do not attempt to maintain pupil silence in drama (7.10.2/1 to 7.10.2/5);

7.10.3 do not believe in the need for high pupil control but attempt to maintain pupil silence in drama (7.10.3/1 to 7.10.3/5);

7.10.4 do not believe in the need for high pupil control and make no attempt to maintain pupil silence in drama (7.10.4/1 to 7.10.4/5).

Hypothesis 7.11 There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers of drama exercise:

7.11.1 believe in the need for high pupil control and attempt to maintain pupil silence in drama (7.11.1/1 to 7.11.1/5);

7.11.2 believe in the need for high pupil control but do not attempt to maintain pupil silence in drama (7.11.2/1 to 7.11.2/5);
7.11.3 do not believe in the need for high pupil control but attempt to maintain pupil silence in drama (7.11.3/1 to 7.11.3/5);

7.11.4 do not believe in the need for high pupil control and make no attempt to maintain pupil silence in drama (7.11.4/1 to 7.11.4/5).

**Hypothesis 7.12**

There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers of theatre:

7.12.1 believe in the need for high pupil control and attempt to maintain pupil silence in drama (7.12.1/1 to 7.12.1/5);

7.12.2 believe in the need for high pupil control but do not attempt to maintain pupil silence in drama (7.12.2/1 to 7.12.2/5);

7.12.3 do not believe in the need for high pupil control but attempt to maintain pupil silence in drama (7.12.3/1 to 7.12.3/5);

7.12.4 do not believe in the need for high pupil control and make no attempt to maintain pupil silence in drama (7.12.4/1 to 7.12.4/5).
Hypothesis 7.13 There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers of dramatic play:

7.13.1 believe that pupils prefer dependence to autonomy and do not allow pupils to make decisions in drama (7.13.1/1 to 7.13.1/5);

7.13.2 believe that pupils prefer dependence to autonomy and allow pupils to make decisions in drama (7.13.2/1 to 7.13.2/5);

7.13.3 do not believe that pupils prefer dependence to autonomy and do not allow pupils to make decisions in drama (7.13.3/1 to 7.13.3/5);

7.13.4 do not believe that pupils prefer dependence to autonomy and do not allow pupils to make decisions in drama (7.13.4/1 to 7.13.4/5).

Hypothesis 7.14 There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers of drama exercise:

7.14.1 believe that pupils prefer dependence to autonomy and do not allow pupils to make decisions in drama (7.14.1/1 to 7.14.1/5);
7.14.2 believe that pupils prefer dependence to autonomy and allow pupils to make decisions in drama (7.14.2/1 to 7.14.2/5);

7.14.3 do not believe that pupils prefer dependence to autonomy and do not allow pupils to make decisions in drama (7.14.3/1 to 7.14.3/5);

7.14.4 do not believe that pupils prefer dependence to autonomy and allow pupils to make decisions in drama (7.14.4/1 to 7.14.4/5);

Hypothesis 7.15 There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers of theatre:

7.15.1 believe that pupils prefer dependence to autonomy and do not allow pupils to make decisions in drama (7.15.1/1 to 7.15.1/5);

7.15.2 believe that pupils prefer dependence to autonomy and allow pupils to make decisions in drama (7.15.2/1 to 7.15.2/5);

7.15.3 do not believe that pupils prefer dependence to autonomy and do not allow pupils to make decisions in drama (7.15.3/1 to 7.15.3/5);
7.15.4 do not believe that pupils prefer dependence to autonomy and allow pupils to make decisions in drama (7.15.4/1 to 7.15.4/5).

Hypothesis 7.16 There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers of dramatic play:

7.16.1 believe that less able pupils can be creative and allow them to participate in drama (7.13.1/1 to 7.13.1/5);

7.16.2 believe that less able pupils can be creative but do not allow them to participate in drama (7.13.2/1 to 7.13.2/5);

7.16.3 do not believe that less able pupils can be creative but allow them to participate in drama (7.13.3/1 to 7.13.3/5);

7.16.4 do not believe that less able pupils can be creative and do not allow them to participate in drama (7.16.4/1 to 7.16.4/5).

Hypothesis 7.17 There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers of drama exercise:
7.17.1 believe that less able pupils can be creative and allow them to participate in drama (7.17.1/1 to 7.17.1/5);

7.17.2 believe that less able pupils can be creative but do not allow them to participate in drama (7.17.2/1 to 7.17.2/5);

7.17.3 do not believe that less able pupils can be creative but allow them to participate in drama (7.17.3/1 to 7.17.3/5);

7.17.4 do not believe that less able pupils can be creative and do not allow them to participate in drama (7.17.4/1 to 7.17.4/5).

Hypothesis 7.18 There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers of theatre:

7.18.1 believe that less able pupils can be creative and allow them to participate in drama (7.18.1/1 to 7.18.1/5);

7.18.2 believe that less able pupils can be creative but do not allow them to participate in drama (7.18.2/1 to 7.18.2/5);
7.18.3 do not believe that less able pupils can be creative but allow them to participate in drama (7.18.3/1 to 7.18.3/5);
7.18.4 do not believe that less able pupils can be creative and do not allow them to participate in drama (7.18.4/1 to 7.18.4/5).

Hypothesis 7.19
There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers of dramatic play:
7.19.1 believe that the most effective teaching is done 'out-front' and maintain a central position in drama (7.19.1/1 to 7.19.1/5);
7.19.2 believe that the most effective teaching is done 'out-front' and do not maintain a central position in drama (7.19.2/1 to 7.19.2/5);
7.19.3 do not believe that the most effective teaching is done 'out-front' and do not maintain a central position in drama (7.19.3/1 to 7.19.3/5);
7.19.4 do not believe that the most effective teaching is done 'out-front' and maintain a central
Hypothesis 7.20 There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers of drama exercise:

7.20.1 believe that the most effective teaching is done 'out-front' and maintain a central position in drama (7.20.1/1 to 7.20.1/5);

7.20.2 believe that the most effective teaching is done 'out-front' and do not maintain a central position in drama (7.20.2/1 to 7.20.2/5);

7.20.3 do not believe that the most effective teaching is done 'out-front' and do not maintain a central position in drama (7.20.3/1 to 7.20.3/5);

7.20.4 do not believe that the most effective teaching is done 'out-front' and maintain a central position in drama (7.20.4/1 to 7.20.4/5).

Hypothesis 7.21 There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers of theatre:
7.21.1 believe that the most effective teaching is done 'out-front' and maintain a central position in drama (7.21.1/1 to 7.21.1/5);

7.21.2 believe that the most effective teaching is done 'out-front' and do not maintain a central position in drama (7.21.2/1 to 7.21.2/5);

7.21.3 do not believe that the most effective teaching is done 'out-front' and do not maintain a central position in drama (7.21.3/1 to 7.21.3/5);

7.21.4 do not believe that the most effective teaching is done 'out-front' and maintain a central position in drama (7.21.4/1 to 7.21.4/5).

Hypothesis 7.22 There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers of dramatic play:

7.22.1 believe that drama provides a welcome chance for pupil mobility and do not restrict pupil mobility in drama (7.22.1/1 to 7.22.1/5);

7.22.2 believe that drama provides a welcome chance for pupil mobility
but restrict pupil mobility in drama (7.22.2/1 to 7.22.2/5);

7.22.3 do not believe that drama provides a welcome chance for pupil mobility and do not restrict pupil mobility in drama (7.22.3/1 to 7.22.3/5);

7.22.4 do not believe that drama provides a welcome chance for pupil mobility and restricts pupil mobility in drama (7.22.4/1 to 7.22.4/5).

Hypothesis 7.23

There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers of drama exercise:

7.23.1 believe that drama provides a welcome chance for pupil mobility and do not restrict pupil mobility in drama (7.23.1/1 to 7.23.1/5);

7.23.2 believe that drama provides a welcome chance for pupil mobility but restrict pupil mobility in drama (7.23.2/1 to 7.23.2/5);

7.23.3 do not believe that drama provides a welcome chance for pupil mobility and do not restrict pupil mobility in drama (7.23.3/1 to 7.23.3/5);

7.23.4 do not believe that drama provides a welcome chance for pupil mobility
and restrict pupil mobility in drama (7.23.4/1 to 7.23.4/5).

Hypothesis 7.24 There will be no significant loss or gain on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers of theatre:

7.24.1 believe that drama provides a welcome chance for pupil mobility and do not restrict pupil mobility in drama (7.24.1/1 to 7.24.1/5);

7.24.2 believe that drama provides a welcome chance for pupil mobility but restrict pupil mobility in drama (7.24.2/1 to 7.24.2/5);

7.24.3 do not believe that drama provides a welcome chance for pupil mobility but do not restrict pupil mobility in drama (7.24.3/1 to 7.24.3/5);

7.24.4 do not believe that drama provides a welcome chance for pupil mobility and restrict pupil mobility in drama (7.24.4/1 to 7.24.4/5).

Hypothesis 7.25 There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers of dramatic play:
7.25.1 believe in the value of competition between pupils and employ it in drama (7.25.1/1 to 7.25.1/5);

7.25.2 believe in the value of competition between pupils but do not employ it in drama (7.25.2/1 to 7.25.2/5);

7.25.3 do not believe in the value of competition between pupils but employ it in drama (7.25.3/1 to 7.25.3/5);

7.25.4 do not believe in the value of competition between pupils and do not employ it in drama (7.25.4/1 to 7.25.4/5).

Hypothesis 7.26 There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers of drama exercise:

7.26.1 believe in the value of competition between pupils and employ it in drama (7.26.1/1 to 7.26.1/5);

7.26.2 believe in the value of competition between pupils but do not employ it in drama (7.26.2/1 to 7.26.2/5);
7.26.3 do not believe in the value of competition between pupils but employ it in drama (7.26.3/1 to 7.26.3/5);

7.26.4 do not believe in the value of competition between pupils and do not employ it in drama (7.26.4/1 to 7.26.4/5).

Hypothesis 7.27 There will be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers of theatre:

7.27.1 believe in the value of competition between pupils and employ it in drama (7.27.1/1 to 7.27.1/5);

7.27.2 believe in the value of competition between pupils but do not employ it in drama (7.27.2/1 to 7.27.2/5);

7.27.3 do not believe in the value of competition between pupils but employ it in drama (7.27.3/1 to 7.27.3/5);

7.27.4 do not believe in the value of competition between pupils and do not employ it in drama (7.27.4/1 to 7.27.4/5).
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ANALYSIS RELATING TO A CLIMATE OF TEACHER OPINION

INTRODUCTION

As discussed earlier in Chapter Four, the present research was somewhat 'evolutionary' in nature. Thus the findings of the preliminary part of the investigation gave rise to further enquiry, and subsequent analysis, reported in Chapters Eight, Nine, Ten and Eleven. In order to investigate the dual influences of teacher drama choices and belief-behaviour consistency upon pupil outcomes, it was necessary to ascertain the characteristics of teacher belief systems.

Firstly, in relation to teacher beliefs and drama choices, the former was seen to provide a context in which the latter might be profitably viewed. It is reasonable to assume that an individual's beliefs about drama choices will be connected to more fundamental beliefs regarding the purposes of the teacher, the learner and the curriculum, and what drama 'is' in making it happen. When these beliefs are shared by others, they may be viewed as an index of likely support given, or denied, to teachers when individual decisions about the use of drama come to be made. These shared beliefs, or 'Teacher Belief Climate', will serve further to reveal the probable acceptance or rejection of
drama use in schools. Therefore, one overall aim of the present chapter is to ascertain the nature of the 'Teacher Belief Climate' in which drama is deemed to operate.

Secondly, teacher belief systems provided a basis for the examination of belief-behaviour consistency and its influences on pupil outcomes. For an individual, beliefs may be viewed as a 'blueprint' for action. Further, beliefs are likely to determine which actions (including drama doing) are to be pursued and which are not. Moreover, beliefs may intervene between intended outcomes (a set of beliefs) and teacher behaviour (action taken in the light of these and other beliefs). Shared or consensual beliefs may come to influence an individual teacher's view of what s/he 'should' be doing in schools. That is, the Climate of Teacher Opinion may reveal what the corporate body of teachers determine to be the 'desirable' means and ends of 'education'. Teachers who do not adhere to this view may well be ostracised by colleagues. As a consequence of these observations, a second major aim of the present chapter is to identify those roles, purposes and strategies that teachers, as a corporate body, regard as worthwhile. Thus, the Teacher Belief Climate can be seen to provide a configuration of shared beliefs, and intonated behaviour, against which the abilities of teachers to be consistent between their beliefs and behaviour may be viewed.

Given the relative 'open-closedness' of belief systems (Rokeach, 1960) it was anticipated that the overall Teacher
Belief Climate would be dimensional in nature. At one end of the continuum would be those teachers possessing relatively 'fixist' (closed) beliefs, while at the other extreme would be those teachers with relatively 'flexist' (open) dispositions.

It was also necessary to find out if any specific beliefs might be attributed to particular groups of teachers. For example, do older teachers differ from their younger colleagues on held beliefs? What are the normative characteristics of teacher belief systems?

The chapter is divided into four sections. The first section contains statements about overall patterns of teacher beliefs. As such, there is no recourse to inferential statistical data. Rather, discussion centres on descriptive statistical examination of findings. Section two, concerning relationships between teacher characteristics and held beliefs, comprises data organised to reflect different groups. This data is arranged on an inferential statistical base such that the discussion is able to proceed around significance testing of hypotheses. Sections three and four summarise the findings and provide a base for the rationale which prompted further investigation and the subsequent results reported in Chapters Eight, Nine, Ten and Eleven. A beginning is made with the analysis of the Teacher Belief Climate.
1. **A DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS OF THE OVERALL CLIMATE**

The Climate of Teacher Opinion is derived from the collective responses of 235 primary school teachers. For purposes of clarity the Climate is analysed in three separate belief sets. This division of beliefs is an administrative convenience and is not based on any assumptions about the mutual exclusiveness of dispositions in one belief set as distinct from other belief sets. Overall beliefs about the teacher, the pupil, the organisation of learning and significant others are each examined in relation to held beliefs about drama, where appropriate. This recognises the notion that all of the teacher's professed beliefs derive from the same common system. It is the purpose of the present analysis to locate the extent to which teacher beliefs, constituting the Climate, are 'open-closed'. 
Table 7.1 Climate of teacher opinion: frequency distribution of teacher beliefs about teachers and pupils (n=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Belief</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Cannot Say</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Role of the teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like directing others</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>(31.9)</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers should direct most learning</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>(43.9)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I lack expertise in drama</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(4.7)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama is for theatre teachers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(5.5)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teacher Focus and Pupil Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most effective teaching out-front</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(10.3)</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama removes teacher attention</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(5.1)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils prefer to be dependent</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>(57.0)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep pupils quiet</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>(15.7)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils misbehave in drama</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(4.7)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils react well to novelty</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>(74.5)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most pupils capable self-discipline</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>(55.3)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama a chance for self-discipline</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>(74.1)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils can be mobile in drama</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>(74.9)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tolerance of Pupil Ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil ideas always tolerated</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>(74.9)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils use own ideas in drama</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>(92.3)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less able = less imagination</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>(15.3)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like others to rely on me for ideas</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>(34.5)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teacher-Pupil Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer to have social distance</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>(17.9)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers should be formal</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>(17.9)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I welcome pupils with problems</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>(83.8)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How pupils are motivated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils need competition</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>(51.1)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I encourage competition</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>(37.5)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama is an intrinsic motivator</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>(68.9)</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.1 Beliefs about the teacher and pupils

1.1.1 The role of the teacher

Inspection of Table 7.1 shows that approximately 90% of the teacher sample believed they possessed the necessary expertise to execute drama in their classrooms. This belief shows a high degree of collective confidence in the teacher's professional abilities and serves to indicate the likely acceptance of drama on the school timetable. In similar vein, 83% of the sample were of the opinion that drama teaching should not be left in the hands of teachers who can act and direct. Thus it may be that the task of doing drama is seen to be the teacher's own and no one else's. Further, views about what drama 'is' may not be restricted to its perception as 'theatre'.

In determining the kind of role that teachers enjoyed adopting in drama and elsewhere, teachers were evenly divided over their like/dislike for directing others. About 44% of teachers believed that they should direct most learning activities because they know more than children. Whether this view is restricted to one or more groups of teachers remains to be seen. Approximately 43% of respondents rejected the notion of majority direction. This latter group may have believed in the virtues of teacher direction, but not to the extent of directing most pupil activities.
1.1.2 Teacher focus and pupil control

Allied to views of the teacher as a director outlined in the previous paragraph is the observed rejection by 73% of the sample that the most effective teaching is done 'out-front'. The possible suggestion here is that the teacher sample believed in utilising a range of classroom strategies more varied than the director-orientated, expository approaches. This may not mean that 'out-front' approaches were not used. At this point, it is pertinent to note that 57% of teachers believed that pupils prefer to be told what to do rather than use their initiative. There is a hint here that teachers who believed in directing the majority of pupil learning may have done so because they saw the learner as a dependent, rather than autonomous, being. Only 27% of teachers believed that pupils are capable of acting independently of the teacher. Given the overwhelming 'syllabus-boundness' of teachers (detailed later), perceptions about teacher direction and pupil dependence, may, for some teachers, provide the pragmatic means by which content is met and pupils are controlled.

Table 7.1 also shows that 63% of teachers held the view that keeping pupils quiet in the classroom is not a high priority. It may be that teachers believed in the value of allowing for pupil interaction in certain social and/or learning contexts. With regard to this notion, Table 7.2 shows that 90% of the respondents saw drama as a valuable
means of encouraging social interaction. Thus, it appears that social interaction and development may be important teacher aims.

In further reference to teacher control of pupils, Table 7.1 indicates that 55% of the sample held the view that pupils are capable of self-discipline, while 36% possessed the opposite view. Thus some teachers appeared to allow for the presence of internal locus of pupil control in matters of discipline. Moreover, 74% of teachers believed that drama allows for the practice of self-discipline. One assumes that some teachers believed that drama provides a means by which pupils may develop self-discipline, but did not believe that pupils are able to gain anything from these experiences.

Teachers also believed that drama provides a welcome opportunity for pupils to move freely around the room. Teachers may have believed in the pupils' ability for internal control, or had confidence in their own competence for external control in drama, or both. It is unlikely that pupil mobility would be allowed if the results were chaotic. Added to this notion was a view held by 86% of the sample that drama is not an excuse for pupils to misbehave, nor as indicated in Table 7.3, is its doing likely to disturb others (77%). This sample of teachers believed further that children tend to behave well when faced with novel learning situations. It is not possible to state the extent to which pupil experiences may be regarded as
'novel'. However, the views that teachers held for pupils in those situations appeared to be generally positive ones. For some teachers and pupils, depending upon lesson frequency, 'drama' may be equated with 'novel learning situations'. If this is the case then views about pupils and novelty may have some impact on drama use.

1.1.3 Teacher-pupil relationships

It may be seen from Table 7.1 that 69% of the teacher sample held the view that teachers should not be formal in their dealings with pupils. They did not believe that pupils would take advantage of them if they adopted a relatively informal teacher stance. Furthermore, 65% of teachers did not believe in maintaining a social distance between themselves and their pupils. An overwhelming 84% of the respondents welcomed pupils coming to them with their social problems. This latter view suggests that teachers' views of their role were likely to encompass that of 'counsellor'. Moreover, the welcoming of pupils with their social problems suggests teacher confidence in the ability to reduce interpersonal tensions and thus allow pupils to approach them. Beliefs regarding more informal teacher stances, and the likelihood of warm teacher-pupil relations, suggest an overall departure from more traditional views of teacher role.
1.1.4 Tolerance of pupil ideas

Accompanying teacher views about teacher-pupil relations are beliefs concerning the place of pupil ideas in the classroom. It can be seen from Table 7.1 that 75% of the sample held that children's ideas should always be tolerated even when they differ from those of the teacher. Further, 92% of teachers believed that drama provides an opportunity for pupils to use their own ideas. However, it is interesting to observe that teachers were evenly divided in their desire to have others rely upon them for ideas and opinions. One may argue that having others rely upon self for ideas and opinions is more a matter of personality than belief. It is to be noted that the expression of preference for one's own ideas above others was made in the context of schools. Moreover, given the non-compulsory nature of drama, teachers were given full reign to pursue their own ideas to the exclusion of pupils' had they so desired. Whether or not this is the case awaits further analysis in Chapter Nine. What is clear is that most of the sample viewed drama as a means of pupil expression. About 75% of teachers did not believe that less able pupils were any less creative than their more able peers. On the face of it less able pupils were likely to be given opportunities to express their own ideas. In practice some kinds of drama may be more facilitative of pupil ideas than others.
1.1.5 The motivation of pupil learning

Table 7.1 shows that there is a division among teachers regarding views about the need for pupils to be extrinsically motivated to learn. About 51% of respondents believed that competition between children leads to higher standards of work. Similarly, teachers were divided over their perceived liking for a competitive classroom ethos. The word 'competitive' may be viewed in terms of competition against self or others. Thus respondents may have accepted one or the other meaning when making their beliefs about competition known. However, given the nature of the division on the competition-against-others item, it is likely that 'a competitive class ethos' was viewed by most respondents as a place where this particular kind of competition is encouraged to flourish. Although the value, or otherwise, of extrinsic learning motivation is unresolved, 69% of the sample believed that drama provides an opportunity for all pupils to be intrinsically motivated to learn. The impression given is that pupils doing drama will be stimulated to learn for the sheer joy of learning. More importantly, perhaps, is that pupils were seen to be capable of learning without the need for extrinsic motivators.
Table 7.2 Climate of teacher opinion: frequency distribution of teacher beliefs about the organisation of learning (n=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Belief</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Cannot Say</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Aims and Purposes of Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main aims are cognitive</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>(18.7)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postpone non-basics</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>(26.8)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No time for drama</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(5.1)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama meets social aims</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>(90.2)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Structure of Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration dilutes knowledge</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(5.5)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama promotes integration</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>(83.8)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama lacks structure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(2.1)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama lacks content</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(1.7)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Syllabus-boundness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers need set targets</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>(91.1)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like planning well ahead</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>(64.3)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous teaching productive</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>(70.6)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to keep to timetable</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>(35.8)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have set places for everything</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>(72.8)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.2 Beliefs about the organisation of learning

1.2.1 The structure of learning

The way that teachers view 'knowledge' is likely to govern the manner in which they attempt to organise it in the classroom. Inspection of Table 7.2 shows that 83% of teachers did not believe that integration of learning tends to dilute knowledge. The impression given is that teachers recognise some value in the correlation of curriculum subjects. Allied to this view is a belief held by 84% of the sample that drama provides an ideal stimulus for integrating other aspects of pupil learning. Much of the teacher's success in integrating curriculum aspects via drama use, is likely to depend upon the wisdom of drama choice. It is notable that 92% of the sample believed that the drama they chose possessed sufficient structure for inclusion in the content-orientated curriculum.

1.2.2 The aims and purposes of learning

Approximately 70% of teachers declared that their major teaching aims were not limited to the encouragement of academic pursuit. Similarly, 56% of the sample expressed a view that they were unlikely to postpone non-basic aspects of the curriculum in favour of the basics - when pressures of time prevailed. Moreover, 87% of respondents believed that drama was not to be avoided due to lack of time. The
implication here is that teachers' aims and educational purposes may outweigh more traditional emphases centred on academic endeavour. Therefore, one is led to believe that drama is not to be abandoned in favour of more traditional pursuits and thus suggests another departure from formal views of the teacher role.

1.2.3 Syllabus boundness-freedom

It can be seen from inspection of Table 7.2 that 91% of teachers believed they should have set targets of work content and that it ought to be completed within the year. Allied to this view is the belief that drama has sufficient content for teachers' perceived educational purposes. Thus, although a departure from more traditional views of role has been evidenced, the move appears to be towards pragmatic, rather than any child-centred ideology. Underlying the apparent syllabus-boundness of teachers may be the belief that pupils only gain fully from learning if all the content of learning is 'pre-mapped'.

The pursuit of work content may be linked to other views on the organisation of learning. For instance, 64% of the teacher sample liked planning ahead so that they knew every step of the lesson before it was reached. However, 71% of the sample believed that spontaneous teaching is just as likely to achieve desired results as set plans. The
combination of these latter two views suggests that although teachers prefer to be well organised, they may be willing to pursue more spontaneous strategies if they are seen to contribute towards learning goals. It may also be that pupil ideas mentioned earlier may only be used by teachers to the extent that they coincide with predetermined work plans and content.

Beliefs about the need for educational planning, allied to teacher spontaneity where applicable, give rise to further speculation on the pragmatic nature of the teacher belief climate.

1.3 The influence of significant others

Pupils as 'significant others' are dealt with in Section 1.1, thus the present section is confined to the influence of colleagues and superordinates as significant others in the life of the teacher.
### Table 7.3 Climate of teacher opinion: frequency distribution of teacher beliefs about significant others (n=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Belief</th>
<th>Agree N</th>
<th>Agree %</th>
<th>Cannot Say N</th>
<th>Cannot Say %</th>
<th>Disagree N</th>
<th>Disagree %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Colleague Supportiveness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues should be mutually tolerant</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>(88.5)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>(8.1)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(3.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama will attract criticism</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(4.7)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>(16.6)</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>(78.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama is noisy for others</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>(12.0)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(10.6)</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>(77.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep failure to myself</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>(15.3)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>(18.3)</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>(66.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Submissiveness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior staff should make important decisions</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>(27.6)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>(16.2)</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>(56.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try to avoid arguments with superiors</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>(20.4)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>(28.1)</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>(51.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3.1 Colleague supportiveness

It may be seen from inspection of Table 7.3 that 88% of the sample believed colleagues should render mutual support to other teachers' methods even if they differ from their own. These methods may or may not include drama use, but nevertheless this majority view may hold consequences for drama acceptance. Furthermore, 79% of teachers felt that drama is unlikely to attract criticism from other staff. It is pertinent to note that more teachers believed that colleagues 'should' be supportive, than was actually evidenced by respondents in their observation of drama support. It was observable that 66% of the teacher sample found it unnecessary to keep their failures and mistakes to themselves. The overall indication is that 88% of the sample believed that colleagues should be mutually supportive, but only 66% of teachers felt that they could share their failures and mistakes with colleagues.

1.3.2 Beliefs about superordinates

Fifty-six percent of the teacher sample believed that senior school staff were not in the best position to make important decisions in the school. Twenty-eight per cent of teachers held the opposite view. A two to one majority of teachers rejecting the notion of senior staff authority implies a relatively low level of submissiveness by less
experienced staff towards their more experienced colleagues.

Teachers were divided over their relative need to follow the directives of principals and inspectors in order to avoid arguments with them. Authority from non-colleague sources may be more potent for some teachers in influencing their actions and decisions. Moreover, principals and inspectors are likely to have more of an influence on a teacher's career prospects than senior staff. However, given that teachers were divided on the issue of this source of authority, the suggestion is that some teachers may adhere to the professional authority of inspectors and principals, although not necessarily to avoid arguments.

Before any summary is made of the Belief Climate, it is useful to show whether the observed trends of opinion are associated with any particular personal and/or environmental characteristics of the teacher sample. Thus, examination is made of teacher beliefs when the sample is grouped according to certain selected characteristics.

2. HYPOTHESES RELATING TO TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS AND HELD BELIEFS

In the present analysis teacher beliefs were analysed according to age of teacher, sex of teacher, type of teacher training, length of teacher training, length of teacher experience, grade taught, size of school, catchment area of school and drama option of teacher. Specific hypotheses
relating to each of these characteristics are presented in summary in Chapter Six.

It was mentioned in Chapter Six that the term 'held beliefs' encompasses 43 separate belief responses derived from the Teacher Opinionnaire. Therefore, the investigation of nine teacher characteristics plus 43 beliefs has involved the subsequent testing of 387 hypotheses in the present area of analysis. Chi square was selected as an appropriate statistical means by which significant relationships (if any) might be identified between each of the nine teacher characteristics and teacher responses to 43 belief items. It has not been possible to present all test results in the conventional tabular format because of the large number of hypotheses tested. The analysis of data relating to each teacher characteristic is accompanied by a summary of tested hypotheses. Overall, most of the null hypotheses were accepted. The results of the few examples of null hypotheses that were rejected are presented in tabular form within the context of the teacher characteristic under scrutiny. The alpha level for the rejection of each null hypotheses was set at the .05 level of confidence.
Table 7.4  Age of teacher and (43) held beliefs: summary of results of hypotheses (n=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>1.1.23</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>1.1.24</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.631</td>
<td>1.1.25</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.4</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.463</td>
<td>1.1.26</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.5</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.682</td>
<td>1.1.27</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.6</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.607</td>
<td>1.1.28</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.7</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>1.1.29</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.8</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.360</td>
<td>1.1.30</td>
<td>8.89</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.9</td>
<td>21.19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.1.31</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.10</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.886</td>
<td>1.1.32</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.11</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>1.1.33</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.12</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>1.1.34</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>SCS ------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.13</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.376</td>
<td>1.1.35</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.14</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>1.1.36</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.15</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>1.1.37</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.16</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>SCS ------</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.38</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.17</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>SCS ------</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.39</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.18</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.973</td>
<td>1.1.40</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.19</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td>1.1.41</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.20</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td>1.1.42</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.21</td>
<td>11.68</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>1.1.43</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.22</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY**

SCS = cell sizes too small for chi square purposes

* = significant $X^2$ value

**N.B.**  Hypotheses are numbered according to placement of belief item on Teacher Opinionnaire (Appendix 3)
2.1 Hypothesis 1.1

Hypothesis 1.1 (1.1 to 1.1.43) stated that there was no significant difference in respect of (43) held beliefs among teachers who were grouped according to age. The 43 hypotheses derived from the 43 separate beliefs were tested with data derived from teacher responses (n=235) to the Opinionnaire. Inspection of Table 7.4 shows that 38 out of 43 null hypotheses were accepted. Hypotheses 1.1.16, 1.1.17 and 1.1.34 were not tested because cell sizes of observed frequencies were considered inadequate for chi square purposes.

Out of the 43 hypotheses only hypotheses 1.1.9 and 1.1.21 were rejected.

Hypothesis 1.1.9 (subsumed under H01.1) asserted that there was no significant difference in respect of held beliefs about the need to be submissive to superiors among teachers who were grouped according to age. The frequency distribution of teachers according to age group and beliefs about submissiveness is reported in Table 7.5. A significant x^2 value of 21.19 was recorded and so hypothesis 1.1.9 was rejected.
Table 7.5 Age of teacher: frequency distribution according to beliefs about the need to be submissive toward superiors (n = 235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief in Need for Submissiveness</th>
<th>20 - 30 years</th>
<th>31 - 40 years</th>
<th>41 years or more</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot say</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 21.19; \ df = 4; \ p<.000$

Hypothesis 1.1.21 (subsumed under $H^0 1.1$) stated that there was no significant difference in respect of held beliefs about pupil control among teachers who were grouped according to age. The frequency distribution of teachers according to age group and beliefs about pupil control is reported in Table 7.6. A significant $x^2$ value was reported and so hypothesis 1.1.21 was rejected.
Table 7.6 Age of teacher: frequency distribution according to beliefs about the need for pupils to be kept quiet (n=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keep Pupils Quiet</th>
<th>20 - 30 years</th>
<th>31 - 40 years</th>
<th>41 years or more</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot say</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 11.68; \ df = 4; \ p < .01$

2.1.1 Discussion

Inspection of Table 7.5 shows that there is a significant relationship between teacher beliefs about the need to avoid arguments with superiors and the age group of teachers. Approximately 69% of 31 to 40 year old teachers reject the need for submissiveness while only 17% of younger teachers and 32% of older teachers share this stance. Table 7.6 indicates that there is also a significant association between teacher beliefs about the need to ensure pupil silence and the age of teachers. About 70% of 31 to 40 year old teachers indicated that keeping pupils quiet in class was not a high priority; 60% of older and 60% of younger teachers also took this stance. A greater percentage of teachers in the oldest age group believed, more so than their younger colleagues, that keeping pupils quiet in class should be a high priority.
Overall, it could well be that the intermediate teacher age group (31 to 40 years) have slightly greater confidence than other staff in matters of teacher submissiveness and pupil control.
Table 7.7  Sex of teacher and (43) held beliefs: summary of results of hypotheses testing (n=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ho</th>
<th>X²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Ho</th>
<th>X²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.468</td>
<td>1.2.23</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>SCS-----</td>
<td>1.2.24</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>1.2.25</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>SCS-----</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.4</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.605</td>
<td>1.2.26</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>SCS-----</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.5</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>1.2.27</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>SCS-----</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.6</td>
<td>8.59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.013*</td>
<td>1.2.28</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.7</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>1.2.29</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.8</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td>1.2.30</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.9</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>1.2.31</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.10</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>1.2.32</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.11</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.736</td>
<td>1.2.33</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>SCS-----</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.12</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.948</td>
<td>1.2.34</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.13</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>1.2.35</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.14</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>1.2.36</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.15</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>1.2.37</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.16</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td>1.2.38</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.17</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.520</td>
<td>1.2.39</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.18</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>1.2.40</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.19</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>1.2.41</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.20</td>
<td>13.42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.001*</td>
<td>1.2.42</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.21</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.949</td>
<td>1.2.43</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.22</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY

SCS = cell sizes too small for chi square purposes

* = significant X² value

N.B. Hypotheses are numbered according to placement of belief item on Teacher Opinionnaire (Appendix 3)
2.2 **Hypothesis 1.2**

Hypothesis 1.2 (1.2.1 to 1.2.43) asserted that there would be no significant difference in respect of (43) held beliefs among teachers who were grouped according to sex. Table 7.7 shows that 37 out of 43 null hypotheses were accepted. Hypotheses 1.2.2, 1.2.25, 1.2.27 and 1.2.33 were not tested because cell sizes of observed frequencies were considered inadequate for chi square purposes. Hypotheses 1.2.6 and 1.2.20 were the only hypotheses rejected.

Hypothesis 1.2.6 (subsumed under $H^0_{1.2}$) asserted that there was no significant difference in respect of held beliefs about directing the work of other people among teachers who were grouped according to sex. The frequency distribution of teachers according to sex and beliefs about direction is reported in Table 7.8. A significant $x^2$ value of 8.59 was recorded and so hypothesis 1.2.6 was rejected.
Table 7.8  Sex of teacher: frequency distribution according to beliefs about direction (n=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I like directing the work of others</th>
<th>Female Teachers</th>
<th>Male Teachers</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot say</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>164</strong></td>
<td><strong>71</strong></td>
<td><strong>235</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\chi^2 = 8.59; \ df = 2; \ p < .01\]

Hypothesis 1.2.20 (subsumed under \(H^01.2\)) stated that there was no significant difference in respect of held beliefs about the effectiveness of spontaneous teaching strategies among teachers who were grouped according to sex. The frequency distribution of teachers according to sex and beliefs about spontaneous teaching strategies is reported in Table 7.9. A significant \(\chi^2\) value of 13.42 was reported and so hypothesis 1.2.20 was rejected.
Table 7.9 Sex of teacher: frequency distribution according to beliefs about flexibility (n=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spontaneous teaching has value</th>
<th>Female Teachers</th>
<th>Male Teachers</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot say</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 13.42; \text{ df } = 2; \text{ p}<.001 \]

2.2.1 Discussion

Male and female teachers appear to differ only in respect of two belief stances. Firstly, most male teachers liked directing the work of 'other people' while the majority of female staff did not. This difference is reflected in the overall climate of teacher opinion. Although the term 'other people' may appear somewhat ambiguous, the teacher sample were asked to respond to all belief statements in the context of classroom and school.
Therefore, it is feasible that the teacher sample will equate 'other people' with 'pupils'. In any event, teachers are likely to manifest their role perceptions in accord with their own personality needs. Thus, teachers who believe that they enjoy directing the work of 'other people' are more likely to pursue this stance in the classroom than colleagues who dislike directing others.

It is pertinent to note also that most male teachers preferred to do theatre, a dramatic mode which is synonymous with 'direction'. Moreover, more female than male teachers opted to use child drama where, theoretically at least, pupils may be responsible for directing their own work. It may be that the drama choices of teachers are related to their relative liking for direction in the classroom.

Secondly, a greater percentage of female teachers believed that spontaneous teaching is just as likely to achieve desired results as set plans. In this context, female teachers would appear to be more flexible than their male colleagues in terms of departing from set plans where appropriate.
Table 7.10  Type of teacher training and held beliefs: summary of results of hypotheses testing (n=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H°</th>
<th>x²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>H°</th>
<th>x²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>1.3.23</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.2</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>1.3.24</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.3</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.899</td>
<td>1.3.25</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.4</td>
<td>11.53</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>1.3.26</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.5</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.653</td>
<td>1.3.27</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.6</td>
<td>-----SCS--------</td>
<td>1.3.28</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.7</td>
<td>11.41</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>1.3.29</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.8</td>
<td>9.02</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>1.3.30</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.9</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>1.3.31</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.10</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>1.3.32</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.11</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>1.3.33</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.12</td>
<td>10.48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>1.3.34</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.13</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.919</td>
<td>1.3.35</td>
<td>10.04</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.14</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.464</td>
<td>1.3.36</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.15</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>1.3.37</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.16</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.395</td>
<td>1.3.38</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.17</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.644</td>
<td>1.3.39</td>
<td>-----SCS------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.18</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.589</td>
<td>1.3.40</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.19</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>1.3.41</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.20</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.469</td>
<td>1.3.42</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.21</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.737</td>
<td>1.3.43</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.22</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.422</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY**

SCS = cell sizes too small for chi square purposes
* = significant x² value

**N.B.**  Hypotheses are numbered according to placement of belief item on Teacher Opinionnaire (Appendix 3)
2.3 Hypothesis 1.3

Hypothesis 1.3 (1.3.1 to 1.3.43) stated that there would be no significant difference in respect of (43) held beliefs among teachers who were grouped according to type of teacher training. Table 7.10 shows that 41 out of 43 null hypotheses were accepted. Hypotheses 1.3.6 and 1.3.39 were not tested due to inadequate cell sizes of observed frequencies.

2.3.1 Discussion

No significant differences in respect of held beliefs were found among teachers who were categorised according to the kind of training they had experienced, that is, infant, infant-primary or primary. It may be that differences between one kind of teacher training and another are too small to have any impact on the belief systems of teachers. For many teachers the influence of basic training on belief systems may well diminish in the light of on-going classroom experiences. Either way the type of teacher training which teachers undergo does not appear to differentiate teachers according to held beliefs.
Table 7.11 Length of teacher training and held beliefs: summary of results of hypotheses testing (n=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ho</th>
<th>x²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Ho</th>
<th>x²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.4.1</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>SCS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4.23</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>SCS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.2</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.502</td>
<td>1.4.24</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.3</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.990</td>
<td>1.4.25</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.4</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.528</td>
<td>1.4.26</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.5</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.612</td>
<td>1.4.27</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.6</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.470</td>
<td>1.4.28</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.7</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>1.4.29</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.8</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.663</td>
<td>1.4.30</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.9</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>SCS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4.31</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.10</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>SCS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4.32</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.11</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.428</td>
<td>1.4.33</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.12</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>1.4.34</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.13</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>1.4.35</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.14</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>1.4.36</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.15</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.939</td>
<td>1.4.37</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.16</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>SCS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4.38</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>SCS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.17</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>1.4.39</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.18</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>1.4.40</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.19</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>SCS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4.41</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.20</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.609</td>
<td>1.4.42</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.21</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>1.4.43</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.22</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY

SCS = cell sizes too small for chi square purposes
* = significant x² value
N.B. Hypotheses are numbered according to placement of belief item on Teacher Opinionnaire (Appendix 3)
2.4 Hypothesis 1.4

Hypothesis 1.4 (1.4.1 to 1.4.43) asserted that there would be no significant difference in respect of (43) held beliefs among teachers who were grouped according to the length of initial teacher training. Inspection of Table 7.11 indicates that 36 out of 43 null hypotheses were accepted. Hypotheses 1.4.1, 1.4.9, 1.4.10, 1.4.16, 1.4.23 and 1.4.38 were not tested due to inadequate cell sizes for chi square purposes.

2.4.1 Discussion

The finding that teacher beliefs did not significantly differ according to length of teacher training (2, 3 or 4 years) serves to reinforce the overall point made in the previous discussion that the influence of teacher training per se upon held beliefs may be small.
Table 7.12 Length of teacher experience and held beliefs: summary of results of hypotheses testing (n=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H°</th>
<th>x²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>H°</th>
<th>x²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.5.1</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>1.5.23</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>SCS</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.2</td>
<td>13.57</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>1.5.24</td>
<td>10.54</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.3</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.487</td>
<td>1.5.25</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.4</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.949</td>
<td>1.5.26</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.5</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>1.5.27</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>SCS</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.6</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.902</td>
<td>1.5.28</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.7</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.789</td>
<td>1.5.29</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.8</td>
<td>11.07</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>1.5.30</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>SCS</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.9</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>SCS</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>1.5.31</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.10</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.568</td>
<td>1.5.32</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.11</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.520</td>
<td>1.5.33</td>
<td>9.54</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.12</td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td>1.5.34</td>
<td>8.23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.13</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.716</td>
<td>1.5.35</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.14</td>
<td>10.14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>1.5.36</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.15</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.965</td>
<td>1.5.37</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.16</td>
<td>14.16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>1.5.38</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.17</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>1.5.39</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>SCS</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.18</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td>1.5.40</td>
<td>9.57</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.19</td>
<td>12.80</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>1.5.41</td>
<td>14.37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.20</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.713</td>
<td>1.5.42</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.21</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>SCS</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>1.5.43</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.22</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.873</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY**

SCS = cell sizes too small for chi square purposes

* = significant x² value

N.B. Hypotheses are numbered according to placement of belief item on Teacher Opinionnaire (Appendix 3)
2.5 **Hypothesis 1.5**

Hypothesis 1.5 (1.5.1 to 1.5.43) stated that there was no significant difference in respect of (43) held beliefs among teachers who were grouped according to length of full time teaching experience. Table 7.12 shows that 37 out of 43 null hypotheses were accepted. Hypotheses 1.5.8, 1.5.21, 1.5.23, 1.5.27, 1.5.30 and 1.5.39 were not tested due to inadequate cell sizes for chi square purposes.

2.5.1 **Discussion**

No significant differences in respect of held beliefs were found among teachers who were categorised according to length of teaching experience. It is likely that teachers with most experience will influence the beliefs (and subsequent practices) of teachers with least experience.* This may be particularly so since the former will no doubt occupy positions of seniority in schools which readily lend themselves to the transmission of school based, collective values. Thus in respect of length of teaching experience many beliefs may be shared, as exemplified by the present finding.

* See for instance the work of Coulter (1971) who found that the values of beginning teachers in the secondary school were influenced by more experienced colleagues.
Table 7.13 Grade taught and teacher beliefs: summary of results of hypotheses testing (n=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H0</th>
<th>X²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>H0</th>
<th>X²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.6.1</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>1.6.2</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.2</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>1.6.3</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.3</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>1.6.4</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.4</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.805</td>
<td>1.6.5</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCS~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.5</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCS~</td>
<td>1.6.6</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.6</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>1.6.7</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.7</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>1.6.8</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.8</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.931</td>
<td>1.6.9</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.9</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.616</td>
<td>1.6.10</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.10</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>1.6.11</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.11</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>1.6.12</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.12</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>1.6.13</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.13</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.384</td>
<td>1.6.14</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.14</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.949</td>
<td>1.6.15</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.15</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.597</td>
<td>1.6.16</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.16</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>1.6.17</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.17</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>1.6.18</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.18</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.461</td>
<td>1.6.19</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.19</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.933</td>
<td>1.6.20</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.20</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>1.6.21</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.21</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.892</td>
<td>1.6.22</td>
<td>9.62</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.047*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY

SCS = cell sizes too small for chi square purposes
* = significant x² value

N.B. Hypotheses are numbered according to placement of belief item on Teacher Opinionnaire (Appendix 3)
2.6 Hypothesis 1.6

Hypothesis 1.6 (1.6.1 to 1.6.43) asserted that there would be no significant difference in respect of (43) held beliefs among teachers who were grouped according to the grade/class of pupils taught. Table 7.13 shows that 41 out of 43 null hypotheses were accepted. Hypothesis 1.6.5 was not tested because observed frequencies in two cells were inadequate for chi square purposes.

Only hypothesis 1.6.22 was not accepted. Hypothesis 1.6.22 (subsumed under $H^01.6$) asserted that there was no significant difference in respect of held beliefs about the likely behaviour of pupils when confronted with novel learning situations among teachers who were grouped according to grade/class of pupils taught. The frequency distribution of teachers according to grade taught and beliefs about likely pupil behaviour is reported in Table 7.14. A significant $x^2$ value of 9.62 was reported and so hypothesis 1.6.22 was rejected.
Table 7.14 Grade of pupil taught: frequency distribution according to beliefs about the likely behaviour of pupils (n=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pupils tend to behave well</th>
<th>Lower Primary</th>
<th>Middle Primary</th>
<th>Upper Primary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot say</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² = 9.62; df = 4; p<.04

2.6.1 Discussion

Approximately 81% of lower primary teachers believed that pupils tend to behave well when faced with novel learning situations while only 65% of upper primary teachers and 53% of middle primary teachers shared this view. It appears that teachers of younger pupils held more positive expectations for self-discipline than colleagues with older pupils.
Table 7.15 Size of school and teacher beliefs: summary of results of hypotheses testing (n=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HO</th>
<th>x²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>HO</th>
<th>x²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.7.1</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.812</td>
<td>1.7.23</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7.2</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>1.7.24</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7.3</td>
<td>------SCS-----</td>
<td>1.7.25</td>
<td>------SCS-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7.4</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.841</td>
<td>1.7.26</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7.5</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td>1.7.27</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7.6</td>
<td>10.93</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>1.7.28</td>
<td>9.01</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7.7</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>1.7.29</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7.8</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>1.7.30</td>
<td>10.29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7.9</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td>1.7.31</td>
<td>9.32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7.10</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>1.7.32</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7.11</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.870</td>
<td>1.7.33</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7.12</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>1.7.34</td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7.13</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>1.7.35</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7.14</td>
<td>------SCS-----</td>
<td>1.7.36</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7.15</td>
<td>------SCS-----</td>
<td>1.7.37</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7.16</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>1.7.38</td>
<td>------SCS-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7.17</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>1.7.39</td>
<td>9.84</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7.18</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>1.7.40</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7.19</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>1.7.41</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7.20</td>
<td>10.27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>1.7.42</td>
<td>------SCS-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7.21</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>1.7.43</td>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY

SCS = cell sizes too small for chi square purposes

N.B. Hypotheses are numbered according to placement of belief item on Teacher Opinionnaire (Appendix 3)
2.7 **Hypothesis 1.7**

Hypothesis 1.7 (1.7.1 to 1.7.43) asserted that there would be no significant difference in respect of (43) held beliefs among teachers who were grouped according to the size of school in which they were based. Inspection of Table 7.15 indicates that 36 out of 43 null hypotheses (1.7.1 to 1.7.43) were accepted. Hypotheses 1.7.3, 1.7.14, 1.7.15, 1.7.22, 1.7.25, 1.7.38 and 1.7.42 were not tested due to inadequate cell sizes of observed frequencies.

### 2.7.1 Discussion

The finding that teacher beliefs did not significantly differ among teachers who were grouped according to size of school suggests the existence of a corporate set of teacher beliefs which is likely to influence all individual teachers regardless of school size. In large and medium-sized schools the influence of a common body of beliefs is likely to be reinforced at both a formal and an informal level. In small schools (often containing only one or two teachers) the same process of influence on teacher beliefs may operate via area meetings and other professional contacts.
Table 7.16  Rural-urban teachers and teacher beliefs:
summary of results of hypotheses testing (n=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H0</th>
<th>x^2</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>H0</th>
<th>x^2</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.8.1</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>1.8.23</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8.2</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>1.8.24</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8.3</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>1.8.25</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8.4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>1.8.26</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8.5</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.618</td>
<td>1.8.27</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8.6</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>1.8.28</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8.7</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>1.8.29</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8.8</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>1.8.30</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8.9</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>1.8.31</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8.10</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>1.8.32</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8.11</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>1.8.33</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8.12</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.847</td>
<td>1.8.34</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8.13</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.896</td>
<td>1.8.35</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8.14</td>
<td>11.36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.003*</td>
<td>1.8.36</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8.15</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>1.8.37</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8.16</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>1.8.38</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8.17</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>1.8.39</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8.18</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td>1.8.40</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8.19</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td>1.8.41</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8.20</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>1.8.42</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.039*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8.21</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.575</td>
<td>1.8.43</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.037*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8.22</td>
<td>14.22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY

SCS = cell sizes too small for chi square purposes
* = significant x^2 value

N.B.  Hypotheses are numbered according to placement of belief item on Teacher Opinionnaire (Appendix 3)
2.8 Hypothesis 1.8

Hypothesis 1.8 (1.8.1 to 1.8.43) asserted that there would be no significant difference in respect of (43) held beliefs among teachers who were grouped according to the type of catchment area (rural or urban) of the school at which they were based. Table 7.16 shows that 37 out of 43 null hypotheses were accepted. Hypotheses 1.8.14, 1.8.15, 1.8.22, 1.8.30, 1.8.42 and 1.8.43 were rejected; the testing of these hypotheses are given in more detail below.

Hypothesis 1.8.14 (subsumed under H^01.8) stated that there was no significant difference in respect of held beliefs about the need to direct most learning activities among teachers who were grouped according to the type of catchment area of the school. The frequency distribution of teachers according to rural-urban catchment area and beliefs about direction is reported in Table 7.17. A significant $\chi^2$ value of 11.36 was reported and so hypothesis 1.8.14 was rejected.
Table 7.17 Rural-urban teachers: frequency distribution according to beliefs about direction (n=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need to direct most learning</th>
<th>Rural Teachers</th>
<th>Urban Teachers</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot say</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 11.36; \ df = 2; \ p<.003$

Hypothesis 1.8.15 (subsumed under $H_0^{1.8}$) stated that there was no significant difference in respect of held beliefs about the tolerance of pupils' ideas among teachers who were grouped according to the type of catchment area of the school. The frequency distribution of teachers according to rural-urban catchment area and beliefs about the tolerance of pupils' ideas is reported in Table 7.18. A significant $x^2$ value of 14.00 was recorded and so hypothesis 1.8.15 was rejected.
Table 7.18 Rural-urban teachers: frequency distribution according to beliefs about the use of pupil ideas (n=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All pupils' ideas should be tolerated</th>
<th>Rural Teachers</th>
<th>Urban Teachers</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot say</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>84</strong></td>
<td><strong>151</strong></td>
<td><strong>235</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 14.00; \text{ df } = 2; \ p < .000 \]

Hypothesis 1.8.22 (subsumed under \( H^01.8 \)) asserted that there was no significant difference in respect of held beliefs about the likely behaviour of pupils when confronted with novel learning situations among teachers who were grouped according to the type of catchment area of the school. The frequency distribution of teachers according to rural-urban catchment area and beliefs about the likely behaviour of pupils is reported in Table 7.19. A significant \( \chi^2 \) value of 14.22 was reported and so hypothesis 1.8.22 was rejected.
Table 7.19  Rural-urban teachers: frequency distribution according to beliefs about the likely behaviour of pupils (n=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pupils tend to behave well</th>
<th>Rural Teachers</th>
<th>Urban Teachers</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot say</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>84</strong></td>
<td><strong>151</strong></td>
<td><strong>235</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 14.22; \text{ df } = 2; \text{ p}<.000 \]

Hypothesis 1.8.30 (subsumed under \( H^01.8 \)) stated that there was no significant difference in respect of held beliefs about drama as a means of intrinsic learning motivation among teachers who were grouped according to the type of catchment area of the school. The frequency distribution of teachers according to rural-urban catchment area and beliefs about drama as an intrinsic learning motivator is reported in Table 7.20. A significant \( x^2 \) value of 12.33 was reported so hypothesis 1.8.30 was rejected.
Table 7.20  Rural-urban teachers: frequency distribution according to beliefs about drama as a learning motivator (n=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drama is a valuable intrinsic learning motivator</th>
<th>Rural Teachers</th>
<th>Urban Teachers</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot say</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 12.33; \ df = 2; \ p<.002$

Hypothesis 1.8.42 (subsumed under H^01.8) stated that there was no significant difference in respect of held beliefs about drama as a stimulus for pupil self discipline among teachers who were grouped according to the type of catchment area of the school. The frequency distribution of teachers according to rural-urban catchment area and beliefs about drama and self-discipline of pupils is reported in Table 7.21. A significant $\chi^2$ value of 6.48 was reported so hypothesis 1.8.42 was rejected.
Table 7.21  Rural-urban teachers: frequency distribution according to beliefs about drama as a means of practicing self-discipline (n=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drama is a chance for all pupils to practice self-discipline</th>
<th>Rural Teachers</th>
<th>Urban Teachers</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot say</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>84</strong></td>
<td><strong>151</strong></td>
<td><strong>235</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 6.48; \ df = 2; \ p < .03$

Hypothesis 1.8.43 (subsumed under $H^01.8$) stated that there was no significant difference in respect of held beliefs about drama as a facilitator of pupil mobility among teachers who were grouped according to the type of catchment area of the school. The frequency distribution of teachers according to rural-urban catchment area and beliefs about drama as a facilitator of pupil mobility is reported in Table 7.22. A significant $x^2$ value of 6.59 was reported so hypothesis 1.8.43 was rejected.
Table 7.22  Rural-urban teachers: frequency distribution according to beliefs about drama as a facilitator of pupil mobility (n=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drama facilitates pupil mobility</th>
<th>Rural Teachers</th>
<th>Urban Teachers</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot say</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 6.59; \ df = 2; \ p<.03 \]

2.8.1 Discussion

Six differences of belief found between teachers who worked in rural and those who worked in urban schools, accounted for most group variation among respondents.

A greater percentage of urban teachers, more so than their rural colleagues, believed that pupils are capable of self-discipline when faced with novel learning situations; that drama is a means by which pupils may exercise self-discipline; that drama is a welcome way for pupils to be mobile in the classroom; that drama is promotive of learning motivation in pupils; and that teachers should tolerate pupil ideas even if they differ from their own.

Moreover, most rural teachers believed that teachers should direct most learning activities because they know more than the child. Conversely, most urban teachers did not believe that the majority of learning should be teacher directed.
It is seen that the belief differences of rural and urban teachers are concerned with the basic nature of pupils, i.e., their abilities for self-discipline and intrinsic learning motivation, and the extent to which teacher direction is deemed necessary. On these matters, urban teachers appear to hold less conservative views about pupils than their rural colleagues.
Table 7.23 Choice of drama option and teacher beliefs: summary of results of hypotheses testing (n=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$H^0$</th>
<th>$x^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>$H^0$</th>
<th>$x^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.9.1</td>
<td>15.35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>1.9.23</td>
<td>10.80</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9.2</td>
<td>15.60</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td>1.9.24</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>SCS</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9.3</td>
<td>14.67</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td>1.9.25</td>
<td>16.44</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9.4</td>
<td>11.65</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.633</td>
<td>1.9.26</td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9.5</td>
<td>18.81</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>1.9.27</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9.6</td>
<td>8.51</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.861</td>
<td>1.9.28</td>
<td>8.62</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9.7</td>
<td>12.87</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>1.9.29</td>
<td>9.88</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9.8</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.962</td>
<td>1.9.30</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>SCS</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9.9</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.914</td>
<td>1.9.31</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>SCS</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9.10</td>
<td>10.16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.750</td>
<td>1.9.32</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9.11</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>SCS</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>1.9.33</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>SCS</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9.12</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.473</td>
<td>1.9.34</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>SCS</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9.13</td>
<td>14.20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.434</td>
<td>1.9.35</td>
<td>19.02</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9.14</td>
<td>19.35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>1.9.36</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>SCS</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9.15</td>
<td>21.06</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>1.9.37</td>
<td>9.27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9.16</td>
<td>12.86</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.537</td>
<td>1.9.38</td>
<td>15.53</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9.18</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>SCS</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>1.9.40</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>SCS</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9.19</td>
<td>15.63</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>1.9.41</td>
<td>17.45</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9.20</td>
<td>22.47</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>1.9.42</td>
<td>21.75</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9.21</td>
<td>14.62</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td>1.9.43</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>SCS</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9.22</td>
<td>16.57</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY**

SCS = cell sizes too small for chi square purposes

N.B. Hypotheses are numbered according to placement of belief item on Teacher Opinionnaire (Appendix 3)
2.9 Hypothesis 1.9

Hypothesis 1.9 (1.9.1 to 1.9.43) asserted that there would be no significant difference in respect of (43) held beliefs among teachers who were grouped according to choice of drama option. Table 7.23 shows that 33 out of 43 null hypotheses were accepted. Hypotheses 1.9.11, 1.9.18, 1.9.24, 1.9.30, 1.9.31, 1.9.33, 1.9.34, 1.9.36, 1.9.40, and 1.9.43 were not tested due to inadequate cell sizes for chi square purposes.

2.9.1 Discussion

Given the views of many theorists, regarding different approaches to drama, it is surprising that teachers grouped according to their drama choices failed to differ on any of the belief items. Implicit within much of the drama literature is the notion that drama options such as theatre and child improvisation are derived from polarised viewpoints regarding the respective roles of teacher and learner. Child improvisation is deemed to be based on child-centred views of the teacher and pupils. Therefore, it is interesting to observe that these potential differences of belief did not eventuate.
3. A SUMMARY OF FINDINGS RELATING TO THE TEACHER BELIEF CLIMATE

It is evident from the findings reported here that most teacher beliefs, constituting the Climate of Opinion, were not ordered along a Flexist (open) - Fixist (closed) dimension of dispositions. Instead we found a high consensus of teacher opinion on four-fifths of all Opinionnaire items. This finding serves to indicate the presence of one major, aggregated set of teacher beliefs, rendering a common view of the teacher's 'professional self'. This view of 'professional self' was seen to prevail across most personal and environmental characteristics of teachers. It is the shared beliefs of teachers which are likely to provide a reference point in classrooms and schools when decisions about what teachers 'should' be doing come to be made. Even if this agreed set of beliefs is not put into practice, it is likely to hold consequences for most, if not all, teacher activity - and subsequently influence the educational outcomes of pupils.

On the face of it, the Climate of Teacher Opinion would appear to possess a number of characteristics usually associated with child-centred educational ideologies. For instance, teachers believed that they should not be formal in their dealings with children; that educational aims should not be limited to cognitive aspects of the curriculum; that the use of pupil ideas should be openly
welcomed; and, that integrated learning practices have merit. However, it was also noted that the teacher sample believed that pupils prefer dependence upon the teacher to autonomy; sought a high degree of content orientation (syllabus-boundness); desired to plan work in great detail; and liked to predetermine educational goals and purposes well in advance. It would appear from these beliefs that teachers are more inclined towards a pragmatic, rather than a child-centred or teacher-centred, Climate of Opinion. As a consequence, it may well be that pupil ideas are only tolerated to the extent that they are in harmony with the teacher's declared goals of work content.

In reference to colleague support, the finding that many beliefs were shared by teachers would seem to suggest a potential degree of mutual supportiveness among teachers. Moreover, it is likely that the collective profile of teacher beliefs will be advanced and reinforced by teachers at both a formal and informal level.

In respect of low consensus beliefs among teachers, respondents are seen to differ on one fifth of Opinionnaire items. These items concerned the use of pupil competition as a means of extrinsic learning motivation; the use of teacher direction; the reliance upon self for opinions and ideas; adherence to the school timetable; and, the teacher's need to be submissive to the authority of superordinates. These particular differences are seen to underlie varied
perceptions about the role of the teacher as a director, a source of ideas, and an autonomous being who may or may not keep to the school timetable. Teachers also differed regarding pupils and the need for extrinsic learning motivation. Moreover, these differences may be based upon particular teacher-role needs within specific pupil, principal, inspector contexts.

As with high consensus beliefs, low consensus beliefs may also have a strong influence upon teacher behaviour and the outcomes of pupils. The mere fact that teachers vary in certain beliefs is not necessarily related to the importance or unimportance of those beliefs in the scheme of things. Thus teachers who hold particular beliefs about direction and the nature of pupils are likely to behave in a different way and engender different ends, from colleagues who hold other dispositions regarding these matters. These differences can be important.

Overall, the degree of teacher consensus on beliefs about drama ranged between 74% and 94% across all drama items. It becomes clear, in principle at least, that drama may be seen by many teachers as an acceptable part of the school curriculum. This is not to suggest that teachers will necessarily put their beliefs into practice, but rather they are potentially accepting of its use. This observation is supported by the degree of apparent 'fit' between teacher beliefs about teaching and allied beliefs about drama. Some examples of belief 'fit' are:
(1) 91% of teachers believed that they should have set targets of work content which they strive to complete in a year. Allied to this view is the common belief that drama has sufficient content (93% of sample) and enough structure (92% of sample) to warrant its inclusion in the work content of the classroom.

(2) 83% of teachers believed in the value of integrated approaches to learning, while 84% of the sample believed that drama is an ideal way of stimulating these strategies.

(3) 75% of teachers believed that pupil ideas should always be tolerated and 92% of the sample thought that drama was a good opportunity for pupils to use their own ideas.

The findings suggest that drama may be accepted by teachers due to its apparent compatibility with other high consensus beliefs. Where consensus on teacher beliefs is low, but views about drama are shared by others, there may be consequences for both drama doing and the teacher's ability to be consistent between beliefs and action. Drama is not usually a compulsory feature of the school timetable and so teachers are generally free to pursue its use in any way they see fit. Teachers who hold the belief that
competition between pupils leads to higher standards of learning might well operate drama in a different way, and achieve different ends, from colleagues who do not share this view. Thus, even though a belief is not shared by other teachers, the fact that teachers hold the belief may give rise to specific teacher behaviour likely to influence the educational outcomes of pupils.

Given the overall pragmatic nature of the Teacher Belief Climate, and positive attitudes towards drama per se, one might be forgiven for thinking that drama is a settled issue on the school timetable. However, a number of findings, when taken together, suggest that drama remains a matter of contention among teachers.

4. THE TEACHER BELIEF CLIMATE: ISSUES WHICH GAVE IMPETUS TO THE PRESENT WORK

Even though teachers were seen to share common views about the uses and benefits of drama, it is notable that these views were expressed with specific kinds of drama in mind. On the Opinionnaire teachers indicated those drama options which they professed doing.

Results of the drama option survey, discussed more fully in Chapter Eight, Section 1, show that teachers were far less united on their drama choices than they had been on beliefs about drama per se. So, although teachers as a group agreed on the value of drama, they disagreed on the
particular means that should be employed to meet their beliefs and achieve desired pupil outcomes. Teachers chose the following types of drama - in rank order:

1. Role play - selected by 26% of the teacher sample
2. Theatre - selected by 22% of the teacher sample
3. Child drama - selected by 21% of the teacher sample
4. Mime - selected by 16% of the teacher sample
5. Drama games - selected by 15% of the teacher sample

From a theoretical standpoint, different drama options demand specific kinds of organisational strategies and are based on particular views of teacher and pupil roles respectively. Yet, when beliefs are examined in the light of teacher drama choices, it is seen that the sample do not differ on any of the belief items.

One reason for this lack of differentiation among the sample might be that teachers exhibit a lack of discernment when they come to select a kind of drama which is compatible with their beliefs about drama or teaching. At this point, it is reasonable to assume that some drama options are going to be more in line with teacher beliefs than others. For example, 92% of teachers believed that drama per se provided a chance for pupils to use their own ideas. It is likely that this chance may be more facilitated by child drama than theatre, since the latter is often based on adult scripts and adult production. There may well be exceptions to this common notion. Teachers may modify or distort their chosen
drama option so that the result may be an increase or decrease in the use of pupil ideas. Nevertheless, it may be seen that regardless of any modifications, some drama options may lend themselves more effectively to the use of pupil ideas than others.

In terms of teacher beliefs and drama 'compatibility', some teachers may feel it more important to espouse the shared view of teacher role than to be 'successful' at doing drama. For instance, given that most teachers believed that they should have set work targets and achieve a set work quota, it follows that drama may have been selected on the basis of content 'fit'. In this instance it may be more pragmatic to employ set drama games as part of a prescribed theme than it is to operate child drama derived solely from pupil ideas.

A fundamental observation is that teachers are likely to choose the kind of drama they do because they 'believe' that it is capable of providing the means to achieve desired pupil ends. Alternatively, they may choose a drama option they find possible to operate in the light of other held beliefs about, e.g. pupils and colleagues. Either way, it is likely that some drama options may prove more viable than others in meeting teacher beliefs and pupil outcomes.

Thus, given the high level of teacher consensus on many beliefs, and the allied differences on drama choices, it was decided to investigate the viability of drama options in
achieving teacher intentions. Moreover, it was also necessary to check on the extent to which teachers behaved in accord with their professed beliefs. It was thought that pupil outcome differences, if any, might be explained in terms of both drama choices and the belief-behaviour consistency of teachers. It was further thought that a teacher's ability to be consistent between held beliefs and behaviour might be more relevant for some kinds of drama than others.

In overall terms the Climate of Teacher Opinion consisted of predominantly shared beliefs which included favourable attitudes towards the use of drama in schools. Furthermore, although teachers agreed upon the value of 'drama', they professed to using different drama options to achieve intended pupil outcomes. What happens to pupil outcomes when different drama options are employed in order to achieve the same ends?

The following chapter aims to answer this and other questions relating to the drama choices of teachers and pupil outcomes.
CHAPTER EIGHT
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CHAPTER EIGHT

ANALYSIS OF DATA RELATING TO DRAMA CHOICES
OF TEACHERS AND PUPIL OUTCOMES

INTRODUCTION

This chapter has two main aims. The first is to test hypotheses relating to actual and ideal drama choices of the teacher sample (n=235). It is necessary to identify the extent to which teachers believed that they were able to pursue their preferred drama choices.

Chi square was used as an appropriate measure of association between actual and ideal drama choices of teachers. An examination is made of the actual and ideal drama choices of the total sample (n=235); this is followed by an analysis of drama choices in relation to teacher characteristics. These characteristics of teachers are age, sex, type of training, length of teacher training, length of teacher experience, grade of pupils taught, size of school and catchment area of school. Rather than examine each teacher characteristic per se (e.g. sex of teacher), separate facets of teacher characteristics are examined in relation to actual and ideal drama choices of teachers (e.g. males and females). This procedure enables an analysis to be made of each teacher facet in relation to the overall trend of drama choices of the total teacher sample.
The second aim of the chapter is to test hypotheses in relation to drama choices and pupil outcomes. Findings derived from an analysis of the Teacher Belief Climate suggested that most of the teacher sample accepted 'drama' as a viable feature of the primary school curriculum. However, the term 'drama' is open to a wide variety of interpretations on the part of teachers and theorists alike. Thus the word 'drama' may be used in reference to role playing, theatre, or any other kind of dramatic activity. Given the overall opinion of teachers that 'drama works', we need to show which kinds of drama 'work' and with what ends in mind. There is an abundance of literature concerning the kind(s) of drama that teachers 'should' be doing in schools. Most writers appear to agree with the recommendations of the Plowden Report (1967) namely, that plays with an audience (theatre) have no place in the primary school. Nevertheless, about 1 in 5 of the present teacher sample believed that the use of theatre can promote desired ends. For a variety of reasons, some of which are proffered in Chapter Two, there has been very little empirical evidence to support or refute beliefs regarding the viability of different drama options. It has been noted in the present sub-sample of teachers (n=16) that all shared common drama aims, but used different means by which these purposes might be achieved, that is, dramatic play, theatre
and drama exercise. There is a need to determine how viable each drama option is in serving to promote significant pupil gains on selected educational outcomes (verbal creativity, figural creativity, empathy, self-esteem and academic self-image) between Time A and Time B - a period of 9 weeks.

Explanations of findings relating to drama choices and pupil outcomes are facilitated by data derived from the Drama Inventory; this instrument was used to observe teacher-pupil behaviour in drama.

A start is made with the tabulation of data and testing of hypotheses relating to actual and ideal drama choices of teachers (n=235).

1. HYPOTHESES RELATING TO ACTUAL AND IDEAL DRAMA CHOICES OF TEACHERS (n=235)

1.1 Hypothesis 2.0

Hypothesis 2.0 stated that there was no significant difference between actual drama choices (the kind of drama teachers are able to do) and ideal drama choices (the kind of drama that teachers would like to do) of the total teacher sample (n=235). This hypotheses was tested with data obtained from the Teacher Opinionnaire. Chi square was used as an appropriate measure of association between actual and ideal drama choices. The frequency distribution of teachers according to actual and ideal drama choices is
reported in Table 8.1. The observed frequency distribution used in the Chi-square procedure was based on the ideal drama choices of teachers and is indicated in parenthesis. The $x^2$ value for the distribution was significant at the .005 level; Hypothesis 2.0, expressed in the null form, was therefore rejected.

Table 8.1 Frequency distribution of the total teacher sample according to actual and ideal drama choices (n=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Theatre</th>
<th>Role Play</th>
<th>Mime</th>
<th>Drama Games</th>
<th>Dramatic Play</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual Choice</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Choice</td>
<td>(63)</td>
<td>(37)</td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>(37)</td>
<td>(75)</td>
<td>(235)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 106.90; \ df = 4; \ p < .005$

1.1.1 Discussion

In terms of actual drama choice, teachers stated that they used (in rank order): role playing (26%), theatre (22%), dramatic play (21%), mime (16%) or drama games (15%). In respect of the ideal drama preferences of teachers, these were (in rank order): dramatic play (32%), theatre (27%), role playing (16%), drama games (16%) or mime (10%).

More teachers would like to have used dramatic play or theatre, but believed that it was not possible to employ these options. A number of teachers who used role playing
or mime preferred other drama options, but believed that they were unable to pursue them.

Overall, 58% of the teacher sample believed that they were unable to pursue their ideal drama choices. This finding is particularly pertinent when one considers that, theoretically at least, there are few constraints placed upon the drama choices of teachers. A more detailed consideration of these findings is given in Section 2 of the present chapter following the testing of hypotheses relating to selected teacher characteristics and drama choices of teachers. It is necessary to show the extent to which the drama preferences of teachers grouped according to certain selected characteristics serve to reflect actual and ideal drama choices of the total teacher sample outlined above. Age of teacher is the first teacher characteristic to be analysed in respect of actual and ideal drama choices of teachers.

1.2 Hypotheses 2.1.1, 2.1.2 and 2.1.3

Hypothesis 2.1.1 asserted that there was no significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of 20 to 30 year old teachers. The frequency distribution of 20 to 30 year old teachers according to actual (observed frequencies) and ideal (expected frequencies) drama choices is reported in Table 8.2. The $x^2$ value of the distribution was significant at the .005 level; Hypothesis 2.1.1 expressed in the null form was therefore rejected.
Hypothesis 2.1.2 stated that there was no significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of 31 to 40 year old teachers; this hypothesis was not tested due to inadequate cell size for chi square procedures.

Hypothesis 2.1.3 asserted that there was no significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of teachers aged 41 years or more. The frequency distribution of 41 years plus teachers according to drama choices (actual and ideal) is reported in Table 8.3. The $x^2$ value of the distribution failed to reach significance at the alpha level of .05 and so null Hypothesis 2.1.3 was accepted.

Table 8.2 Frequency distribution of 20 to 30 year old teachers according to actual and ideal drama choices (n=117)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Choice (O)</th>
<th>Theatre</th>
<th>Role Play</th>
<th>Mime</th>
<th>Drama Games</th>
<th>Dramatic Play</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(O)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Choice (E)</td>
<td>(38)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(34)</td>
<td>(117)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 27.40; \ df = 4; \ p<.005$
Table 8.3 Frequency distribution of teachers aged 41 years or more according to actual and ideal drama choices (n=59)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Theatre</th>
<th>Role Play</th>
<th>Mime</th>
<th>Drama Games</th>
<th>Dramatic Play</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual Choice (0)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Choice (E)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(59)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x² = 8.94; df = 4; p n.s.

1.2.1 Discussion

In respect of actual drama choices the youngest group of teachers (20 to 30 years) stated that they used (in rank order): role play (27%), theatre (20%), dramatic play (20%), drama games (18%) or mime (15%). With regard to ideal drama choices, this youngest age group wished to use (in rank order): theatre (32%), dramatic play (29%), role playing (19%), drama games (13%) or mime (7%). There was a statistically significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of the 20-30 year old group of teachers. More teachers wanted to do theatre or dramatic play but found that this was not possible. A number of teachers who used role playing preferred other drama options but felt unable to pursue them. The drama choices of the youngest age group serves to reflect the overall trend of teachers' drama choices away from role playing and mime and more towards theatre or dramatic play.
Although no significant difference was reported between actual and ideal drama choices of the oldest age group of teachers, Table 8.3 suggests a desired move on the part of these teachers away from role playing and more towards dramatic play.

1.3 Hypotheses 2.2.1 and 2.2.2

Hypothesis 2.2.1 stated that there was no significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of female teachers. The frequency distribution of female teachers according to actual and ideal drama choices is given in Table 8.4. The $x^2$ value of the distribution was significant at the .005 level and so null Hypothesis 2.2.1 was rejected.

Hypothesis 2.2.2 asserted that there was no significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of male teachers. This hypothesis was not tested due to inadequate cell sizes for chi square purposes.

Table 8.4 Frequency distribution of female teachers according to actual and ideal drama choices (n=164)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Theatre</th>
<th>Role Play</th>
<th>Mime</th>
<th>Drama Games</th>
<th>Dramatic Play</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual Choice (O)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Choice (E)</td>
<td>(38)</td>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>(51)</td>
<td>(164)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 33.59; \ df = 4; \ p < .005$
1.3.1 Discussion

In terms of actual drama choices female teachers stated that they used (in rank order): role playing (29%), dramatic play (20%), drama games (19%), mime (18%) or theatre (14%). With regard to ideal drama preferences, female teachers wanted to do (in rank order): dramatic play (31%), theatre (23%), drama games (18%), role playing (16%) or mime (12%). There was a statistically significant difference between actual and ideal drama preferences of female teachers. More females wished to do dramatic play or theatre but found that this was not possible. A number of female teachers who used role playing or mime preferred other drama options but felt unable to pursue them. Female teachers constituted almost 70% of the total teacher sample and so the pattern of their drama preferences was very similar to that reported for the total teacher sample (n=235).

1.4 Hypotheses 2.3.1, 2.3.2 and 2.3.3

Hypothesis 2.3.1. stated that there was no significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of teachers who were infant trained. The frequency distribution of infant trained teachers according to actual and ideal drama choices is reported in Table 8.5. The $x^2$ value of the distribution was significant at the .005 level and so null Hypothesis 2.3.1 was rejected.
Hypothesis 2.3.2 asserted that there was no significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of teachers who were infant-primary trained. This hypothesis was not tested due to inadequate cell sizes of observed frequencies for chi square purposes.

Hypothesis 2.3.3 stated that there was no significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of teachers who were primary trained. The frequency distribution of primary trained teachers according to actual and ideal drama preferences is reported in Table 8.6. A significance level of .005 was reported for the $x^2$ distribution and so null Hypothesis 2.3.3 was rejected.

Table 8.5  Frequency distribution of infant trained teachers according to actual and ideal drama choices (n=57)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Choice (0)</th>
<th>Theatre</th>
<th>Role Play</th>
<th>Mime</th>
<th>Drama Games</th>
<th>Dramatic Play</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Choice (E)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(57)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 22.87; \ df = 4; \ p<.005$
Table 8.6 Frequency distribution of primary trained teachers according to actual and ideal drama choices (n=139)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Theatre</th>
<th>Role Play</th>
<th>Mime</th>
<th>Drama Games</th>
<th>Dramatic Play</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual Choice (O)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Choice (E)</td>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>(47)</td>
<td>(139)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 20.64; \ df = 4; \ p<.005$

1.4.1 Discussion

Teachers who were infant trained stated that they used (in rank order): role playing (35%), drama games (24%), dramatic play (16%), theatre (16%) or mime (9%). Infant trained teachers wished to do (in rank order) dramatic play (28%), theatre (23%), drama games (23%), role playing (14%), or mime (12%). There was a statistically significant difference between actual and ideal drama preferences of infant trained teachers. Infant trained teachers wished to do more dramatic play, theatre or drama games but believed that this was not possible. A number of infant trained teachers who used role playing or mime preferred other drama options but believed that they were unable to pursue them.

Primary trained teachers (n=139) stated that they used (in rank order): dramatic play (29%), theatre (23%), role playing (19%), mime (18%) or drama games (11%). The ideal drama preferences of primary trained teachers were (in rank order): dramatic play (34%), theatre (26%), role playing
(17%), drama games (15%) or mime (8%). There was a statistically significant difference between the actual and ideal drama preferences of primary teachers. More primary trained teachers wanted to do dramatic play, drama games or theatre but indicated that this was not possible. A number of teachers who used role playing or mime preferred other drama options but believed that they were unable to pursue them.

1.5 Hypotheses 2.4.1, 2.4.2 and 2.4.3

Hypothesis 2.4.1 asserted that there was no significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of two year trained teachers. The frequency distribution of two year trained teachers according to actual and ideal drama choices is reported in Table 8.7. The $x^2$ value of the distribution was significant at the .005 level and so null Hypothesis 2.4.1 was rejected.

Hypothesis 2.4.2 stated that there was no significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of teachers who were three year trained. The frequency distribution of three year trained teachers in respect of actual and ideal drama choices is given in Table 8.8. The $x^2$ value of the distribution was significant at the .05 level and so null Hypothesis 2.4.2 was rejected.

Hypothesis 2.4.3 stated that there was no difference between actual and ideal drama choices of four year trained teachers; it was not tested due to the presence of inadequate cell sizes for chi square procedures.
Table 8.7 Frequency distribution of two year trained teachers according to actual and ideal drama choices (n=124)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theatre</th>
<th>Role Play</th>
<th>Mime</th>
<th>Drama Games</th>
<th>Dramatic Play</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual Choice (O)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Choice (E)</td>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>(40)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 20.68; \text{ df } = 4; \ p < .005$

Table 8.8 Frequency distribution of three year trained teachers according to actual and ideal drama choices (n=89)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theatre</th>
<th>Role Play</th>
<th>Mime</th>
<th>Drama Games</th>
<th>Dramatic Play</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual Choice (O)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Choice (E)</td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 10.69; \text{ df } = 4; \ p < .05$

1.5.1 Discussion

Teachers who were 2 year trained stated that they used (in rank order): role playing (25%), theatre (23%), dramatic play (23%), mime (15%) or drama games (14%). Ideally 2 year trained teachers wished to do (in rank order): dramatic play (32%), theatre (27%), drama games (17%), role playing (13%) or mime (11%). There was a statistically significant
difference between the actual and ideal drama preferences of 2 year trained teachers. As with the overall pattern of actual and ideal drama choices of teachers (n=235) reported in Table 8.1, more 2 year trained teachers wanted to teach theatre, drama games or dramatic play and fewer wished to teach role playing or mime.

Three year trained teachers (n=89) stated that they were doing (in rank order): role playing (27%), theatre (23%), drama games (20%), dramatic play (19%) or mime (11%). They wished to teach (in rank order): dramatic play (31%), theatre (27%), role playing (19%), drama games (13%) or mime (10%). As Table 8.8 shows, there was a significant difference between the actual and ideal drama choices of three year trained teachers. The desire for more three year trained teachers to have taught dramatic play or theatre and less to have taught role playing or mime reflects the overall distribution of the drama choices of teachers (n=235) shown in Table 8.1. However, unlike the overall distribution of drama preferences of teachers (n=235), fewer three year trained teachers wanted to do drama games.

1.6 Hypotheses 2.5.1, 2.5.2 and 2.5.3

Hypothesis 2.5.1 asserted that there was no significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of teachers with 1 to 10 years experience. The frequency distribution of teachers with 1 to 10 years of teaching
experience in respect of actual and ideal drama choices is reported in Table 8.9. The $x^2$ value of the distribution was significant at the .005 level so null Hypothesis 2.5.1 was rejected.

Hypothesis 2.5.2 stated that there was no significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of teachers with 11 to 20 years of teaching experience. The frequency distribution of teachers with 11 to 20 years of teaching experience in respect of actual and ideal drama choices is given in Table 8.10. A significance level of .005 was reported for the distribution and so null Hypothesis 2.5.2 was rejected.

Hypothesis 2.5.3 asserted that there was no significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of teachers with 21 or more years of teaching experience. This hypothesis was not tested due to inadequate cell sizes for chi square procedures.
Table 8.9  Frequency distribution of teachers with 1 to 10 years teaching experience according to actual and ideal drama choices (n=134)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Theatre</th>
<th>Role Play</th>
<th>Mime</th>
<th>Drama Games</th>
<th>Dramatic Play</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual Choice (O)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Choice (E)</td>
<td>(41)</td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(38)</td>
<td>(134)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 27.76; \ df = 4; \ p < 0.005 \]

Table 8.10  Frequency distribution of teachers with 11 to 20 years teaching experience according to actual and ideal drama choices (n=71)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Theatre</th>
<th>Role Play</th>
<th>Mime</th>
<th>Drama Games</th>
<th>Dramatic Play</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual Choice (O)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Choice (E)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>(71)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 22.02; \ df = 4; \ p < 0.005 \]

1.6.1 Discussion

Teachers with 1 to 10 years of teaching experience stated that they were doing (in rank order): role playing (27%), theatre (21%), dramatic play (19%), mime (17%), or drama games (16%). Ideally these teachers wished to do (in rank order): theatre (30%), dramatic play (29%), role playing (18%), drama games (15%) or mime (8%). Table 8.9
shows that there was a statistically significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of teachers with 1 to 10 years experience. The distribution of actual drama choices of teachers with least teaching experience is identical (in rank order) to the overall frequency distribution of drama choices of the total sample (n=235).

Teachers with 11 to 20 years experience professed that they were doing (in rank order): dramatic play (25%), role playing (24%), theatre (21%), mime (16%) or drama games (14%). Ideally these teachers wished to do dramatic play (38%), theatre (22%), drama games (21%), role playing (12%) or mime (7%). More teachers wanted to do dramatic play and drama games but indicated that this was not possible.

A number of teachers who used role playing or mime preferred other drama options but believed that they were unable to pursue them.

1.7 Hypotheses 2.6.1, 2.6.2 and 2.6.3

Hypothesis 2.6.1 asserted that there was no significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of teachers with lower primary* pupils. The frequency distribution of teachers with lower primary pupils in

* lower primary = Kinder, Grade 1 and Grade 2 pupils (5 to 8 year old)
respect of actual and ideal drama choices is reported in Table 8.11. A significance level of .005 was reported for the distribution and so null Hypothesis 2.6.1 was rejected.

Hypothesis 2.6.2 stated that there was no significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of teachers with middle primary** pupils. Table 8.12 shows the frequency distribution of teachers with middle primary pupils with regard to actual and ideal drama choices. The \( x^2 \) value of the distribution was significant at the .005 level; null Hypothesis 2.6.2 was therefore accepted.

Hypothesis 2.6.3 stated that there was no significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of teachers with upper primary*** pupils. This hypothesis was not tested due to inadequate cell sizes of observed frequencies for chi square purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Choice (0)</th>
<th>Theatre</th>
<th>Role Play</th>
<th>Mime</th>
<th>Drama Games</th>
<th>Dramatic Play</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(104)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Choice (E)</td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(104)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( x^2 = 35.95; \text{ df } = 4; \text{ p}<.005 \)

** middle primary = Grade 3 and Grade 4 pupils (9 to 10 years old)

*** upper primary = Grade 5 and Grade 6 pupils (11 to 12 years old)
Table 8.12 Frequency distribution of teachers with middle primary pupils according to actual and ideal drama choices (n=74)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Choice (0)</th>
<th>Theatre</th>
<th>Role Play</th>
<th>Mime</th>
<th>Drama Games</th>
<th>Dramatic Play</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(74)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 29.90; \text{ df } = 4; \text{ p}<.005 \]

1.7.1 Discussion

Teachers with lower primary pupils stated that they were doing (in rank order): role playing (33%), drama games (21%), mime (18%), theatre (14%), or dramatic play (14%). Ideally these teachers wanted to employ (in rank order): dramatic play (30%), theatre (23%), drama games (21%), role playing (15%), or mime (11%). There was a statistically significant difference between what teachers said they were doing in drama and ideally what they wanted to be doing in drama. More lower primary teachers wished to pursue theatre or dramatic play but did not find this possible. A number of teachers who used role playing or mime preferred other drama options but believed that they were unable to pursue them.

The desire for more teachers to do dramatic play or theatre and less teachers to do role playing or mime is consistent with the actual and ideal drama preferences of the total teacher sample (n=235).
Teachers with middle primary pupils stated that they were using (in rank order): theatre (28%), mime (22%), dramatic play (20%), role playing (19%), drama games (11%) or mime (7%). Teachers with middle primary pupils would like to have made more use of dramatic play and less use of mime.

1.8 Hypotheses 2.7.1, 2.7.2 and 2.7.3

Hypothesis 2.7.1 stated that there was no significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of teachers in small schools. This hypothesis was not tested because cell sizes of observed frequencies were too small for chi square purposes.

Hypothesis 2.7.2 asserted that there was no significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of teachers working in medium-sized schools. The frequency distribution of teachers working in medium-sized schools according to actual and ideal drama choices is reported in Table 8.13. The $x^2$ value of the distribution was significant at the .005 level and so null Hypothesis 2.7.1 was rejected.

Hypothesis 2.7.3 stated that there was no significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of teachers in large schools. Table 8.14 shows the frequency distribution of teachers working in large schools in respect of actual and ideal drama choices. The $x^2$ value of the distribution was significant at the .005 level; null Hypothesis 2.7.3 was therefore rejected.
Table 8.13 Frequency distribution of teachers working in medium-sized primary schools according to actual and ideal drama choices (n=98)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Choice (O)</th>
<th>Theatre</th>
<th>Role Play</th>
<th>Mime</th>
<th>Drama Games</th>
<th>Dramatic Play</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Choice (E)</td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(98)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[x^2 = 20.78; \ df = 4; \ p < .005\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Choice (O)</th>
<th>Theatre</th>
<th>Role Play</th>
<th>Mime</th>
<th>Drama Games</th>
<th>Dramatic Play</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Choice (E)</td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>(99)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[x^2 = 18.84; \ df = 4; \ p < .005\]

1.8.1 Discussion

Teachers working in medium-sized schools stated that they used (in rank order): role playing (35%), theatre (23%), drama games (15%), mime (14%) or dramatic play (13%). Ideally these teachers wished to teach (in rank order): theatre (31%), dramatic play (22%), role playing...
(18%), drama games (16%) or mime (13%). Teachers in medium-sized schools wanted to use more theatre or dramatic play and less role playing.

Teachers working in large schools stated that they employed (in rank order): dramatic play (32%), mime (20%), drama games (18%), role playing (16%), or theatre (14%). Ideally these teachers wished to teach (in rank order): dramatic play (37%), theatre (23%), role playing (17%), drama games (14%) or mime (9%). Teachers in large primary schools wanted to use more theatre or dramatic play and employ less mime or drama games.

1.9 Hypotheses 2.8.1 and 2.8.2

Hypothesis 2.8.1 asserted that there was no significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of rural teachers. The frequency distribution of rural teachers in respect of actual and ideal drama choices is reported in Table 8.15. The x² value of the distribution was significant at the .005 level and so null Hypothesis 2.8.1 was rejected.

Hypothesis 2.8.2 stated that there was no significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of urban teachers. The frequency distribution of urban teachers in respect of actual and ideal drama preferences is given in Table 8.16. The x² value of the distribution was significant at the .01 level and so null Hypothesis 2.8.2 was rejected.
Table 8.15 Frequency distribution of rural primary teachers according to actual and ideal drama choices (n=84)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Theatre</th>
<th>Role Play</th>
<th>Mime</th>
<th>Drama Games</th>
<th>Dramatic Play</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual Choice (O)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Choice (E)</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 27.42; \text{ df } = 4; \text{ p}<.005 \]

Table 8.16 Frequency distribution of urban primary teachers according to actual and ideal drama choices (n=151)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Theatre</th>
<th>Role Play</th>
<th>Mime</th>
<th>Drama Games</th>
<th>Dramatic Play</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual Choice (O)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Choice (E)</td>
<td>(37)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>(47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 14.20; \text{ df } = 4; \text{ p}<.01 \]

1.9.1 Discussion

Teachers working in rural schools stated that they used (in rank order): theatre (25%), role playing (24%), mime (21%), dramatic play (17%), or drama games (13%). Ideally they wished to teach (in rank order): theatre (32%), dramatic play (32%), drama games (13%), mime (12%) or role playing (11%). Teachers in rural schools wanted to operate more theatre or dramatic play and less mime or role playing.
Teachers working in urban schools claimed to be using (in rank order): role playing (27%), dramatic play (23%), theatre (20%), drama games (17%) or mime (13%). Urban teachers ideally wished to teach (in rank order): dramatic play (31%), theatre (24%), role playing (19%), drama games (17%) or mime (9%). In short, teachers in urban schools wished to use more dramatic play or theatre and less role playing or mime. Attention is now given to an overview of findings relating to actual and ideal drama choices of the sample of teachers (n=235).

2. AN OVERVIEW OF FINDINGS RELATING TO ACTUAL AND IDEAL DRAMA CHOICES OF TEACHERS (n=235)

There was a statistically significant difference between actual and ideal drama choices of the total sample of teachers (n=235). There was a desire on the part of the sample to do less role playing or mime and to do more dramatic play or theatre. It is notable that when teachers were categorised according to age, sex, type of teacher training, length of teacher training, length of teaching experience, grade of pupils taught, size of school and school catchment area, the overall pattern of ideal and actual drama choices remained the same. That is, fewer teachers wanted to do role play and mime while more would have preferred to operate either dramatic play or theatre.

The reasons why some teachers wished to move away from the use of mime or role playing are none too clear. One may only surmise that a number of teachers may have recognised
deficiencies in these two drama options that may have only been met by the use of either theatre or dramatic play. In terms of teacher beliefs there were no significant differences of opinion among professed users of mime or role playing. That is, there was no indication as to which beliefs might influence mime or role playing in particular. In reference to the use of mime, Hargreaves (1979) has pointed out that this particular option is facilitative of high teacher control. If this follows, then a desired move by some teachers from mime to dramatic play may be thwarted because the latter is not so susceptible to teacher control as the former.

In similar vein, observation of role playing in schools suggests that it can be derived predominantly from teacher rather than pupil sources. In a desired move from mime or role playing to dramatic play, it may follow that some teachers are unable to pursue their choice because of held beliefs about pupils. For instance, the Climate of Teacher Opinion showed that teachers were divided over the degree to which the work of pupils should be teacher directed. It is notable that both mime and role playing are likely to facilitate teacher direction more so than dramatic play. Teachers were also divided in respect of others relying upon them for ideas and opinions. Mime and role playing can be based solely on teacher ideas, whereas in order for plays to be 'child invented', they require the use of predominantly pupil ideas.
With reference to the use of theatre, some teachers may well lack, or feel that their pupils lack, the necessary expertise to use it 'successfully'. This may be particularly true of teachers who would like to do theatre with young pupils.

It is observable that, in terms of drama choices, the distribution of drama electives was related to the age of pupils being taught. Lower primary teachers stated they did (in rank order) role playing, drama games, mime, dramatic play or theatre. Teacher emphasis on drama games and role playing suggests a preoccupation with the child's initiation into aspects of social development. Both role playing and drama games tend to be associated with social order and set rules. In this instance teachers may have felt that young pupils were incapable of doing theatre or of inventing their own work.

Teachers of middle primary pupils professed to using (in rank order) theatre, mime, dramatic play, role playing or drama games. As mentioned earlier, mime is often, though not always, used as a means of 'silent control' by some teachers. However, it may also be that middle primary teachers find that mime assists in the development of pupil outcomes that are of value to them.

In the upper primary area of school, teachers state that they do (in rank order): theatre, dramatic play, role playing, drama games or mime. It is interesting to note the inversion of drama choices between the lower and upper part of the primary school. Findings suggest that as pupils move
through the primary school they are likely to experience less role playing or mime and more theatre or dramatic play. There is an indication that more teachers would like to do theatre or dramatic play with their pupils, but find that this is not possible in the light of perceptions about the abilities of pupils.

3. HYPOTHESES RELATING TO DRAMA CHOICES OF TEACHERS AND PUPIL OUTCOMES

The data used for the testing of hypothesis reported here was derived from the measurement of the five criterion pupil variables; that is, creativity (verbal and figural forms of the Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking), empathy (the Empathy Scale - self-invented), self-esteem (Coopersmith Self-esteem Inventory) and academic self-image (the Academic Self-image Scale).

The reader is reminded that all of the following are based on a sample (n=16)* that is small for reasons of necessity already outlined. However, the fact that much of the data obtained from the 16 teachers concerned was intensive and almost clinical in character does enable considerable confidence to be obtained in respect of the reported findings.

Prior to the testing of hypotheses relating to drama

* The 16 teachers are distributed as follows: dramatic play (n=6); drama exercise (n=4); and theatre (n=6).
In order to avoid possible confusion as to which units of measurement are under scrutiny, it is noted that the emphasis here is upon the sub-sample of 16 teachers and 370 pupils located within their respective intact classes.

Furthermore, analysis of this data, which lies beyond the scope of the present thesis, could allow for speculating an interaction between class size and teaching method. However, major reorganisation and perhaps some addition of new data could be required.
choices and pupil outcomes, it was necessary to determine if there were any significant gains or losses on each of the pupil measures between Time A and Time B for the total sub-sample of 16 teachers. Table 8.17 shows that there were no significant gains or losses on any of the five pupil measures between Time A and Time B - reported for the sub-sample of 16 teachers as a whole. This being the case, hypotheses 3.1 to 3.5 were subsequently tested, the results of which are reported in Sections 3.1 to 4 of this chapter.

Table 8.17 Sub-sample of 16 teachers: gains and losses of pupils on educational outcomes (n=370)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pupil Measure</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean</th>
<th>TIME B Mean</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
<th>t value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbal creativity</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>50.10 9.67</td>
<td>50.13 9.33</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figural creativity</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>49.82 8.17</td>
<td>49.96 8.47</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>16.89 3.53</td>
<td>17.01 3.71</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Self-image</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>11.17 3.54</td>
<td>11.28 3.68</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>15.20 4.21</td>
<td>15.27 4.46</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(df = 369)

A t-test for correlated data was used to test all hypotheses relating to pupils' gains and losses on educational outcomes. All t-tests are two-tailed. The
alpha level for rejection of each null hypothesis was set at the .05 level of confidence.

3.1 **Hypothesis 3.1**

Hypothesis 3.1 asserted that there would be no significant gain or loss on a pupil measure of verbal creativity between Time A and Time B where dramatic play was used (3.1.1), where drama exercise was used (3.1.2), and where theatre was used (3.1.3). The three subsumed hypotheses were tested with data derived from the verbal form of the Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking (1962).

The results of the analysis relating to the drama choices of teachers and verbal creativity of pupils are reported in Table 8.18. In respect of dramatic play and verbal creativity of pupils (3.1.1), the t value of -3.60 was significant at the .000 level and so null Hypothesis 3.1.1 was rejected. With regard to drama exercise and verbal creativity of pupils (3.1.2), the t value of +4.56 was significant at the .000 level and so null Hypothesis 3.1.2 was rejected. In respect of theatre and the verbal creativity of pupils (3.1.3), the t value of -0.02 failed to achieve significance at the alpha level of .05 and so null Hypothesis 3.1.3 was accepted.
Table 8.18 Drama choices of teachers: respective gains and losses of pupils on a measure of verbal creativity (n of pupils = 370)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drama Choice</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean ± s</th>
<th>TIME B Mean ± s</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
<th>t value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TIME A Mean ± s</td>
<td>TIME B Mean ± s</td>
<td>Diff.</td>
<td>t value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dramatic Play</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>50.54 ± 9.94</td>
<td>52.63 ± 10.63</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>-3.60*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>48.40 ± 9.23</td>
<td>48.42 ± 7.48</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>51.76 ± 9.53</td>
<td>48.20 ± 8.19</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>+4.56*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>50.10 ± 9.67</td>
<td>50.13 ± 9.33</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.000 (two-tailed t-test)

3.1.1 Discussion

The preceding analysis revealed that teachers who used dramatic play (n=6) promoted significant pupil gains on a measure of verbal creativity. Teachers of drama exercise (n=4) promoted significant regression between 01 and 02 measures. Teachers of theatre (n=6) promoted neither significant gains nor losses on the pupil measure of verbal creativity.

Observation of drama suggests that pupils' chances of developing verbal creativity may have been greatly minimised, or denied in some cases. For instance, it was observed that teachers of theatre were unable (due to logistical reasons) to give all pupils a part to play, so that participation in any verbal pursuit was selective. One
assumes that the only pupils to develop language in an imaginative manner, via drama, would be those able to take part.

A further observation is that teachers of theatre used adult words/scripts, rather than the pupils' own words. This meant that even if pupils were given parts to play there were few apparent opportunities for them to be verbally creative. In respect of drama exercise, only teacher 'O' allowed pupils to talk, so that pupils of other drama exercise teachers had little chance, if any, to express themselves verbally. Only dramatic play teachers as a whole group allowed all pupils to talk when doing their own plays.

3.2 Hypothesis 3.2

Hypothesis 3.2 stated that there would be no significant gain or loss on a pupil measure of figural creativity between Time A and Time B where dramatic play was used (3.2.1), where drama exercise was used (3.2.2), and where theatre was used (3.2.3). The three subsumed hypotheses, 3.2.1, 3.2.2 and 3.2.3, were tested with data derived from the figural form of the Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking (1962).

The results of the analysis relating to the drama choices of teachers and figural (non-verbal) creativity of pupils are reported in Table 8.19. In respect of dramatic
play and figural creativity of pupils (3.2.1), the t value of -3.24 was significant at the .001 level and so null hypothesis 3.2.1 was rejected. With regard to drama exercise and figural creativity of pupils (3.2.2), the t value of +4.18 was significant at the .000 level and so null Hypothesis 3.2.2 was rejected. In respect of theatre and figural creativity of pupils (3.2.3) the t value of +0.63 failed to achieve significance at the set alpha level of .05 and so null Hypothesis 3.2.3 was accepted.

Table 8.19 Drama choices of teachers: respective gains and losses of pupils on a measure of figural creativity

(n of pupils = 370)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drama Choice</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean</th>
<th>TIME A s</th>
<th>TIME B Mean</th>
<th>TIME B s</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
<th>t value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dramatic Play</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>49.94</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>52.58</td>
<td>8.97</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>-3.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>49.20</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>48.85</td>
<td>8.97</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>+0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>50.51</td>
<td>7.87</td>
<td>46.98</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>+4.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>49.82</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>49.96</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.001
** p<.000 (two-tailed t-test)
3.2.1 Discussion

The preceding analysis showed that teachers who used dramatic play (n=6) promoted significant pupil gains on a measure of figural creativity. Teachers of drama exercise (n=4) promoted significant pupil regression on a measure of figural creativity. Teachers of theatre (n=6) promoted neither significant gains nor losses on the pupil measure of figural creativity.

Observation of teachers doing dramatic play suggests that all pupils were given the opportunity to be figurally, or visually, creative in the imaginative construction and implementation of their own plays. Teachers who operated drama exercise appeared to give few opportunities for pupils to diverge from the teachers' own set views of drama ends. With regard to theatre, only a few, selected pupils were able to participate in the activity. As such the effect of theatre on the figural creativity of pupils (if any) would be restricted to those fortunate enough to take part.

3.3 Hypothesis 3.3

Hypothesis 3.3 stated that there would be no significant gain or loss on a pupil measure of empathy between Time A and Time B where dramatic play was used (3.3.1), where drama exercise was used (3.3.2), and where theatre was used (3.3.3). The three subsumed hypotheses, 3.3.1, 3.3.2, and 3.3.3, were tested with data derived from the Empathy Scale.
The results of the analysis relating to the drama choices of teachers and empathy of pupils are reported in Table 8.20. In respect of dramatic play and empathy of pupils (3.3.1) the t value of -2.17 was significant at the .03 level and so null Hypothesis 3.3.1 was rejected. With regard to drama exercise and empathy of pupils, the t value of -0.32 failed to achieve significance at the set alpha level of .05 and so null Hypothesis 3.3.2 was accepted. In respect of theatre and empathy of pupils, the t value of +0.70 failed to achieve significance at the alpha level of .05, therefore null Hypothesis 3.3.3 was accepted.

Table 8.20 Drama choices of teachers: respective gains and losses of pupils on a measure of empathy (n of pupils = 370)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drama Choice</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean s</th>
<th>TIME B Mean s</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
<th>t value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dramatic Play</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>16.98 3.32</td>
<td>17.36 3.70</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>-2.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>16.61 3.63</td>
<td>16.46 3.56</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>+0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>17.12 3.75</td>
<td>17.19 3.86</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>16.89 3.53</td>
<td>17.01 3.71</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.03 (two-tailed t-test)

3.3.1 Discussion

Pupils who experienced dramatic play exhibited significant gains on the Empathy Scale. It is notable that teachers of dramatic play (n=6) allowed pupils to work in
self-appointed groups. It may be that the promotion of empathy might be more readily facilitated by placing pupils in social groupings. Teachers of drama exercise (n=4) and theatre (n=6) recorded no significant change in the empathic tendencies of pupils. Pupils working in the drama exercise mode were not allowed to communicate with each other.

Teachers of theatre appeared to provide only limited means by which empathy might be developed in pupils. Not all pupils were given a dramatic role, thus some pupils were not afforded an opportunity to 'see things from another person's point of view'.

3.4 Hypothesis 3.4

Hypothesis 3.4 asserted that there would be no significant gain or loss on a pupil measure of self-esteem between Time A and Time B where dramatic play was used (3.4.1), where drama exercise was used (3.4.2), and where theatre was used (3.4.3). The three subsumed hypotheses were tested with data derived from the Coopersmith Self-esteem Inventory (1967).

The results of the analysis relating to the drama choices of teachers and self-esteem of pupils are reported in Table 8.21. In respect of dramatic play and self-esteem of pupils (3.4.1), the t value of -1.13 failed to achieve significance at the alpha level of .05 and so null Hypothesis 3.4.1 was accepted. With regard to drama exercise and self-esteem of pupils (3.4.2), the t value of
-1.67 failed to reach the predetermined alpha level of .05 and so null Hypothesis 3.4.2 was accepted. In respect of theatre and self-esteem of pupils (3.4.3), the t value of +1.39 also failed to achieve significance at the .05 level, therefore null Hypothesis 3.4.3 was accepted.

Table 8.21 Drama choices of teachers: respective gains and losses of pupils on a measure of self-esteem
(n of pupils = 370)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drama Choice</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>TIME B Mean</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
<th>t value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dramatic Play</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>15.29 4.37</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.48 4.65</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>15.15 4.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.91 4.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>+1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>15.08 4.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.43 4.38</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>-1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>15.20 4.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.27 4.46</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4.1 Discussion

The preceding analysis revealed that teachers who used dramatic play, drama exercise or theatre failed to promote significant change on a pupil measure of self-esteem. This finding serves to support notions advanced by some theorists that self-esteem is a stable aspect of personality over short periods of time. Coopersmith (1967) notes that beliefs about the self tend to be highly resistant to change. It may be argued that nine weeks is a very short
period of time by which changes in pupil self-esteem might occur. Nevertheless, from the point of view of teachers who do theatre, nine weeks was seen as sufficient time in which to put on a dramatic performance and change the self-esteem of pupils.

A survey of literature suggests that an increase in self-esteem is often made by disadvantaged pupils, rather than more fortunate peers. In these instances a change in self-esteem may arise via one or more treatments, e.g., an Outward Bound Course. It may be that disadvantaged pupils have more room for improving their level of self-esteem than the non-disadvantaged pupils of the present teacher sample.

3.5 Hypothesis 3.5

Hypothesis 3.5 stated that there would be no significant gain or loss on a pupil measure of academic self-image between Time A and Time B where dramatic play was used (3.5.1), where drama exercise was used (3.5.2), and where theatre was used (3.5.3). The three subsumed hypotheses, 3.5.1, 3.5.2 and 3.5.3, were tested with data derived from the Academic Self-image Scale (Barker-Lunn, 1970).

The results of the analysis relating to the drama choices of teachers and academic self-image of pupils are reported in Table 8.22. In respect of dramatic play and self-image of pupils (3.5.1), the t value of -3.00 was
significant at the .003 level and so null Hypothesis 3.5.1 was rejected. With reference to drama exercise and academic self-image of pupils (3.5.2), the t value of +0.80 did not achieve significance at the predetermined alpha level of .05; therefore null Hypothesis 3.5.2 was accepted. In respect of theatre and academic self-image of pupils (3.5.3), the t value of +0.88 failed to achieve significance at the .05 level and so null Hypothesis 3.5.3 was accepted.

Table 8.22 Drama choices of teachers: respective gains and losses of pupils on a measure of academic self-image
(n of pupils = 370)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drama Choice</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean s</th>
<th>TIME B Mean s</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
<th>t value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dramatic Play</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>10.84 3.72</td>
<td>11.36 3.74</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>-3.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>11.40 3.20</td>
<td>11.23 3.40</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>+0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>11.40 3.66</td>
<td>11.22 3.97</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>+0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>11.17 3.54</td>
<td>11.28 3.68</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-1.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.003 (two-tailed t-test)

3.5.1 Discussion

The Barker-Lunn (1970) Academic Self-Image Scale (A.S.I.S.) was used as a means of measuring pupil outcomes on this factor. Even though there were no reported changes in the general self-esteem of pupils (Section 3.4), this was not the case with pupil's view of academic self. Teachers
of dramatic play promoted significant pupil gains in respect of the academic self-image of pupils. On the other hand, teachers of theatre and drama exercise made no apparent impression on the academic self-image of pupils at all. The A.S.I.S. was used to test out notions regarding the spread of pupil confidence from drama to other areas of the curriculum. It would prove difficult to determine whether drama stimulated pupil confidence or if some other aspect of the curriculum stimulated pupil confidence. However, it is notable that the beliefs and behaviour of teachers are likely to be brought to bear upon all aspects of pupil learning. More insight may be given to these findings when we come to look at the beliefs and behaviour of teachers according to drama choices.

4. A SUMMARY OF FINDINGS RELATING TO DRAMA CHOICES OF TEACHERS AND PUPIL OUTCOMES

Many teachers ideally wished to use dramatic play or theatre. These two options appear to represent the kinds of drama that many teachers believed they should be doing in classrooms. This apparent division among teachers reflects a worldwide controversy between advocates of child-centred drama (dramatic play) and theatre. These two drama choices of teachers were examined in relation to pupils' gains/losses on selected educational outcomes. For reasons already given in Chapter 4 Section 1.5, drama exercise was included as an extra drama option for examination in relation to pupil outcomes.
It was found that teachers who employed dramatic play techniques (n=6) produced significant pupil gains on measures of creativity (figural and verbal), empathy and academic self-image. The results suggest that teachers who allow pupils to invent their own drama tend to increase their probabilities of meeting intended pupil outcomes. This finding lends some support to those educators who advance this kind of drama.

Teachers of theatre produced no significant changes on pupil outcomes. In view of the heavy criticism that theatre use in the primary school is given by writers, one might have expected significant losses on pupil outcomes. This may have been particularly so in respect of theatre and self-esteem of pupils. Most writers point to the effects that theatre performance is likely to have on the self-confidence of pupils, particularly younger ones. However, the finding that there was no significant change produced at all, via theatre, might well serve some teachers to question its use, to the extent that intended outcomes were not met. It may be that theatre, done no more than nine times a year by the present sample (n=6), provided insufficient exposure for pupils to benefit from its use. Allied to this notion is the observation that not all pupils were given an active part in school performances. The influence of theatre on the development of non-participant pupils is likely to be minimal, or even totally absent.
In reference to the use of drama exercise, pupils regressed significantly on measures of verbal and figural creativity. Furthermore, exercise pupils made no significant changes on measures of empathy, self-esteem and academic self-image. Observation showed drama exercise to be facilitative of high teacher direction. A high level of teacher control may not be in keeping with the development of creative thinking abilities in pupils (Soar, 1966). Moreover, it was also noted that the use of drama exercise did not provide opportunities for pupils to work in social groups and so possibilities of empathic development may have been limited.

Although dramatic play has been seen as a viable means of achieving drama outcomes, it would be misleading to suggest that any kind of drama will reap pupil gains at all times. It can be argued that dramatic play facilitates certain teacher beliefs and actions which may lead to significant pupils gains on outcomes. However, the drama option itself does nothing more than facilitate beliefs and actions. No drama option can work independently of the teacher and pupils doing the activity. A number of researchers in the drama area have ignored the influences of teachers and pupils on outcomes when drama options have been examined. The literature abounds with claims that drama options 'x' or 'y' or 'z' are capable of achieving desired
results - seemingly without the influence of teachers whose task is to organise the activity.

It is likely that a number of teachers in the present sample derived their faith in drama (in the absence of empirical evidence) from literature sources of the kind mentioned above. This 'black box' approach to drama may have led some teachers to believe that the very act of doing drama with pupils was enough to guarantee success. When we examine the viability of given drama options, we need to do so in relation to the beliefs and behaviour of teachers organising the activity. What part do teacher beliefs and behaviour play in producing observed pupil outcomes?
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CHAPTER NINE

ANALYSIS OF DATA RELATING TO TEACHER BELIEFS,
TEACHER BEHAVIOUR AND PUPIL OUTCOMES

INTRODUCTION

It has been observed in Chapter Eight that some drama options may be more viable than others in achieving intended pupil outcomes. Any drama option is only the sum of the beliefs and practices of teachers who employ it. Thus, having discovered that some drama options may be more facilitative of achieving desired ends than others, we wish to show which particular teacher beliefs and behaviour are associated with pupils' gains/losses.

The present chapter has two main purposes. Firstly there is a need to make an assessment of the influence of separate teacher beliefs on pupil outcomes. The first part of the analysis is concerned with the testing of hypotheses relating to nine separate teacher belief areas and subsequent pupils' gains/losses on outcomes. The data for hypotheses testing is derived from the responses of the sub-sample of teachers (n=16) to 9 belief statements on the Teacher Opinionnaire.

Secondly, there is a desire to assess the influence of 9 separate aspects of teacher behaviour on pupils' gains/losses on educational outcomes. This part of the analysis consists of hypotheses testing in relation to the 9 aspects of teacher behaviour observed via the use of the Drama
Inventory. The hypotheses tested here are presented in Chapter Six. For purposes of hypotheses testing a t-test for correlated data was used to determine significant changes on pupil outcomes. All t-tests were two-tailed.

The reader is reminded again that the following analysis is based on a small sub-sample of teachers (n=16). It was noted earlier that the nature of the data base was such that confidence may be placed in the findings. All n of cases used in statistical tables refer to the pupils of the sub-sample of teachers.

1. RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN TEACHER BELIEFS AND PUPIL OUTCOMES

Teachers (n=16) were grouped according to their stance (agree/disagree) on 9 selected belief statements on the Teacher Opinionnaire. These belief statements referred to:

. the directing of other people's work;
. the use of pupils' ideas in drama;
. the value of spontaneous teaching strategies (flexibility);
. the perceived need for high pupil control;
. the preference of pupils for dependence rather than autonomy;
. the ability of less able pupils to be creative;
. the effectiveness of 'out-front' teaching; and
. the value of competition between pupils.
From here pupils' gains/losses on outcomes of these grouped teachers were examined via the testing of Hypotheses 4.1. In effect teacher responses (Yes/No) to 9 belief statements across 5 pupil outcomes meant that 90 hypotheses were tested. It was found that 74 out of 90 null hypotheses tested were accepted and so rather than rendering a separate discussion following the testing of each hypothesis, one overall discussion is presented at the end of the analysis. Hypotheses codes ending in /1, /2, /3, /4 and /5 refer to pupil outcomes of verbal creativity (/1), figural creativity (/2), empathy (/3), self-esteem (/4) and academic self-image (/5) respectively.*

1.1 Hypothesis 4.1

Hypothesis 4.1 (constituting 4.1.1/1 to 4.1.2/5**) stated that there would be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers liked or disliked directing the work of others.

The results of testing hypotheses 4.1.1/1 to 4.1.2/5 are reported in Table 9.1. Hypotheses 4.1.1/1 to 4.1.1/5 and 4.1.2/1, 4.1.2/2, 4.1.2/4 and 4.1.2/5 were accepted

* For more details see Chapter Six, Section 4.4.

** It is these constituent hypotheses, shown in parenthesis following each main statement of hypothesis, which were tested and reported. For example, hypothesis 4.1 is only a summary of hypotheses 4.1.1/1 to 4.1.2/5.
because t values were not significant at the .05 level. Hypothesis 4.1.2/3, concerning teachers disliking directing the work of others and pupil's gains/losses on a measure of empathy, was rejected because the t value of -2.93 was significant at the .004 level.

Table 9.1 Beliefs of teachers about direction and pupil outcomes: results of testing hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Belief of Teacher</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean s</th>
<th>TIME B Mean s</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1/1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>48.46 8.90</td>
<td>48.33 8.26</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1/2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>48.75 7.67</td>
<td>48.84 8.01</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>.858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1/3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>16.54 3.54</td>
<td>16.48 3.75</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1/4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>14.84 4.35</td>
<td>14.92 4.60</td>
<td>-0.58</td>
<td>.561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1/5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>11.18 3.50</td>
<td>11.17 3.68</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.2/1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>53.49 10.33</td>
<td>53.82 10.30</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>.657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.2/2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>52.04 8.74</td>
<td>52.27 8.94</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.2/3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>17.60 3.43</td>
<td>18.11 3.36</td>
<td>-2.93</td>
<td>.004*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.2/4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>15.92 3.82</td>
<td>16.00 4.09</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.2/5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>11.13 3.64</td>
<td>11.52 3.67</td>
<td>-1.87</td>
<td>.064</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(df = n of pairs -1)

**KEY**

0 = teacher liked directing others
X = teacher did not like directing others
* = rejected hypothesis
1.2 Hypothesis 4.2

Hypothesis 4.2 (constituting 4.2.1/1 to 4.2.2/5) asserted that there would be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers did or did not believe that ideas of pupils should be used.

The results of testing hypotheses 4.2.1/1 to 4.2.1/5 are given in Table 9.2. All these hypotheses were accepted because t values were not significant at the .05 level. It was not possible to test hypotheses 4.2.2/1 to 4.2.2/5 because no teachers in the sub-sample believed that pupils' ideas should not be used.

Table 9.2 Beliefs of teachers about pupil ideas and pupil outcomes: results of testing hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H°</th>
<th>Belief of Teacher</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean s</th>
<th>TIME B Mean s</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2.1/1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>50.10 9.67</td>
<td>50.13 9.33</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>.951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.1/2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>49.82 8.17</td>
<td>49.96 8.47</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.1/3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>16.89 3.53</td>
<td>17.01 3.71</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
<td>.285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.1/4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>15.20 4.21</td>
<td>15.27 4.46</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
<td>.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.1/5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>11.17 3.54</td>
<td>11.28 4.68</td>
<td>-1.02</td>
<td>.310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.2/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to 4.2.2/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(df = n of pairs -1)

KEY
0 = teacher believed that pupils' ideas should be used
N.T. = hypothesis not tested because no teacher held this view
1.3 Hypothesis 4.3

Hypothesis 4.3 (constituting 4.3.1/1 to 4.3.2/5) stated that there would be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers did or did not believe in the value of spontaneous teaching strategies.

The results of testing hypotheses 4.3.1/1 to 4.3.2/5 are reported in Table 9.3. Hypotheses 4.3.1/2 and 4.3.1/4, concerning pupils' gains/losses on measures of verbal creativity and self-esteem respectively, were rejected because t values were significant at the .04 level or higher (4.3.1/2 : t = -1.99) (4.3.1/4 : t = -2.44). Hypotheses 4.3.2/2 and 4.3.2/4, regarding teachers not believing in the value of spontaneous teaching strategies and pupils' gains/losses on measures of verbal creativity and self-esteem respectively, were rejected because t values were significant at the .02 level or higher (4.3.2/2 : t = 3.80) (4.3.2/4 : t = 2.30). The remaining hypotheses were accepted because t values were not significant at the .05 level.
Table 9.3 Beliefs of teachers about flexibility and pupil outcomes: results of testing hypotheses

| H°      | Belief of Teacher | n of Pupils | TIME A Mean | s | TIME B Mean | s | t value | p       |
|---------|-------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|---|-------------|---------------|---------|---------|
| 4.3.1/1 | 0                 | 251         | 50.54       | 9.94          |   | 50.21       | 9.85          | 0.71    | .478    |
| 4.3.1/2 | 0                 | 251         | 49.02       | 7.90          |   | 50.23       | 8.53          | -1.99   | .047*   |
| 4.3.1/3 | 0                 | 251         | 17.05       | 3.56          |   | 17.13       | 3.76          | -0.56   | .576    |
| 4.3.1/4 | 0                 | 251         | 15.05       | 4.32          |   | 15.36       | 4.59          | -2.44   | .015*   |
| 4.3.1/5 | 0                 | 251         | 11.08       | 3.60          |   | 11.18       | 3.83          | -0.71   | .476    |
| 4.3.2/1 | X                 | 119         | 49.17       | 9.04          |   | 49.96       | 8.15          | -1.12   | .266    |
| 4.3.2/2 | X                 | 119         | 51.52       | 8.50          |   | 49.40       | 8.34          | 3.80    | .000*   |
| 4.3.2/3 | X                 | 119         | 16.53       | 3.46          |   | 16.76       | 3.59          | -1.02   | .311    |
| 4.3.2/4 | X                 | 119         | 15.50       | 3.97          |   | 15.09       | 4.19          | 2.30    | .023*   |
| 4.3.2/5 | X                 | 119         | 11.34       | 3.41          |   | 11.49       | 3.34          | -0.76   | .452    |

(df = n of pairs -1)

KEY
0 = teacher believed that spontaneous methods have value
X = teacher believed that spontaneous methods do not have value
* = rejected hypothesis

1.4 Hypothesis 4.4

Hypothesis 4.4 (constituting 4.4.1/1 to 4.4.2/5) asserted that there would be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers did or did not believe that pupil control was a high priority.
The results of testing hypotheses 4.4.1/1 to 4.4.2/5 are given in Table 9.4. Hypothesis 4.4.1/1, concerning teachers believing that pupil control was a high priority and pupils' gains/losses on a measure of verbal creativity, was rejected because the t value of 5.79 was significant at the .001 level. Hypothesis 4.4.2/1, regarding teachers not believing that pupil control was a high priority and pupils' gains/losses on a measure of verbal creativity was rejected because the t value of -2.18 was significant at the .03 level. The remaining hypotheses were accepted because t values were not significant at the .05 level.

Table 9.4 Beliefs of teachers about pupil control and pupil outcomes: results of testing hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H₀</th>
<th>Belief of Teacher</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean</th>
<th>TIME A s</th>
<th>TIME B Mean</th>
<th>TIME B s</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.4.1/1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52.94</td>
<td>10.35</td>
<td>47.67</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.1/2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>47.56</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>47.37</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.1/3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17.58</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>17.47</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.1/4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>15.03</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
<td>.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.1/5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11.64</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>11.84</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.2/1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>49.63</td>
<td>9.48</td>
<td>50.54</td>
<td>9.39</td>
<td>-2.18</td>
<td>.030*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.2/2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>50.20</td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td>50.40</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.2/3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>16.77</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>16.94</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
<td>.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.2/4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>15.27</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>15.31</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.2/5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>11.09</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>11.19</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
<td>.415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(df = n of pairs -1)

**KEY**

0 = teacher believed that pupil control was a high priority
X = teacher believed that pupil control was not a high priority
* = rejected hypothesis
1.5 **Hypothesis 4.5**

Hypothesis 4.5 (constituting 4.5.1/1 to 4.5.2/5) asserted that there would be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers did or did not believe that pupils prefer dependence to autonomy.

The results of testing hypotheses 4.5.1/1 to 4.5.2/5 are presented in Table 9.5. Hypothesis 4.5.1/1, concerning teachers believing that pupils prefer dependence to autonomy and pupils' gains/losses on a measure of verbal creativity, was rejected because the t value of 3.49 was significant at the .001 level. Hypothesis 4.5.2/1, regarding teachers believing that pupils do not prefer dependence to autonomy and pupils' gains/losses on a measure of verbal creativity was rejected because the t value of -3.53 was significant at the .001 level. The remaining hypotheses were accepted because t values were not significant at the .05 level.
Table 9.5 Beliefs of teachers about pupil control and pupil outcomes: results of testing hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H0</th>
<th>Belief of Teacher</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>TIME B Mean</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.5.1/1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>51.42</td>
<td>9.69</td>
<td>49.43</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.1/2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>49.32</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>50.01</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
<td>.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.1/3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>16.78</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>16.76</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.1/4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>14.81</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>-1.27</td>
<td>.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.1/5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>11.02</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.2/1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>48.92</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>50.75</td>
<td>10.28</td>
<td>-3.53</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.2/2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>50.28</td>
<td>8.62</td>
<td>49.92</td>
<td>8.91</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.2/3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>16.98</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>17.24</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>-1.59</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.2/4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>15.54</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>15.52</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.2/5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>11.22</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>11.52</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>-1.82</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(df = n of pairs -1)

KEY
0 = teacher believed that pupils prefer dependence to autonomy
X = teacher believed that pupils do not prefer dependence to autonomy
* = rejected hypothesis

1.6 Hypothesis 4.6

Hypothesis 4.6 (constituting 4.6.1/1 to 4.6.2/5) stated that there would be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers did or did not believe that less able pupils were capable of being creative.

The results of testing hypotheses 4.6.1/1 to 4.6.2/5 are
given in Table 9.6. Hypothesis 4.6.2/2, concerning teachers believing that less able pupils are unlikely to be creative and pupils' gains/losses on a measure of figural creativity, was rejected because the t value of 3.53 was significant at the .001 level. The remaining hypotheses were accepted because t values were not significant at the .05 level.

Table 9.6  Beliefs of teachers about less able pupils and pupil outcomes: results of testing hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H0</th>
<th>Belief of Teacher</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean ± s</th>
<th>TIME B Mean ± s</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.6.1/1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>50.90 ± 9.93</td>
<td>51.20 ± 9.34</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>.491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6.1/2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>50.40 ± 8.30</td>
<td>51.14 ± 8.36</td>
<td>-1.40</td>
<td>.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6.1/3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>16.83 ± 3.49</td>
<td>17.04 ± 3.69</td>
<td>-1.59</td>
<td>.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6.1/4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>15.17 ± 4.14</td>
<td>15.28 ± 4.45</td>
<td>-0.92</td>
<td>.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6.1/5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>10.96 ± 3.57</td>
<td>11.13 ± 3.63</td>
<td>-1.35</td>
<td>.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6.2/1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>46.57 ± 7.51</td>
<td>45.36 ± 7.67</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6.2/2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>47.26 ± 7.06</td>
<td>44.72 ± 6.81</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6.2/3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>17.13 ± 3.71</td>
<td>16.89 ± 3.78</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6.2/4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>15.29 ± 4.55</td>
<td>15.25 ± 4.56</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6.2/5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>12.10 ± 3.26</td>
<td>11.97 ± 3.84</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>.612</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(df = n of pairs -1)

KEY
0 = teacher believed that less able pupils can be creative
X = teacher believed that less able pupils are unlikely to be creative
* = rejected hypothesis
1.7 Hypothesis 4.7

Hypothesis 4.7 (constituting 4.7.1/1 to 4.7.2/5) stated that there would be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers did or did not believe that the most effective teaching is done 'out-front'.

The results of testing hypotheses 4.7.1/1 to 4.7.2/5 are reported in Table 9.7. Hypothesis 4.7.1/2, concerning teachers believing that the most effective teaching is done 'out-front' and pupils' gains/losses on a measure of figural creativity, was rejected because the t value of 3.53 was significant at the .001 level. The remaining hypotheses were accepted because t values were not significant at the .05 level.
Table 9.7 Beliefs of teachers about centredness and pupil outcomes: results of testing hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H₀</th>
<th>Belief of Teacher</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean s</th>
<th>TIME B Mean s</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.7.1/1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>46.57 7.51</td>
<td>45.36 7.67</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7.1/2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>47.26 7.06</td>
<td>44.72 6.81</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7.1/3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>17.13 3.71</td>
<td>16.89 3.78</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7.1/4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>15.29 4.55</td>
<td>15.25 4.56</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7.1/5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>12.10 3.26</td>
<td>11.97 3.84</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>.612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7.2/1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>50.90 9.93</td>
<td>51.20 9.34</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>.491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7.2/2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>50.40 8.30</td>
<td>51.14 8.36</td>
<td>-1.40</td>
<td>.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7.2/3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>16.83 3.49</td>
<td>17.04 3.69</td>
<td>-1.59</td>
<td>.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7.2/4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>15.17 4.14</td>
<td>15.28 4.45</td>
<td>-0.92</td>
<td>.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7.2/5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>10.96 3.57</td>
<td>11.13 3.63</td>
<td>-1.35</td>
<td>.177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(df = n of pairs -1)

KEY
0 = teacher believed that most effective teaching is 'out-front'
X = teacher believed that most effective teaching is not limited to being 'out-front'
* = rejected hypothesis

1.8 Hypothesis 4.8

Hypothesis 4.8 (constituting 4.8.1/1 to 4.8.2/5) asserted that there would be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers did or did not believe that drama provides a welcome chance for pupil mobility.
The results of testing hypotheses 4.8.1/1 to 4.8.1/5 are reported in Table 9.8. All these hypotheses were accepted because t values were not significant at the .05 level. It was not possible to test hypotheses 4.8.2/1 to 4.8.2/5 because all teachers in the sub-sample (n=16) believed that drama was a welcome opportunity for pupils to be mobile in the classroom, that is, no person held the opposite view.

Table 9.8 Beliefs of teachers about pupil mobility and pupil outcomes: results of testing hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H⁰</th>
<th>Belief of Teacher</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean</th>
<th>TIME B Mean</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8.1/1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>50.10</td>
<td>50.13</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>.951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8.1/2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>49.82</td>
<td>49.96</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8.1/3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>16.89</td>
<td>17.01</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
<td>.285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8.1/4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>15.27</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
<td>.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8.1/5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>11.17</td>
<td>11.28</td>
<td>-1.02</td>
<td>.310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8.2/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8.2/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.T.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(df = n of pairs -1)

KEY
0 = teacher believed that drama provides a welcome chance for pupil mobility
N.T. = hypothesis not tested because no teacher held this view
1.9 Hypothesis 4.9

Hypothesis 4.9 (constituting 4.9.1/1 to 4.9.2/5) stated that there would be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers did or did not believe in the value of competition between pupils as a learning motivator.

The results of testing hypotheses 4.9.1/1 to 4.9.2/5 are given in Table 9.9. Hypothesis 4.9.1/2, concerning teachers believing that competition between pupils leads to higher standards of work and pupils' gains/losses on a measure of figural creativity, was rejected because the t value of 2.18 was significant at the .03 level. Hypothesis 4.9.2/2, regarding teachers believing that competition between pupils was not an effective learning motivator and pupils' gains/losses on a measure of figural creativity, was rejected because the t value of -2.29 was significant at the .02 level. The remaining hypotheses were accepted because t values were not significant at the .05 level.
Table 9.9  Beliefs of teachers about pupil competition and pupil outcomes: results of testing hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H0</th>
<th>Belief of Teacher</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>TIME B Mean</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.9.1/1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>47.99</td>
<td>8.95</td>
<td>47.44</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9.1/2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>49.29</td>
<td>7.55</td>
<td>48.17</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>.030*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9.1/3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>17.37</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>17.48</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
<td>.457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9.1/4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>15.07</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>15.05</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>.892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9.1/5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>11.17</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>11.29</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9.2/1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>52.91</td>
<td>9.89</td>
<td>53.70</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>-1.23</td>
<td>.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9.2/2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>50.53</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>52.35</td>
<td>9.28</td>
<td>-2.29</td>
<td>.023*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9.2/3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>16.39</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
<td>.445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9.2/4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>15.37</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>15.57</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>-1.29</td>
<td>.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9.2/5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>11.16</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>11.27</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
<td>.534</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(df = n of pairs -1)

KEY
0 = teacher believed that competition between pupils has value
X = teacher believed that competition between pupils has little value
* = rejected hypothesis

1.10 Discussion

Tables 9.1 to 9.9 showed that very few separate teacher beliefs were associated with significant gains/losses of pupils on outcomes. Only 5 beliefs were related to significant pupils' gains on outcomes.
Firstly, significant pupils' gains on a measure of verbal creativity were promoted by teachers who believed that:

- keeping pupils quiet was not a high priority;
- pupils preferred dependence to autonomy.

Secondly, teachers who believed one or more of the following produced significant pupils' gains on a measure of figural creativity:

- the most effective teaching methods were not limited to 'out-front' strategies; and
- spontaneous teaching methods were capable of promoting desired ends.

Thirdly, teachers who believed that spontaneous teaching methods were capable of promoting desired ends also made significant pupils' gains on a measure of self-esteem.

Fourthly, teachers who did not like directing the work of others produced significant pupils' gains on a measure of empathy.

Out of the 90 hypotheses tested only 6 revealed significant associations between pupils' losses on outcomes and beliefs of teachers. Significant pupils' losses were made by teachers where they believed that:

- pupils preferred dependence to autonomy;
- less able pupils were unlikely to be creative;
- the most effective teaching is done 'out-front'; and
competition between pupils leads to higher standards of work.

Those teachers who believed that spontaneous teaching methods were not as effective as set plans in meeting desired ends promoted significant pupils' losses on measures of figural creativity and self-esteem. Significant pupils' losses were made by teachers on a measure of figural creativity where they believed that keeping pupils quiet was a high priority.

Finally, not one of the 9 belief elements was found to be associated with significant pupils' gains/losses on a measure of academic self-image. Examination is now made of separate aspects of teacher behaviour in a bid to determine their influence (if any) on pupil outcomes.

2. RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN TEACHER BEHAVIOUR AND PUPIL OUTCOMES

Teachers were grouped according to observations of their behaviour on 9 predetermined criteria; the areas of observation correspond with the 9 belief elements analysed above. The purpose was to show which of these aspects of teacher behaviour, if any, were associated with significant pupils' gains/losses on each measure of educational outcome. The discussion of findings is reserved until all hypotheses (5.1 to 5.9) testing has been reported.
2.1 Hypothesis 5.1

Hypothesis 5.1 (constituting 5.1.1/1 to 5.1.2/5) stated that there would be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers were grouped according to whether they allowed pupils to direct their own work.

The results of testing hypotheses 5.1.1/1 to 5.1.2/5 are reported in Table 9.10. Hypotheses 5.1.1/1 and 5.1.1/5, concerning teachers allowing pupils to direct their own work in drama and pupils' gains/losses on measures of verbal creativity and academic self-image respectively, were rejected because t values were significant at the .01 level or higher (5.1.1/1 : t = -3.73) (5.1.1/5 : t = -2.55). Hypothesis 5.1.2/1, regarding teachers not allowing pupils to direct their own work in drama and pupils' gains/losses on a measure of verbal creativity, was rejected because the t value of 2.57 was significant at the .01 level. The remaining hypotheses were accepted because t values were not significant at the .05 level.
Table 9.10 Behaviour of teachers concerning direction and pupil outcomes: results of testing hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H0</th>
<th>Behaviour of Teacher</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A</th>
<th>TIME B</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1.1/1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>50.03</td>
<td>52.42</td>
<td>-3.73</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.1/2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>51.55</td>
<td>51.68</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.1/3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>17.06</td>
<td>17.41</td>
<td>-1.82</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.1/4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>15.37</td>
<td>15.54</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
<td>.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.1/5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>10.84</td>
<td>11.34</td>
<td>-2.55</td>
<td>.012*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.2/1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>50.14</td>
<td>48.90</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>.011*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.2/2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>48.90</td>
<td>49.04</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.2/3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>16.80</td>
<td>16.80</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.2/4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>15.10</td>
<td>15.13</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.2/5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>11.34</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>.511</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(df = n of pairs -1)

KEY
0 = teacher allowed pupils to direct own work in drama
X = teacher did not allow pupils to direct own work in drama
* = rejected hypothesis

2.2 Hypothesis 5.2

Hypothesis 5.2 (constituting 5.2.1/1 to 5.2.2/5) asserted that there would be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers did or did not make use of pupil ideas in drama.
The results of testing hypotheses 5.2.1/1 to 5.2.2/5 are presented in Table 9.11. Hypotheses 5.2.1/1, 5.2.1/2, 5.2.1/3 and 5.2.1/5, concerning teachers making use of pupil ideas and pupils' gains/losses on measures of verbal and figural creativity, empathy and academic self-image respectively, were rejected because t values were significant at the .03 level or higher (5.2.1/1 : $t = -2.99$) (5.2.1/2 : $t = -2.52$) (5.2.1/3 : $t = -2.11$) (5.2.1/5 : $t = -2.67$). Hypotheses 5.2.2/1 and 5.2.2/2, regarding teachers not making use of pupil ideas and pupils' gains/losses on measures of verbal and figural creativity respectively, were rejected because t values were significant at the .009 level or higher (5.2.2/1 : $t = 2.64$) (5.2.2/2 : $t = 2.73$). The remaining hypotheses were accepted because t values were not significant at the .05 level.
Table 9.11 Behaviour of teachers concerning pupil ideas and pupil outcomes: results of testing hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Behaviour of Teacher</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean ± s</th>
<th>TIME B Mean ± s</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.2.1/1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>50.52 ± 9.71</td>
<td>52.21 ± 10.46</td>
<td>-2.99</td>
<td>.003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.1/2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>50.15 ± 9.10</td>
<td>52.08 ± 9.00</td>
<td>-2.52</td>
<td>.013*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.1/3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>16.87 ± 3.38</td>
<td>17.22 ± 3.76</td>
<td>-2.11</td>
<td>.036*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.1/4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>15.36 ± 4.38</td>
<td>15.55 ± 4.63</td>
<td>-1.22</td>
<td>.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.1/5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>10.93 ± 3.64</td>
<td>11.37 ± 3.68</td>
<td>-2.67</td>
<td>.008*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.2/1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>49.75 ± 9.64</td>
<td>48.34 ± 7.83</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>.009*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.2/2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>49.54 ± 7.29</td>
<td>48.14 ± 7.54</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.2/3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>16.90 ± 3.66</td>
<td>16.83 ± 3.65</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.2/4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>15.06 ± 4.07</td>
<td>15.04 ± 4.31</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.2/5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>11.37 ± 3.44</td>
<td>11.21 ± 3.68</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(df = n of pairs -1)

KEY
0 = teacher made use of pupil ideas
X = teacher did not make use of pupil ideas
* = rejected hypothesis

2.3 Hypothesis 5.3

Hypothesis 5.3 (constituting 5.3.1/1 to 5.3.2/5) stated that there would be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers did or did not keep to set plans in drama.
The results of testing hypotheses 5.3.1/1 to 5.3.2/5 are reported in Table 9.12. Hypothesis 5.3.1/1, concerning teachers keeping to set plans and pupils' gains/losses on a measure of verbal creativity, was rejected because the t value of 2.57 was significant at the .01 level. Hypotheses 5.3.2/1, 5.3.2/2, 5.3.2/3 and 5.3.2/5, regarding teachers not keeping to set plans and pupils' gains/losses on measures of verbal and figural creativity, empathy and academic self-image respectively, were rejected because t values were significant at the .003 level or higher (5.3.2/1 : t = -4.16) (5.3.2/2 : t = -3.15) (5.3.2/3 : t = -3.75) (5.3.2/5 : t = -3.23). The remaining hypotheses were accepted because t values were not significant at the .05 level. It was also found that three teachers of the sub-sample (n=16) had no set plans; these teachers were labelled 'abdicators'. Although no hypotheses were generated in respect of abdicators and pupil outcomes, the influence of this group of teachers on pupil outcomes is shown in Table 9.12.
Table 9.12 Behaviour of teachers concerning flexibility and pupil outcomes: results of testing hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Behaviour of Teacher</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean s</th>
<th>TIME B Mean s</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.3.1/1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>50.14 9.60</td>
<td>48.90 7.99</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>.011*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.1/2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>48.90 7.53</td>
<td>49.04 8.26</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.1/3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>16.80 3.69</td>
<td>16.80 3.73</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.1/4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>15.10 4.24</td>
<td>15.13 4.43</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.1/5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>11.34 3.49</td>
<td>11.25 3.70</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>.511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.2/1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>52.89 10.34</td>
<td>56.71 11.92</td>
<td>-4.16</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.2/2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50.80 9.60</td>
<td>54.50 10.01</td>
<td>-3.15</td>
<td>.003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.2/3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>17.84 3.38</td>
<td>18.75 3.13</td>
<td>-3.75</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.2/4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>16.21 3.80</td>
<td>16.40 4.20</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
<td>.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.2/5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11.10 3.47</td>
<td>12.03 3.33</td>
<td>-3.23</td>
<td>.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abd's/1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>47.77 8.83</td>
<td>49.02 9.12</td>
<td>-1.44</td>
<td>.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abd's/2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>52.15 8.59</td>
<td>49.44 6.58</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abd's/3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>16.44 2.98</td>
<td>16.36 3.70</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abd's/4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>14.72 4.35</td>
<td>14.86 4.68</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>.576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abd's/5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>10.63 3.73</td>
<td>10.80 3.83</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
<td>.533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(df = n of pairs -1)

KEY
0 = teacher kept to set plans
X = teacher did not keep to set plans
Y = Abdicator - teacher had no set plans (and took no part in drama)
* = rejected hypothesis

2.4 Hypothesis 5.4

Hypothesis 5.4 (constituting 5.4.1/1 to 5.4.2/5) asserted that there would be no significant gain or loss on
each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers did or did not attempt to maintain pupil silence in drama.

The results of testing hypotheses 5.4.1/1 to 5.4.2/5 are reported in Table 9.13. Hypotheses 5.4.1/1 and 5.4.1/2, concerning teachers attempting to maintain pupil silence in drama and pupils' gains/losses on measures of verbal and figural creativity respectively, were rejected because t values were significant at the .03 level or higher. Hypotheses 5.4.2/1, 5.4.2/2 and 5.4.2/5, regarding teachers not attempting to maintain pupil silence in drama and pupils' gains/losses on measures of verbal and figural creativity and academic self-image respectively, were rejected because t values were significant at the .05 level or higher (5.4.2/1 : t = -1.94) (5.3.2/2 : t = -3.00) (5.4.2/5 : t = -2.22). The remaining hypotheses were accepted because t values were not significant at the .05 level.
### Table 9.13 Behaviour of teachers concerning pupil control and pupil outcomes: results of testing hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H0</th>
<th>Behaviour of Teacher</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean</th>
<th>TIME B Mean</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.4.1/1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>48.93</td>
<td>47.62</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>.037*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.1/2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>49.11</td>
<td>46.81</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.1/3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>16.73</td>
<td>16.97</td>
<td>-1.36</td>
<td>.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.1/4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>14.89</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.1/5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>11.12</td>
<td>10.94</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.2/1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>50.94</td>
<td>51.92</td>
<td>-1.94</td>
<td>.054*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.2/2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>50.33</td>
<td>52.21</td>
<td>-3.00</td>
<td>.003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.2/3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>17.04</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.2/4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>15.41</td>
<td>15.47</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>.664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.2/5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>11.19</td>
<td>11.52</td>
<td>-2.22</td>
<td>.027*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(df = n of pairs -1)

**KEY**

0 = teacher attempted to maintain pupil silence
X = teacher did not attempt to maintain pupil silence
* = rejected hypothesis

---

2.5 **Hypothesis 5.5**

Hypothesis 5.5 (constituting 5.5.1/1 to 5.5.2/5) asserted that there would be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers did or did not allow pupils to make decisions in drama.
The results of testing hypotheses 5.5.1/1 to 5.5.2/5 are given in Table 9.14. Hypotheses 5.5.1/1 and 5.5.1/5, concerning teachers allowing pupils to make decisions in drama and pupils' gains/losses on measures of verbal creativity and academic self-image respectively, were rejected because t values were significant at the .01 level or higher (5.5.1/1 : \( t = -3.73 \)) (5.5.1/5 : \( t = -2.55 \)). Hypothesis 5.5.2/1, regarding teachers not allowing pupils to make decisions in drama and pupils' gains/losses on a measure of verbal creativity, was rejected because the t value of 2.57 was significant at the .01 level. The remaining hypotheses were accepted because t values were not significant at the .05 level.
Table 9.14  Behaviour of teachers concerning pupil decision-making and pupil outcomes: results of testing hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ho</th>
<th>Behaviour of Teacher</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean s</th>
<th>TIME B Mean s</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.5.1/1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>50.03 9.83</td>
<td>52.42 11.09</td>
<td>-3.73</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.1/2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>51.55 9.04</td>
<td>51.68 8.61</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.1/3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>17.06 3.22</td>
<td>17.41 3.65</td>
<td>-1.82</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.1/4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>15.37 4.17</td>
<td>15.54 4.52</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
<td>.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.1/5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>10.84 3.61</td>
<td>11.34 3.66</td>
<td>-2.55</td>
<td>.012*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.2/1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>50.14 9.60</td>
<td>48.90 7.99</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>.011*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.2/2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>48.90 7.53</td>
<td>49.04 8.26</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.2/3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>16.80 3.69</td>
<td>16.80 3.73</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.2/4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>15.10 4.24</td>
<td>15.13 4.43</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.2/5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>11.34 3.49</td>
<td>11.25 3.70</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>.511</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(df = n of pairs -1)

KEY

0 = teacher allowed pupils to make decisions in drama
X = teacher did not allow pupils to make decisions in drama
* = rejected hypothesis

2.6 Hypothesis 5.6

Hypothesis 5.6 (constituting 5.6.1/1 to 5.6.2/5) stated that there would be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers did or did not allow less able pupils to participate in drama.
The results of testing hypotheses 5.6.1/1 to 5.6.2/5 are reported in Table 9.15. Hypotheses 5.6.1/2 and 5.6.1/5, concerning teachers allowing less able pupils to participate in drama and pupils' gains/losses on measures of figural creativity and academic self-image respectively, were rejected because t values were significant at the .04 level or higher (5.6.1/2 : t = -2.72) (5.6.1/5 : t = -2.02). Hypothesis 5.6.2/2, regarding teachers not allowing less able pupils to participate in drama and pupils' gains/losses on a measure of figural creativity, was rejected because the t value of 4.10 was significant at the .000 level. The remaining hypotheses were accepted because t values were not significant at the .05 level.
Table 9.15 Behaviour of teachers concerning less able pupils and pupil outcomes: results of testing hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( H^0 )</th>
<th>Behaviour of Teacher</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean s</th>
<th>TIME B Mean s</th>
<th>( t ) value</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.6.1/1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>51.27 9.94</td>
<td>51.09 10.03</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6.1/2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>49.40 8.35</td>
<td>50.97 8.51</td>
<td>-2.72</td>
<td>.007*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6.1/3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>17.00 3.49</td>
<td>17.07 3.81</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td>.627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6.1/4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>15.11 4.46</td>
<td>15.32 4.61</td>
<td>-1.65</td>
<td>.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6.1/5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>11.12 3.67</td>
<td>11.40 3.74</td>
<td>-2.02</td>
<td>.044*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6.2/1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>47.76 8.68</td>
<td>48.20 7.41</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6.2/2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>50.69 7.77</td>
<td>47.95 8.04</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6.2/3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>16.65 3.63</td>
<td>16.89 3.49</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
<td>.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6.2/4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>15.36 3.68</td>
<td>15.17 4.16</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6.2/5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>11.26 3.28</td>
<td>11.04 3.54</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.295</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \text{df} = n \text{ of pairs} - 1 \)

KEY
0 = teacher allowed less able pupils to participate in drama
X = teacher did not allow less able pupils to participate in drama
* = rejected hypothesis

2.7 Hypothesis 5.7

Hypothesis 5.7 (constituting 5.7.1/1 to 5.7.2/5) asserted that there would be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers did or did not maintain a central position in drama.
The results of testing hypotheses 5.7.1/1 to 5.7.2/5 are presented in Table 9.16. Hypothesis 5.7.1/1, concerning teachers maintaining a central position in drama and pupils' gains/losses on a measure of verbal creativity, was rejected because the t value of 2.57 was significant at the .01 level. Hypotheses 5.7.2/1 and 5.7.2/5, regarding teachers not maintaining a central position in drama and pupils' gains/losses on measures of verbal creativity and academic self-image respectively, were rejected because t values were significant at the .01 level or higher (5.7.2/1 : t = -3.73) (5.7.2/5 : t = -2.55). The remaining hypotheses were accepted because t values were not significant at the .05 level.
Table 9.16 \( H^0 \) Behaviour of teachers concerning centredness and pupil outcomes: results of testing hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( H^0 )</th>
<th>Behaviour of Teacher</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean</th>
<th>TIME B Mean</th>
<th>( t ) value</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.7.1/1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>50.14</td>
<td>48.90</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>.011*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7.1/2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>48.90</td>
<td>49.04</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7.1/3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>16.80</td>
<td>16.80</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7.1/4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>15.10</td>
<td>15.13</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7.1/5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>11.34</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>.511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7.2/1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>50.03</td>
<td>52.42</td>
<td>-3.73</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7.2/2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>51.55</td>
<td>51.68</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7.2/3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>17.06</td>
<td>17.41</td>
<td>-1.82</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7.2/4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>15.37</td>
<td>15.54</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
<td>.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7.2/5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>10.84</td>
<td>11.34</td>
<td>-2.55</td>
<td>.012*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \text{(df} = \text{n of pairs} -1) \)

**KEY**

0 = teacher maintained a central position in drama
X = teacher did not maintain a central position in drama
* = rejected hypothesis

2.8 Hypothesis 5.8

Hypothesis 5.8 (constituting 5.8.1/1 to 5.8.2/5) stated that there would be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers did or did not restrict pupil mobility in drama.
The results of testing hypotheses 5.8.1/1 to 5.8.2/5 are reported in Table 9.17. Hypotheses 5.8.1/2 and 5.8.1/5, concerning teachers not restricting pupil mobility in drama and pupils' gains/losses on measures of figural creativity and academic self-image respectively, were rejected because t values were significant at the .03 or higher (5.8.1/2 : \( t = -2.11 \)) (5.8.1/5 : \( t = -2.76 \)). Hypothesis 5.8.2/2, regarding teachers restricting pupil mobility in drama and pupils' gains/losses on a measure of figural creativity, was rejected because the t value of 2.41 was significant at the .01 level. The remaining hypotheses were accepted because t values were not significant at the .05 level.
Table 9.17  Behaviour of teachers concerning pupil mobility and pupil outcomes: results of testing hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H0</th>
<th>Behaviour of Teacher</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean</th>
<th>TIME B Mean</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.8.1/1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>50.13 9.38</td>
<td>50.94 10.37</td>
<td>-1.54</td>
<td>.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8.1/2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>49.63 8.78</td>
<td>51.05 8.82</td>
<td>-2.11</td>
<td>.036*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8.1/3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>17.06 3.46</td>
<td>17.26 3.74</td>
<td>-1.32</td>
<td>.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8.1/4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>15.29 4.40</td>
<td>15.47 4.61</td>
<td>-1.24</td>
<td>.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8.1/5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>11.23 3.70</td>
<td>11.65 3.80</td>
<td>-2.76</td>
<td>.006*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8.2/1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>50.07 10.04</td>
<td>49.16 7.81</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8.2/2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>50.05 7.40</td>
<td>48.66 7.85</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>.017*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8.2/3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>16.68 3.61</td>
<td>16.71 3.65</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>.867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8.2/4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>15.08 3.98</td>
<td>15.04 4.28</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>.748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8.2/5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>11.08 3.35</td>
<td>10.84 3.49</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(df = n of pairs -1)

KEY
0 = teacher allowed pupils to be mobile in drama
X = teacher did not allow pupils to be mobile in drama
* = rejected hypothesis

2.9  Hypothesis 5.9

Hypothesis 5.9 (constituting 5.9.1/1 to 5.9.2/5) stated that there would be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers did or did not encourage the use of competition between pupils in drama.
The results of testing hypotheses 5.9.1/1 to 5.9.2/5 are given in Table 9.18. Hypotheses 5.9.2/3 and 5.9.2/5, concerning teachers not encouraging competition between pupils in drama and pupils' gains/losses on measures of empathy and academic self-image respectively, were rejected because t values were significant at the .01 level or higher (5.9.2/3 : t = -2.69) (5.9.2/5 : t = -2.54). The remaining hypotheses were accepted because t values were not significant at the .05 level.

Table 9.18 Behaviour of teachers concerning pupil competition and pupil outcomes: results of testing hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H0</th>
<th>Behaviour of Teacher</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean s</th>
<th>TIME B Mean s</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.9.1/1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>49.06 9.20</td>
<td>48.47 7.98</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9.1/2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>47.99 7.22</td>
<td>48.53 8.34</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
<td>.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9.1/3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>16.89 3.75</td>
<td>16.69 3.70</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9.1/4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>15.20 4.17</td>
<td>15.27 4.39</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>.668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9.1/5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>11.63 3.52</td>
<td>11.45 3.76</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9.2/1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>51.10 10.02</td>
<td>51.70 10.23</td>
<td>-1.05</td>
<td>.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9.2/2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>51.56 8.64</td>
<td>51.32 8.38</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9.2/3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>16.88 3.32</td>
<td>17.32 3.70</td>
<td>-2.69</td>
<td>.008*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9.2/4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>15.19 4.46</td>
<td>15.28 4.54</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
<td>.531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9.2/5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>10.72 3.51</td>
<td>11.12 3.60</td>
<td>-2.54</td>
<td>.012*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(df = n of pairs -1)

KEY
0 = teacher encouraged competition between pupils in drama
X = teacher did not encourage competition between pupils in drama
* = rejected hypothesis
2.10 Discussion

Significant pupils' gains on verbal creativity were related to the following aspects of teacher behaviour:

- pupils were allowed to direct their own work in drama;
- teachers did not maintain pupil silence in drama; and
- teachers maintained a peripheral stance in drama.

Significant pupils' gains on figural creativity were found to be associated with:

- the absence of competition between pupils;
- the use of pupil ideas;
- the participation of all pupils in drama; and
- the exercise of spontaneous teaching strategies.

The development of pupil empathy was related to the teachers' exercise of spontaneous teaching strategies and the use of pupils' ideas in drama. Pupil self-esteem was not found to be associated with any of the 9 aspects of observed teacher behaviour.

Pupil academic self-image was found to be associated with all 9 facets of teacher behaviour. That is:

- pupils were allowed to direct their own work in drama;
- pupils were allowed mobility in drama;
pupils were able to make decisions in drama;

- teachers maintained a peripheral stance in drama;

- teachers did not maintain pupil silence in drama;

- teachers exercised spontaneous teaching strategies;

- all pupils participated in drama;

- teachers did not encourage competition between pupils in drama; and

- pupils were able to use their own ideas.

Significant pupils' losses were only found on measures of creativity. In respect of verbal creativity significant pupils' losses were evidenced where teachers:

- did not allow pupils to direct their own work in drama;

- did not allow pupils to use their own ideas;

- kept to set plans;

- attempted to maintain pupil silence in drama;

- maintained a central stance in drama; and

- did not allow pupils to make decisions in drama.

With regard to figural creativity, significant losses were reported on this outcome where teachers:

- did not allow pupils to direct their own work in drama;
. kept to set plans;
. attempted to maintain pupil silence in drama;
. did not allow less able pupils to participate in drama; and
. placed restrictions on pupil mobility in drama.

It would appear that more teacher behaviour is associated with pupil outcomes than teacher beliefs. However, the results suggest that teacher behaviour is not enough in itself to guarantee pupil success on outcomes.
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CHAPTER 10

ANALYSIS OF DATA RELATING TO COMBINATIONS OF BELIEF-BEHAVIOUR OF TEACHERS, DRAMA CHOICES AND PUPIL OUTCOMES

INTRODUCTION

Having examined the respective influences of single elements of teacher beliefs and behaviour on pupil outcomes, the purpose of the present analysis is to test hypotheses relating to various combinations of teacher belief-behaviour and the achievement of intended pupil outcomes. There is a need to show which combinations of belief-behaviour of teachers are associated with significant gains and losses of pupils on outcomes. How important is it for pupil outcomes that teachers act in accord with their beliefs? Is it more important to be consistent when using one kind of drama than another? These questions provided impetus for the present analysis.

For purposes of analysis, responses of the sub-sample of teachers (n=16) to 9 belief statements# on the Teacher Opinionnaire were examined in relation to 9 corresponding aspects of teacher behaviour* which were observed with the use of the Drama Inventory. Teachers agreed or disagreed

# These provided the bases of hypotheses 4.1 to 4.9.
* These provided the bases of hypotheses 5.1 to 5.9.
with each of the 9 belief statements on the Teacher Opinionnaire, that is, they took belief stance A or B. In terms of teacher behaviour teachers acted in accord with belief stance A or B. Thus four combinations of belief-behaviour were identified and used to categorise the sub-sample of teachers (n=16) according to their belief-behaviour stances in respect of:

- direction;
- pupil ideas;
- flexibility;
- pupil control;
- pupil dependence;
- less able pupils;
- centredness;
- pupil mobility; and
- pupil competition.

The present analysis is divided into 9 parts each of which concerns the testing of hypotheses relating to 1 of the 9 belief-behaviour elements above. Within each part, hypotheses are tested in relation to belief-behaviour combinations of teachers and pupil outcomes:

1. regardless of drama choice; and
2. according to drama choice (dramatic play, drama exercise and theatre).

This 9 part analysis is followed by a summary of findings and an overview relating to belief-behaviour characteristics of teachers and pupil outcomes.
The statistical and coding procedures employed to test hypotheses in the present analysis are the same as those used in Chapter 9. All hypotheses are presented fully in Chapter 6.

1. **Hypothesis 6.1**

Hypothesis 6.1 (constituting 6.1.1 to 6.1.4) stated that there would be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers were grouped according to beliefs and behaviour regarding direction (see Key).

The results of testing hypotheses 6.1.1 to 6.1.4 are reported in Table 10.1. Hypothesis 6.1.2 concerning teachers liking direction and allowing pupils to direct their own work and pupils' gains/losses on a measure of figural creativity, was rejected because the $t$ value of 3.79 was significant at the .000 level. Hypotheses 6.1.3/1 and 6.1.3/2, regarding teachers disliking direction and not allowing pupils to direct their own work and pupils' gains/losses on measures of verbal and figural creativity respectively, were rejected because $t$ values were significant at the .01 level or higher (6.1.3/1 : $t = 2.80$)

# It is these constituent hypotheses, shown in parenthesis following each main hypothesis, which were actually tested and reported. For example hypothesis 6.1 is only a summary of hypotheses 6.1.1 to 6.1.4/5.
Hypotheses 6.1.4/1, 6.1.4/2, 6.1.4/3 and 6.1.4/5, concerning teachers disliking direction and allowing pupils to direct their own work and pupils' gains/losses on measures of verbal and figural creativity, empathy and academic self-image respectively, were rejected because t values were significant at the .003 level or higher (6.1.4/1 : t = -4.16) (6.1.4/2 : t = -3.15) (6.1.4/3 : t = -3.75) (6.1.4/5 : t = -3.23). All other hypotheses, concerning teacher belief-behaviour characteristics regarding direction and subsequent pupil outcomes, were accepted because t values were not significant at the .05 level or higher.

Hypotheses 7.1, 7.2 and 7.3

Hypotheses 7.1 (7.1.1/1 to 7.1.4/5), 7.2 (7.2.1 to 7.2.4/5) and 7.3 (7.3.1/1 to 7.3.4/5) asserted that there would be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers of dramatic play, drama exercise and theatre respectively were grouped according to beliefs and behaviour regarding direction (see Key).

The results of testing hypotheses 7.1.1/1 to 7.1.4/5, 7.2.1/1 to 7.2.1/5 and 7.3.1/1 to 7.3.1/5 are given in Table 10.2. Hypotheses 7.2.2/1 to 7.2.2/5 were not tested because neither teachers of drama exercise nor theatre possessed these belief-behaviour characteristics.

Hypothesis 7.1.1/2, concerning teachers of dramatic play liking direction and directing the work of pupils and
pupils' gains/losses on a measure of figural creativity, was rejected because the t value of -7.51 was significant at the .001 level. Hypothesis 7.1.2/2, regarding teachers of dramatic play liking direction and allowing pupils to direct their own work and pupils' gains/losses on a measure of figural creativity was not accepted because the t value of 3.79 was significant at the .000 level. Hypotheses 7.1.4/1, 7.1.4/2, 7.1.4/3 and 7.1.4/5, concerning teachers of dramatic play disliking direction and allowing pupils to direct their own work and pupils' gains/losses on measures of verbal and figural creativity, empathy and academic self-image respectively, were rejected because t values were significant at the .003 level or higher. (7.1.4/1 : t = -4.16) (7.1.4/2 : t = -3.15) (7.1.4/3 : t = -3.75) (7.1.4/5 : t = -3.23).

Hypothesis 7.2.1/1 and 7.2.1/2, concerning teachers of drama exercise liking direction and not allowing pupils to direct their own work and pupils' gains/losses on measures of verbal and figural creativity respectively, were not accepted because t values were significant at the .003 level or higher (7.2.1/1 : t = 3.67) (7.2.1/2 : t = 3.20). Hypotheses 7.2.3/1 to 7.2.3/4, regarding teachers of drama exercise disliking direction and not allowing pupils to direct their own work and pupils' gains/losses on measures of verbal and figural creativity, empathy and self-esteem, were rejected because t values were significant at the .04 level or higher (7.2.3/1 : t = 2.86) (7.2.3/2 : t = 2.96) (7.2.3/3 : t = -2.08) (7.2.3/4 : t = -2.22).
Hypothesis 7.3.2/4, concerning teachers of theatre disliking direction and not allowing pupils to direct their own work and pupils' gains/losses on a measure of self-esteem, was rejected because the t value of 2.73 was significant at the .01 level. Inspection of Table 10.2 shows that other hypotheses, relating to teachers using different kinds of drama and belief-behaviour elements regarding direction and subsequent pupil outcomes, were accepted because t values were not significant at the .05 level or higher.
### Table 10.1 Belief-behaviour of teachers concerning direction and pupil outcomes: results of testing hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Belief- Behaviour</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean s</th>
<th>TIME B Mean s</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1.1/1</td>
<td>O O</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>48.74 8.93</td>
<td>48.05 7.90</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.1/2</td>
<td>O O</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>47.36 6.82</td>
<td>48.60 8.53</td>
<td>-1.81</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.1/3</td>
<td>O O</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>16.58 3.75</td>
<td>16.53 3.78</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>.748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.1/4</td>
<td>O O</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>14.89 4.36</td>
<td>14.94 4.58</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.1/5</td>
<td>O O</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>11.41 3.38</td>
<td>11.32 3.62</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>.568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.2/1</td>
<td>O X</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>47.77 1.04</td>
<td>49.02 1.07</td>
<td>-1.44</td>
<td>.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.2/2</td>
<td>O X</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>52.15 8.59</td>
<td>49.44 6.58</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.2/3</td>
<td>O X</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>16.44 2.98</td>
<td>16.36 3.70</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.2/4</td>
<td>O X</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>14.72 4.35</td>
<td>14.86 4.68</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>.576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.2/5</td>
<td>O X</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>10.63 3.73</td>
<td>10.80 3.83</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
<td>.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.3/1</td>
<td>X O</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54.03 10.36</td>
<td>51.25 7.84</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.007*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.3/2</td>
<td>X O</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>53.15 7.81</td>
<td>50.28 7.40</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.3/3</td>
<td>X O</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>17.39 3.49</td>
<td>17.54 3.49</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>.523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.3/4</td>
<td>X O</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>15.67 3.86</td>
<td>15.65 3.98</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>.947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.3/5</td>
<td>X O</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>11.15 3.81</td>
<td>11.06 3.92</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.4/1</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>52.89 10.34</td>
<td>56.71 11.92</td>
<td>-4.16</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.4/2</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50.80 9.60</td>
<td>54.50 10.01</td>
<td>-3.15</td>
<td>.003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.4/3</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>17.84 3.38</td>
<td>18.75 3.13</td>
<td>-3.75</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.4/4</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>16.21 3.80</td>
<td>16.40 4.20</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.4/5</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11.10 3.47</td>
<td>12.03 3.33</td>
<td>-3.23</td>
<td>.002*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(df = n of pairs -1)

**KEY**

O O = teacher liked directing and did not allow pupils to direct own work
O X = teacher liked directing and allowed pupils to direct own work
X O = teacher disliked directing and did not allow pupils to direct own work
X X = teacher disliked directing and allowed pupils to direct own work
N.T. = hypothesis not tested - sample without belief-behaviour combination
* = rejected hypothesis
Table 10.2  Belief-behaviour of teachers concerning direction, drama choice and pupil outcomes: results of testing hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Belief-Behaviour</th>
<th>Drama Type</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A</th>
<th>TIME B</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1.1/1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53.03</td>
<td>53.65</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>.657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1.1/2</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41.92</td>
<td>57.03</td>
<td>-7.51</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1.1/3</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16.57</td>
<td>17.07</td>
<td>-1.26</td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1.1/4</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.88</td>
<td>15.19</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
<td>.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1.1/5</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10.84</td>
<td>11.46</td>
<td>-1.73</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1.2/1</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>47.77</td>
<td>49.02</td>
<td>-1.44</td>
<td>.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1.2/2</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>52.15</td>
<td>49.44</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1.2/3</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>16.44</td>
<td>16.36</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1.2/4</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>14.72</td>
<td>14.86</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>.576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1.2/5</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>10.63</td>
<td>10.80</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
<td>.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1.3/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1.3/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1.3/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1.4/1</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>52.89</td>
<td>56.71</td>
<td>-4.16</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1.4/2</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50.80</td>
<td>54.50</td>
<td>-3.15</td>
<td>.003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1.4/3</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>17.84</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>-3.75</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1.4/4</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>16.21</td>
<td>16.40</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1.4/5</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>12.03</td>
<td>-3.23</td>
<td>.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2.1/1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48.80</td>
<td>45.36</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2.1/2</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48.63</td>
<td>46.02</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2.1/3</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17.34</td>
<td>16.95</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2.1/4</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15.27</td>
<td>15.44</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>.606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2.1/5</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12.53</td>
<td>12.59</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>.828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2.2/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2.2/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued over ...
Table 10.2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Belief- Behaviour</th>
<th>Drama Type</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean</th>
<th>TIME A s</th>
<th>TIME B Mean</th>
<th>TIME B s</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.2.3/1</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>55.07</td>
<td>10.79</td>
<td>51.38</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>.007*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2.3/2</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>52.61</td>
<td>7.88</td>
<td>48.07</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>.005*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2.3/3</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16.88</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>17.45</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>-2.08</td>
<td>.044*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2.3/4</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14.88</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>15.42</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>-2.22</td>
<td>.032*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2.3/5</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10.14</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>9.69</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2.4/1</td>
<td>to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3.1/1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>47.63</td>
<td>9.05</td>
<td>47.87</td>
<td>7.55</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3.1/2</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>48.15</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>47.66</td>
<td>7.99</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>.445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3.1/3</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>16.25</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>16.20</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3.1/4</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>14.73</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>14.66</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>.728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3.1/5</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>11.04</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3.2/1</td>
<td>to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3.2/5</td>
<td>to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3.3/1</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52.04</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>51.00</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3.3/2</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>54.18</td>
<td>7.74</td>
<td>54.50</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>.748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3.3/3</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.36</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>17.72</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3.3/4</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17.18</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>16.09</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>.013*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3.3/5</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.09</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>-1.21</td>
<td>.238</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(df = n of pairs -1)

**KEY**

0 0 = teacher liked directing and did not allow pupils to direct own work
0 X = teacher liked directing and allowed pupils to direct own work
X 0 = teacher disliked directing and did not allow pupils to direct own work
X X = teacher disliked directing and allowed pupils to direct own work
N.T. = hypothesis not tested - sample without belief-behaviour combination
* = rejected hypothesis
Dp = dramatic play
De = drama exercise
T = theatre
1.2 Discussion

As a group, teachers who disliked directing the work of others, and who allowed pupils to direct their own drama, were seen to produce significant pupil gains on creativity (verbal and non-verbal), empathy and academic self-image. Because only teachers of dramatic play possessed this belief-behaviour combination, it is only they who were seen to generate significant pupil gains on four out of five educational outcomes.

Teachers who disliked directing the work of others, but nevertheless directed pupils' work in drama, recorded significant pupil losses on measures of verbal and non-verbal creativity. Teachers of theatre who possessed this particular belief-behaviour combination did not record pupil losses on creativity. However, they did produce significant pupil losses on self-esteem. Drama exercise teachers who disliked directing the work of others, but who directed pupil drama, produced significant pupil losses on verbal and non-verbal creativity. It was also noted that these particular drama exercise teachers also produced significant pupil gains on empathy and self-esteem.

There were some teachers who disliked directing the work of others and allowed pupils to direct their own drama work. These teachers came only from the dramatic play group and were labelled 'abdicators' for purposes of this analysis. They were given this term because they offered no
assistance whatsoever to pupils in drama. They believed that drama should be entirely of the pupils' own doing, including all aspects of organisation.

Teachers who liked directing the work of others, and who directed the drama work of pupils, produced neither pupil gains nor losses on educational outcomes. However, when we examine specific drama groups employing this belief-behaviour combination, a number of observations may be made. One teacher of dramatic play was seen to produce significant pupil gains on non-verbal creativity. Elsewhere, teachers of theatre with this belief-behaviour combination did not make any gains on outcomes at all. Teachers of drama exercise produced significant pupil losses on both verbal and non-verbal creativity.

Overall, the teacher's ability to be consistent between beliefs and behaviour may hold implications for pupil outcomes when doing specific kinds of drama. Teachers of dramatic play who were inconsistent not only failed to produce pupil gains on four out of five outcomes, but also generated pupil losses on non-verbal creativity. Similarly, theatre teachers who were inconsistent recorded significant pupil losses on self-esteem. Consistent theatre teachers made neither losses nor gains on pupil outcomes. However, all drama exercise teachers were seen to make significant pupil losses on verbal and non-verbal creativity whether
they were consistent or inconsistent. It is notable, however, that drama exercise teachers who were inconsistent managed to generate significant pupil gains on empathy and self-esteem regardless of losses elsewhere.

2. **Hypothesis 6.2**

Hypothesis 6.2 (constituting 6.2.1/1 to 6.2.4/5) stated that there would be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers were grouped according to beliefs and behaviour regarding pupil ideas (see Key).

The results of testing hypotheses 6.2.1/1 to 6.2.1/5 and 6.2.3/1 to 6.2.3/5 are given in Table 10.3. It was not possible to test hypotheses 6.2.1/1, 6.2.2/1 to 6.2.2/5 and 6.2.4/1 to 6.2.4/5 because no teacher in the sub-sample (n=16) had the necessary combinations of belief and behaviour. Hypotheses 6.2.1/1, 6.2.1/2, 6.2.1/3 and 6.2.1/5, concerning teachers believing in, and using, pupil ideas and pupils' gains/losses on measures of verbal and figural creativity, empathy and academic self-image respectively, were rejected because t values were significant at the .03 level or higher (6.2.1/1 : t = -2.99) (6.2.1/2 : t = -2.52) (6.2.1/3: t = -2.11) (6.2.1/5 : t = -2.67). Hypotheses 6.2.2/1 and 6.2.2/2, regarding teachers' believing in, and using, pupil ideas and pupils' gains/
losses on measures of verbal and figural creativity respectively, were rejected because t values were significant at the .009 level or higher (6.2.2/1 t = 2.64) (6.2.2/2 : t = 2.73). All other hypotheses concerning beliefs and actions of teachers in respect of pupil ideas and pupil outcomes were accepted because t values were not significant at the .05 level or higher.

2.1 Hypotheses 7.4, 7.5 and 7.6

Hypotheses 7.4 (7.4.1/1 to 7.4.4/5), 7.5 (7.5.1/1 to 7.5.4/5) and 7.6 (7.6.1/1 to 7.6.4/5) stated that there would be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers of dramatic play, drama exercise and theatre respectively were grouped according to beliefs and behaviour regarding pupil ideas (see Key).

The results of testing hypotheses 7.4.1/1 to 7.4.1/5, 7.5.1/1 to 7.5.1/5, 7.5.3/1 to 7.5.3/5 and 7.6.2/1 to 7.6.2/5 are presented in Table 10.4. Hypotheses 7.4.2/1 to 7.4.4/5, 7.5.2/1 to 7.5.2/5, 7.5.4/1 to 7.5.4/5, 7.6.1/1 to 7.6.1/5 and 7.6.3/1 to 7.6.4/5 were not tested because no teachers had these combinations of belief, behaviour and drama choice.

Hypotheses 7.4.1/1, 7.4.1/2, 7.4.1/3 and 7.4.1/5, concerning teachers of dramatic play believing in, and using pupil ideas and pupils' gains/losses on verbal and figural
creativity, empathy and academic self image respectively, were not accepted because t values were significant at the .03 level or higher (7.4.1/2 : $t = -3.60$) (7.4.1/2 : $t = -3.24$) (7.4.1/3 : $t = -2.17$) (7.4.1/5 $t = -3.00$).

Hypothesis 7.5.1/2, concerning teachers of drama exercise believing in, and using, pupil ideas and pupils' gains/losses on a measure of figural creativity, was rejected because the t value of 4.12 was significant at the .000 level. Hypotheses 7.5.2/1 and 7.5.2/2, regarding teachers of drama exercise believing in, but not using, pupil ideas and pupils' gains/losses on measures of verbal and figural creativity respectively, were rejected because t values were significant at the .002 level or higher (7.5.2/1 : $t = 4.57$) (7.5.2/2 : $t = 3.24$). Other hypotheses relating to belief-behaviour of teachers in respect of pupil ideas, drama choices and pupil outcomes, were accepted because t values were not significant at the .05 level.
Table 10.3 Belief-behaviour of teachers concerning pupil ideas and pupil outcomes: results of testing hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Belief-Behaviour</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean</th>
<th>TIME A s</th>
<th>TIME B Mean</th>
<th>TIME B s</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.2.1/1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>50.52</td>
<td>9.71</td>
<td>52.21</td>
<td>10.46</td>
<td>-2.99</td>
<td>.003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.1/2</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>50.15</td>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>52.08</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>-2.52</td>
<td>.013*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.1/3</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>16.87</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>17.22</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>-2.11</td>
<td>.036*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.1/4</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>15.36</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>15.55</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>-1.22</td>
<td>.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.1/5</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>10.93</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>11.37</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>-2.67</td>
<td>.008*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.2/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.T.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.2/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.T.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.3/1</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>49.75</td>
<td>9.64</td>
<td>48.34</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>.009*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.3/2</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>49.54</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>48.14</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>.007*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.3/3</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>16.90</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>16.83</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.3/4</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>15.06</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>15.04</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.3/5</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>11.37</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>11.21</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.4/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.T.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.4/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.T.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(df = n of pairs -1)

**KEY**

0 0 = teacher believed in, and used, pupil ideas
0 X = teacher believed in, but did not use, pupil ideas
N.T. = hypothesis not tested - sample without belief-behaviour combination
* = rejected hypothesis
Table 10.4 Belief-behaviour of teachers concerning pupil ideas, drama choice and pupil outcomes: results of testing hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Belief-Behaviour</th>
<th>Drama Type</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean s</th>
<th>TIME B Mean s</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.4.1/1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>50.54</td>
<td>9.94</td>
<td>52.63</td>
<td>10.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4.1/2</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>49.94</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>52.58</td>
<td>8.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4.1/3</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>16.98</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>17.36</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4.1/4</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>15.29</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>15.48</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4.1/5</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>10.84</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>11.36</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4.2/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4.2/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5.1/1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50.31</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td>48.12</td>
<td>7.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5.1/2</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>52.25</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>47.31</td>
<td>8.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5.1/3</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.81</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>15.93</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5.1/4</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>16.25</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5.1/5</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.81</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5.2/1</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>52.08</td>
<td>9.95</td>
<td>48.21</td>
<td>8.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5.2/2</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>50.13</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>46.91</td>
<td>6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5.2/3</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>17.41</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>17.46</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5.2/4</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>14.89</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>15.26</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5.2/5</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>11.31</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>11.17</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5.3/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5.3/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6.1/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6.1/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.T.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued over ...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean</th>
<th>TIME B Mean</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.6.2/1</td>
<td>O X</td>
<td>48.40</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>.981</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6.2/2</td>
<td>O X</td>
<td>49.20</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>.530</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6.2/3</td>
<td>O X</td>
<td>16.61</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>.487</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6.2/4</td>
<td>O X</td>
<td>15.15</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6.2/5</td>
<td>O X</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**

- **O** = teacher believed in, and used, pupil ideas
- **X** = teacher believed in, but did not use, pupil ideas
- **N.T.** = hypothesis not tested - sample without belief-behaviour combination
- **Dp** = dramatic play
- **T** = theatre

(df = n of pairs - 1)
2.2 Discussion

All of the teacher sample agreed in principle that drama provides a good opportunity for pupils to use their own ideas. However, in practice, a number of teachers failed to invite or use pupil ideas in drama. Teachers, as a group, who believed in, and made use of pupil ideas, generated significant pupil gains on measures of creativity (verbal and non-verbal), empathy and self-esteem.

In relation to drama choice and the use of pupil ideas, only dramatic play teachers were able to achieve pupil gains on the outcomes named above. One teacher of drama exercise who believed in and made use of pupil ideas, not only failed to produce pupil gains on outcomes, but also generated a significant pupil loss on non-verbal creativity. There were no teachers of theatre who invited or made use of pupil ideas.

Teachers as a group who believed in using pupil ideas, but did not do so, recorded a significant pupil loss on both verbal and non-verbal aspects of creativity. Teachers of theatre in this group made neither gains nor losses on pupil outcomes. Drama exercise teachers in this group managed to generate significant pupil losses on both verbal and non-verbal aspects of creativity. There were no dramatic play teachers in this group since all members were seen to use pupil ideas in drama.
It seems that teachers who differed in their ability to be consistent between held beliefs and observed behaviour, also differed in the kinds of pupil outcomes they tended to produce. Consistent teachers doing dramatic play produced significant pupil gains on four out of five selected pupil outcomes. On the other hand, consistent teachers doing drama exercise not only failed to achieve any pupil gains, but also produced a significant pupil loss on non-verbal creativity. Moreover, inconsistent drama exercise teachers produced no significant pupil gains and made significant losses on verbal and non-verbal creativity.

All theatre teachers were deemed to be inconsistent in this belief-behaviour context since none of them used pupil ideas regardless of their professed beliefs. As reported, theatre teachers managed neither pupil gains nor pupil regression on educational outcomes.

3. **Hypothesis 6.3**

Hypothesis 6.3 (constituting 6.3.1 to 6.3.4/5) asserted that there would be no significant gain or loss on each outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers were grouped according to beliefs and actions in respect of flexibility (see Key).

The results of testing hypotheses 6.3.1/1 to 6.3.2/5 and 6.3.4/1 to 6.3.4/5 are reported in Table 10.5. It was
not possible to test hypotheses 6.3.3/1 to 6.3.3/5 because no teachers in the sub-sample (n=16) had the necessary belief-behaviour characteristics. Hypotheses 6.3.1/1, 6.3.1/2, 6.3.1/3 and 6.3.1/5, concerning teachers believing in, and using, spontaneous teaching strategies and pupils' gains/losses on measures of verbal and figural creativity, empathy and academic self-image respectively, were rejected because t values were significant at the .003 level or higher (6.3.1/1 : t = -4.16) (6.3.1/2 : t = -3.15) (6.3.1/3 : t = -3.75) (6.3.1/5 : t = -3.23). Hypotheses 6.3.2/1 and 6.3.2/4, regarding teachers of drama exercise believing in, but not using, spontaneous teaching strategies and pupils' gains/losses on measures of verbal creativity and self-esteem respectively, were rejected because t values were significant at the .03 level or higher. Hypothesis 6.3.4/4, concerning teachers believing in, and adhering to, set plans and pupils' gains/losses on a measure of self-esteem, was rejected because the t value of 2.39 was significant at the .01 level. All other hypotheses that were tested in relation to teacher belief-behaviour regarding flexibility and pupil outcomes were rejected because t values were not significant at the .05 level.

Table 10.5 also shows the influence of 'Abdicators' (see Key) on pupil outcomes even though no hypotheses were tested in this regard. 'Abdicators' (teachers who take no
part in drama) made significant gains on a pupil measure of figural creativity.

3.1 Hypotheses 7.7, 7.8 and 7.9

Hypotheses 7.7 (7.7.1/1 to 7.7.4/5), 7.8 (7.8.1/1 to 7.8.4/5) and 7.9 (7.9.1/1 to 7.9.4/5) stated that there would be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers of dramatic play, drama exercise and theatre respectively were grouped according to beliefs and actions regarding flexibility (see Key).

The results of testing hypotheses 7.7.1/1 to 7.7.2/5, 7.8.2/1 to 7.8.2/5, 7.9.2/1 to 7.9.2/5 and 7.9.4/1 to 7.9.4/5 are reported in Table 10.6. It was not possible to test hypotheses 7.7.3/1 to 7.7.4/5, 7.8.1/1 to 7.8.1/5, 7.8.3/1 to 7.8.4/5, 7.9.2/1 to 7.9.1/5 or 7.9.3/1 to 7.9.3/5 because no teachers in the sub-sample (n=16) had the appropriate belief-behaviour characteristics and drama choices.

Hypotheses 7.7.1/1, 7.7.1/2, 7.7.1/3 and 7.7.1/5, concerning teachers of dramatic play believing in, and using, spontaneous teaching strategies and pupils' gains/losses on measures of verbal and figural creativity, empathy and academic self-image respectively, were rejected because t values were at the .01 level or higher (7.7.1/1 : t = -4.16) (7.7.1/2 : t = -3.15) (7.7.1/3 : t = -3.75) (7.7.1/5 : t = -3.23). Hypothesis 7.7.2/2, regarding
teachers of dramatic play believing in, but not using, spontaneous teaching strategies and pupils' gains/losses on a measure of figural creativity, was rejected because the t value of -7.51 was significant at the .000 level.

Hypotheses 7.8.2/1 and 7.8.2/2, concerning teachers of drama exercise believing in, but not using, spontaneous teaching strategies and pupils' gains/losses on measures of verbal and figural creativity respectively, were rejected because both t values were significant at the .000 level (7.8.2/1 : t = 4.56) (7.8.2/2 : t = 4.18).

Hypotheses 7.9.2/3 and 7.9.2/5, regarding teachers of theatre believing in, but not using, spontaneous teaching strategies and gains/losses on empathy and academic self-image respectively, were rejected because t values were significant at the .02 level or higher (7.9.2/3 : t = 3.27) (7.9.2/5 : t = 2.27). Hypothesis 7.9.4/4, concerning teachers of theatre believing in, and keeping to set plans and pupils' gains/losses on a measure of self-esteem, was rejected because the t value of 2.39 was significant at the .01 level.

The influence of teacher 'Abdicators' (dramatic play only) on pupil outcomes is shown in Table 10.6. Other hypotheses relating to the belief-behaviour characteristics regarding flexibility, drama choices and pupil outcomes, were accepted because t values were not significant at the .05 level.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Belief-Behaviour</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean s</th>
<th>TIME B Mean s</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.3.1/1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>52.89 10.34</td>
<td>56.71 11.92</td>
<td>-4.16</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.1/2</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50.80 9.60</td>
<td>54.50 10.01</td>
<td>-3.15</td>
<td>.003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.1/3</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>17.84 3.38</td>
<td>18.75 3.13</td>
<td>-3.75</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.1/4</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>16.21 3.80</td>
<td>16.40 4.20</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
<td>.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.1/5</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11.10 3.47</td>
<td>12.03 3.33</td>
<td>-3.23</td>
<td>.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.2/1</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>51.75 9.85</td>
<td>49.51 8.32</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.2/2</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>48.62 7.45</td>
<td>49.53 7.98</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
<td>.285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.2/3</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>16.79 3.80</td>
<td>16.63 3.98</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.2/4</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>14.90 4.39</td>
<td>15.25 4.57</td>
<td>-2.14</td>
<td>.034*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.2/5</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>11.25 3.59</td>
<td>11.05 3.80</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.3/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.3/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.3/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.3/3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.3/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.3/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.4/1</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>47.39 8.54</td>
<td>47.86 7.32</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.4/2</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>49.38 7.67</td>
<td>48.21 8.70</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.070*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.4/3</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>16.80 3.50</td>
<td>17.08 3.26</td>
<td>-1.11</td>
<td>.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.4/4</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>15.43 3.97</td>
<td>14.94 4.19</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>.019*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.4/5</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>11.49 3.33</td>
<td>11.58 3.51</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>.700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

continued over ...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Belief-Behaviour</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean s</th>
<th>TIME B Mean s</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abdicators/1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>47.77</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdicators/2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>52.15</td>
<td>8.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdicators/3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>16.44</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdicators/4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>14.72</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdicators/5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>10.63</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(df = n of pairs -1)

**KEY**

0 0 0 = teacher believed in, and made use of, spontaneous teaching methods
0 X = teacher believed in, but did not make use of, spontaneous teaching methods
X X = teacher believed in, and kept to, set plans
Y = abdicators - teachers had no set plans, and took no part in drama teaching
N.T. = hypothesis not tested - sample without belief-behaviour combination
* = rejected hypothesis
Table 10.6 Belief-behaviour of teachers concerning flexibility, drama choice and pupil outcomes: results of testing hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Belief-Behaviour</th>
<th>Drama Type</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A</th>
<th>TIME B</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.7.1/1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>52.89</td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td>56.71</td>
<td>11.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7.1/2</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50.80</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>54.50</td>
<td>10.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7.1/3</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>17.84</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7.1/4</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>16.21</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>16.40</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7.1/5</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>12.03</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7.2/1</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53.03</td>
<td>10.33</td>
<td>53.65</td>
<td>8.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7.2/2</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41.92</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>57.03</td>
<td>9.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7.2/3</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16.57</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>17.07</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7.2/4</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.88</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>15.19</td>
<td>5.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7.2/5</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10.84</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>11.46</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7.3/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7.4/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdicators/1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>47.77</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>49.02</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdicators/2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>52.15</td>
<td>8.59</td>
<td>49.44</td>
<td>6.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdicators/3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>16.44</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>16.36</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdicators/4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>14.72</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>14.86</td>
<td>4.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdicators/5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>10.63</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>10.80</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8.1/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8.1/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8.2/1</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>51.76</td>
<td>9.53</td>
<td>48.20</td>
<td>8.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8.2/2</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>50.51</td>
<td>7.87</td>
<td>46.98</td>
<td>6.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8.2/3</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>17.12</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>17.19</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8.2/4</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>15.08</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>15.43</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8.2/5</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>11.40</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>11.22</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued over ...
Table 10.6 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Belief-Behaviour</th>
<th>Drama Type</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean s</th>
<th>TIME B Mean s</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.8.3/1 to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8.5/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9.1/1 to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9.1/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9.2/1</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>50.83</td>
<td>10.43</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9.2/2</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>48.78</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>-1.55</td>
<td>.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9.2/3</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16.16</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9.2/4</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14.48</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>-1.10</td>
<td>.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9.2/5</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11.18</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>.029*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9.3/1 to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9.3/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9.4/1</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>47.39</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9.4/2</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>49.38</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9.4/3</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>16.80</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>-1.11</td>
<td>.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9.4/4</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>15.43</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>.019*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9.4/5</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>11.49</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>.700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(df = n of pairs -1)

KEY
0 O = teacher believed in, and made use of, spontaneous teaching methods
0 X = teacher believed in, but did not make use of, spontaneous teaching methods
X X = teacher believed in, and kept to, set plans
Y = Abdicators - teachers had no set plans, and took no part in drama teaching
N.T. = hypothesis not tested - sample without belief-behaviour combination
* = rejected hypothesis
Dp = dramatic play
De = drama exercise
T = theatre
3.2 Discussion

Teachers who believed that spontaneous teaching was just as likely to produce desired results as set plans, and who used spontaneous teaching approaches in drama, produced significant pupil gains on creativity (verbal and non-verbal), empathy and academic self-image. It is notable that only dramatic play teachers constituted this group and thus generated the stated outcomes of pupils. All theatre and drama exercise teachers maintained adherence to set plans throughout drama.

There were those teachers who believed in the value of spontaneous teaching methods, but were seen to keep to set plans. As a group these teachers produced significant pupil losses on verbal creativity and self-esteem. In respect of drama choice, and this belief-behaviour combination, teachers of theatre produced a significant pupil loss on academic self-image. Similarly, drama exercise teachers produced significant losses on verbal and non-verbal creativity. One dramatic play teacher, 'D', recorded a significant pupil gain on non-verbal creativity.

Those teachers who preferred set plans to spontaneous teaching and who kept to set plans in drama, produced a significant pupil loss on self-esteem. Elsewhere, teacher 'abdicators' were seen to generate a significant pupil loss on non-verbal creativity.

In respect of belief-behaviour consistency, the ability
of teachers to be consistent was found to be associated with particular pupil outcomes: consistent dramatic play teachers produced significant pupil gains on creativity (verbal and non-verbal), empathy and academic self-image. One inconsistent dramatic play teacher managed to produce a significant pupil gain on non-verbal creativity, but not so on measures of empathy, academic self-image and verbal creativity. Moreover, dramatic play 'abdicators' failed to produce any significant pupil gains and recorded a significant pupil loss on non-verbal creativity. Consistent theatre teachers produced a significant loss on self-esteem of pupils. Inconsistent theatre teachers managed to generate significant pupil losses on empathy and academic self-image. All drama exercise teachers were inconsistent in this belief-behaviour context. That is, all this group believed in the value of spontaneous teaching, but all kept to set plans in drama. This group produced significant pupil losses on verbal and non-verbal creativity.

In respect of pupil gains and spontaneous teaching methods, only the dramatic play group recorded any significant gains on pupil outcomes in this belief-behaviour context.
4. **Hypothesis 6.4**

Hypothesis 6.4 (constituting 6.4.1/1 to 6.4.4/5) asserted that there would be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers were grouped according to beliefs and actions in respect of pupil control (see Key).

The results of testing hypotheses 6.4.1/1 to 6.4.1/5 and 6.4.3/1 to 6.4.4/5 are reported in Table 10.7. It was not possible to test hypotheses 6.4.2/1 to 6.4.2/5 because teachers in the sub-sample (n=16) did not have the necessary belief-behaviour characteristics. Hypothesis 6.4.1/1, concerning teachers believing in, and exercising, high pupil control and pupils' gains/losses on a measure of verbal creativity, was rejected because the t value of 5.79 was significant at the .000 level. Hypothesis 6.4.3/2, regarding teachers believing in, but exercising high, pupil control and pupils' gains/losses on a measure of figural creativity, was rejected because the t value of 4.41 was significant at the .000 level. Hypotheses 6.4.4/1, 6.4.4/2 and 6.4.4/5, concerning teachers' believing in, and exercising, low pupil control and pupils' gains/losses on measures of verbal and figural creativity and academic self-image, were rejected because t values were significant at the .05 level or higher (6.4.4/1 : t = -1.94) (6.4.4/2 : t = -3.00) (6.4.4/5 : t = -2.22). Other hypotheses,
relating to belief-behaviour of teachers in respect of pupil control and pupil outcomes, were accepted because t values were not significant at the .05 level.

4.1 Hypotheses 7.10, 7.11 and 7.12

Hypotheses 7.10 (7.10.1/1 to 7.10.4/5), 7.11 (7.11.1/1 to 7.11.4/5) and 7.12 (7.12.1/1 to 7.12.4/5) stated that there would be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers of dramatic play, drama exercise and theatre respectively were grouped according to beliefs and actions regarding pupil control (see Key).

The results of testing hypotheses 7.10.4/1 to 7.10.4/5, 7.11.1/1 to 7.11.1/5, 7.11.3/1 to 7.11.3/5 and 7.12.3/1 to 7.12.3/5 are reported in Table 10.8. It was not possible to test hypotheses 7.10.1/1 to 7.10.3/5, 7.11.2/1 to 7.11.2/5 or 7.12.3/1 to 7.12.4/5 because no teachers had these combinations of beliefs, actions and drama choices.

Hypotheses 7.10.4/1, 7.10.4/2, 7.10.4/3 and 7.10.4/5, concerning teachers of dramatic play believing in and exercising, low pupil control and pupils' gains/losses on measures of verbal and figural creativity, empathy and academic self-image, were rejected because t values were significant at the .03 level or higher (7.10.4/1 : t = -3.60) (7.10.4/2 : t = -3.24) (7.10.4/3 : t = -2.17) (7.10.4/5 : t = -3.00).

Hypothesis 7.11.1/1, regarding teachers of drama
exercise believing in, and adopting high pupil control and pupils' gains/losses on a measure of verbal creativity, was rejected because the t value of 5.79 was significant at the .000 level. Hypotheses 7.11.3/2 and 7.11.3/5, concerning teachers of drama exercise believing in low, but exercising high, pupil control and pupils' gains/losses on measures of figural creativity and academic self-image respectively, were rejected because t values were significant at the .03 level or higher (7.11.3/2 : t = 6.57) (7.11.3/5 : t = 2.33). Hypothesis 7.11.4/2, regarding teachers of drama exercise believing in, and using, low pupil control and pupils' gains/losses on a measure of verbal creativity, was rejected because the t value of 4.12 was significant at the .001 level.

Hypothesis 7.12.3/2, regarding teachers of theatre believing in low, but exercising high, pupil control and pupils' gains/losses on a measure of figural creativity, was rejected because the t value of 2.04 was significant at the .04 level. Hypotheses 7.12.4/2 and 7.12.4/3, concerning teachers of theatre believing in, and exercising, low pupil control and pupils' gains/losses on measures of figural creativity and empathy respectively, were rejected because t values were significant at the .03 level or higher (7.12.4/2 : t = -2.16) (7.12.4/3 : t = 3.69). All other hypotheses, concerning beliefs and behaviour of teachers in respect of pupil control, drama choices and pupil outcomes, were accepted because t values were not significant at the .05 level or higher.
Table 10.7  Belief-behaviour of teachers concerning pupil control and pupil outcomes: results of testing hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Belief-Behaviour</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A</th>
<th>TIME B</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.4.1/1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52.94</td>
<td>10.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4.1/2</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>47.56</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4.1/3</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17.58</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4.1/4</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4.1/5</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11.64</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4.2/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4.3/1</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>46.83</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td></td>
<td>.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4.3/2</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>49.93</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4.3/3</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>16.28</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td></td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4.3/4</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>14.97</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td></td>
<td>.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4.3/5</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>10.86</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td></td>
<td>.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4.4/1</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>50.94</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>.054*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4.4/2</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>50.33</td>
<td>8.72</td>
<td></td>
<td>.003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4.4/3</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td></td>
<td>.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4.4/4</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>15.41</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td></td>
<td>.664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4.4/5</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>11.19</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td></td>
<td>.027*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(df = n of pairs -1)

KEY
0 0 = teacher believed in, and exercised, high pupil control
0 X = teacher believed in low, but exercised high, pupil control
X X = teacher believed in, and exercised, low pupil control
N.T. = hypothesis not tested - sample without belief-behaviour combination
* = rejected hypothesis
Table 10.8 Belief-behaviour of teachers concerning pupil control, drama choice and pupil outcomes: results of testing hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Belief- Behaviour</th>
<th>Drama Type</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean</th>
<th>TIME B Mean</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.10.1/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.T.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.10.3/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.10.4/1</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>50.54</td>
<td>52.63</td>
<td>-3.60</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.10.4/2</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>49.94</td>
<td>52.58</td>
<td>-3.24</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.10.4/3</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>16.98</td>
<td>17.36</td>
<td>-2.17</td>
<td>.032*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.10.4/4</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>15.29</td>
<td>15.48</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.10.4/5</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>10.84</td>
<td>11.36</td>
<td>-3.00</td>
<td>.003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.11.1/1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52.94</td>
<td>47.67</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.11.1/2</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>47.56</td>
<td>47.37</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.11.1/3</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17.58</td>
<td>17.47</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.11.1/4</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>15.03</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
<td>.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.11.1/5</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11.64</td>
<td>11.84</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.11.2/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.T.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.11.2/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.11.3/1</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>49.80</td>
<td>49.65</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.11.3/2</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>56.95</td>
<td>45.70</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.11.3/3</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.95</td>
<td>17.45</td>
<td>-1.42</td>
<td>.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.11.3/4</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>15.85</td>
<td>-1.45</td>
<td>.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.11.3/5</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>.031*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.11.4/1</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50.31</td>
<td>48.12</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.11.4/2</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>52.25</td>
<td>47.31</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.11.4/3</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.81</td>
<td>15.93</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.11.4/4</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>16.25</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>.652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.11.4/5</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.81</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>.414</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued over ...
Table 10.8 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Belief-Behaviour</th>
<th>Drama Type</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean s</th>
<th>TIME B Mean s</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.12.1/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.12.2/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.12.3/1</td>
<td>X O</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>46.09</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.12.3/2</td>
<td>X O</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>48.19</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>.045*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.12.3/3</td>
<td>X O</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>16.12</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>-1.51</td>
<td>.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.12.3/4</td>
<td>X O</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>14.90</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.12.3/5</td>
<td>X O</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>10.96</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>.369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.12.4/1</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52.55</td>
<td>9.81</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/12/4/5</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51.02</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>-2.16</td>
<td>.036*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.12.4/3</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17.51</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.12.4/4</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15.62</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.12.4/5</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12.20</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>.792</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(df = n of pairs - 1)

**KEY**

O O = teacher believed in, and exercised, high pupil control
O X = teacher believed in low, but exercised high, pupil control
X X = teacher believed in, and exercised, low pupil control
N.T. = hypothesis not tested - sample without belief-behaviour combination
* = rejected hypothesis
Dp = dramatic play
De = drama exercise
T = theatre
4.2 Discussion

Teachers who believed that keeping pupils quiet was not a high priority and who did not maintain silence in drama, generated significant pupil gains on verbal and non-verbal creativity and academic self-image. In respect of belief-behaviour combinations and drama choice, teachers of dramatic play produced significant pupil gains on creativity (verbal and non-verbal), empathy and academic self-image. Teachers of theatre also managed to promote significant pupil gains on non-verbal creativity, but further produced a significant pupil loss in empathy. Drama exercise teachers produce no significant gains and generated a significant pupil loss on non-verbal creativity. Some drama exercise teachers also produced a significant pupil loss on empathy. Those teachers who believed that keeping pupils quiet was not a high priority and maintained pupil silence throughout drama, generated no significant pupils' gains only a significant pupil loss on non-verbal creativity.

Consistent dramatic play teachers (all of the group), generated significant pupil gains on most pupil outcomes. Whether drama exercise teachers were consistent, or otherwise, they all produced significant pupil losses on either verbal or non-verbal creativity. This was the case even when drama exercise teachers believed that keeping pupils quiet was not a high priority. Consistent teachers of drama exercise who did not allow pupils to talk in drama
accrued a significant pupil loss on verbal creativity. Inconsistent drama exercise teachers who did not allow pupils to talk produced a significant pupil loss on academic self-image. Inconsistent theatre teachers generated a significant pupil loss on non-verbal creativity. On the other hand, consistent teachers of theatre generated a significant pupil gain on non-verbal creativity, and a significant loss on empathy.

5. **Hypothesis 6.5**

Hypothesis 6.5 (consisting of 6.5.1/1 to 6.5.4/5) asserted that there would be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers were grouped according to beliefs and behaviour regarding pupil dependence (see Key).

The results of testing hypotheses 6.5.1/1 to 6.5.1/5 and 6.5.3/1 to 6.5.4/5 are reported in Table 10.9. It was not possible to test hypotheses 6.5.2/1 to 6.5.2/5 because no teachers in the sub-sample (n=16) possessed the necessary characteristics. Hypothesis 6.5.1/1, concerning teachers believing in, and exercising, pupil dependence and pupils' gains/losses on a measure of verbal creativity, was rejected because the t value of 3.49 was significant at the .001 level. Hypothesis 6.5.3/2, regarding teachers believing in pupil autonomy, but encouraging pupil dependence and pupils' gains/losses on a measure of figural creativity,
rejected because the t value of 2.02 was significant at the .04 level. Hypotheses 6.5.4/1 and 6.5.4/5, concerning teachers believing in, and exercising, pupil autonomy and pupils' gains/losses on measures of verbal creativity and academic self-image respectively, were rejected because t values were significant at the .01 level or higher (6.5.4/1: t = -3.73) (6.5.4/5: t = -2.55). All other hypotheses, relating to belief-behaviour characteristics of teachers in respect of pupil dependence and pupil outcomes, were accepted because t values were not significant at the .05 level.

5.1 Hypotheses 7.13, 7.14 and 7.15

Hypotheses 7.13 (7.13.1/1 to 7.13.4/5), 7.14 (7.14.1/1 to 7.14.4/5) and 7.15 (7.15.1/1 to 7.15.4/5) stated that there would be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers of dramatic play, drama exercise and theatre respectively were grouped according to beliefs and behaviour regarding pupil dependence (see Key).

The results of testing hypotheses 7.13.3/1 to 7.13.4/5, 7.14.1/1 to 7.14.1/5 and 7.15.3/1 to 7.15.4/5 are reported in Table 10.10. It was not possible to test hypotheses 7.13.1/1 to 7.13.2/5, 7.14.2/1 to 7.14.4/5 and 7.15.1/1 to 7.15.2/5 because the sample did not possess the necessary belief-behaviour characteristics and drama choices.

Hypothesis 7.13.3/2, concerning teachers of dramatic play believing in pupil autonomy but exercising pupil
dependence, and pupils' gains/losses on a measure of figural creativity, was rejected because the t value of -7.51 was significant at the .000 level. Hypotheses 7.13.4/1 and 7.13.4/5, regarding teachers of dramatic play believing in and exercising pupil autonomy and pupils' gains/losses on measures of verbal creativity and academic self-image respectively, were rejected because t values were significant at the .01 level or higher (7.13.4/1 : t = -3.73) (7.13.4/5 : t = -2.55).

Hypotheses 7.14.1/1 and 7.14.1/2, regarding teachers of drama exercise believing in, and exercising, pupil dependence, and pupils' gains/losses on verbal and figural creativity respectively, were rejected because t values were both significant at the .000 level (7.14.1/1 : t = 4.56) (7.14.1/2 : t = 4.18).

Hypothesis 7.15.3/2, concerning teachers of theatre believing in pupil autonomy, but exercising pupil dependence and pupils' gains/losses on a measure of figural creativity, was rejected because the t value of 2.02 was significant at the .04 level. Other hypotheses relating to belief-behaviour of teachers in respect of pupil dependence, drama choices and pupil outcomes, were accepted because t values were not significant at the .05 level.
### Table 10.9  
**Belief-behaviour of teachers concerning pupil dependence and pupil outcomes: results of testing hypotheses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Belief-Behaviour</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean</th>
<th>TIME A s</th>
<th>TIME B Mean</th>
<th>TIME B s</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.5.1/1</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>46.75</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>46.73</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5.1/2</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>47.80</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>47.10</td>
<td>9.37</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>.048*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5.1/3</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>16.38</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>15.86</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5.1/4</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>11.96</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>11.48</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5.1/5</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>50.03</td>
<td>9.83</td>
<td>50.11</td>
<td>11.09</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5.2/1</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>51.55</td>
<td>9.04</td>
<td>51.68</td>
<td>8.61</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5.2/2</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>17.06</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>17.11</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>-1.82</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5.2/3</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>15.37</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>15.54</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>-2.55</td>
<td>.012*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5.2/4</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>10.84</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>11.34</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>-2.55</td>
<td>.012*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5.2/5</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>11.02</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>.588</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(df = n of pairs - 1)

**KEY**

0 0 = teacher believed in, and encouraged, pupil dependence
0 X = teacher believed in autonomy but encouraged dependence
X X = teacher believed in, and encouraged, pupil autonomy
N.T. = hypothesis not tested - sample without belief-behaviour combination
* = rejected hypothesis
Table 10.10  Belief-behaviour of teachers concerning pupil dependence, drama choice and pupil outcomes: results of testing hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Belief- Behaviour</th>
<th>Drama Type</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>TIME B Mean</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.13.1/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.T.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.13.2/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.13.3/1</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53.03</td>
<td>10.33</td>
<td>53.65</td>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>.657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.13.3/2</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41.92</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>57.03</td>
<td>9.56</td>
<td>-7.51</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.13.3/3</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16.57</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>17.07</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>-1.26</td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.13.3/4</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.88</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>15.19</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
<td>.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.13.3/5</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10.84</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>11.46</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>-1.73</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.13.4/1</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>50.03</td>
<td>9.83</td>
<td>52.42</td>
<td>11.09</td>
<td>-3.73</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.13.4/2</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>51.55</td>
<td>9.04</td>
<td>51.68</td>
<td>8.61</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.13.4/3</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>17.06</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>17.41</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>-1.82</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.13.4/4</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>15.37</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>15.54</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
<td>.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.13.4/5</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>10.84</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>11.34</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>-2.55</td>
<td>.012*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.14.1/1</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>51.76</td>
<td>9.53</td>
<td>48.20</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.14.1/2</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>50.51</td>
<td>7.87</td>
<td>46.98</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.14.1/3</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>17.12</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>17.19</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.14.1/4</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>15.08</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>15.43</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>-1.67</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.14.1/5</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>11.40</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>11.22</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>.428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.15.1/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.T.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.15.2/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.15.3/1</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>46.75</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>47.50</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
<td>.398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.15.3/2</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>47.80</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>46.48</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>.048*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.15.3/3</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>16.83</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>16.90</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>.802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.15.3/4</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>15.86</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>15.48</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.15.3/5</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>11.96</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>11.86</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>.712</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued over ...
Table 10.10 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Belief-Behaviour</th>
<th>Drama Type</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean</th>
<th>TIME A s</th>
<th>TIME B Mean</th>
<th>TIME B s</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.15.4/1</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50.03</td>
<td>9.83</td>
<td>52.42</td>
<td>11.09</td>
<td>-3.73</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.15.4/2</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51.55</td>
<td>9.04</td>
<td>51.68</td>
<td>8.61</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.15.4/3</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>17.06</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>17.41</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>-1.82</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.15.4/4</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15.37</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>15.54</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
<td>.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.15.4/5</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10.84</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>11.34</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>-2.55</td>
<td>.012*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(df = n of pairs - 1)

KEY
0 0 = teacher believed in, and encouraged, pupil dependence
0 X = teacher believed in autonomy but encouraged dependence
X X = teacher believed in, and encouraged, pupil autonomy
N.T. = hypothesis not tested - sample without belief-behaviour combination
* = rejected hypothesis
Dp = dramatic play
De = drama exercise
T = theatre
5.2 Discussion

Those teachers who believed that pupils preferred autonomy to dependence, and allowed for pupil decision-making in drama, were seen to generate significant pupil gains on verbal creativity and academic self-image. This group only consisted of teachers who used dramatic play.

Teachers who believed that pupils preferred to be autonomous rather than dependent, but who encouraged pupil dependence in drama, produced a significant pupil loss on figural creativity and no significant gains elsewhere. This group was composed of theatre teachers only. All drama exercise teachers believed in, and encouraged, pupil dependence and generated significant pupil losses on both verbal and non-verbal creativity.

Consistent dramatic play teachers who encouraged pupil decision-making in drama produced significant pupil gains on verbal creativity and academic self-image. One consistent dramatic play teacher who encouraged pupil dependence rather than autonomy, produced significant pupil gains on non-verbal creativity. Consistent theatre teachers who encouraged pupil dependence produced no pupil gains, while their inconsistent theatre colleagues produced a significant pupil loss on non-verbal creativity.
6. Hypothesis 6.6

Hypothesis 6.6 (constituting 6.6.1/1 to 6.6.4/5) asserted that there would be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers were grouped according to beliefs and actions in respect of less able pupils (see Key).

The results of testing hypotheses 6.6.1/1 to 6.6.3/5 are presented in Table 10.11. It was not possible to test hypotheses 6.6.4/1 to 6.6.4/5 because no teachers in the sub-sample (n=16) had the necessary belief-behaviour characteristics. Hypotheses 6.6.1/1, 6.6.1/2, 6.6.1/3 and 6.6.1/5, concerning teachers exercising the creative abilities of less able pupils and pupils' gains/losses on measures of verbal and figural creativity, empathy and academic self-image respectively, were rejected because t values were significant at the .03 level or higher (6.6.1/1 : t = -2.99) (6.6.1/2 : t = -2.52) (6.6.1/3 : t = -2.11) (6.6.1/5 : t = -2.67). Hypothesis 6.2.2/2, regarding teachers believing in, but not exercising, the creative abilities of less able pupils was rejected because the t value of 4.10 was significant at the .000 level. Hypotheses 6.6.3/1 and 6.6.3/3, concerning teachers not believing in, but exercising, the creative abilities of less able pupils and pupils' gains/losses on measures of verbal creativity
and empathy respectively, were rejected because t values were significant at the .02 level or higher (6.6.3/1 : t = 5.65) (6.6.3/3 : t = 2.38). Other hypotheses relating to belief-behaviour of teachers in respect of less able pupils and pupil outcomes were accepted because t values were not significant at the .05 level.

6.1 Hypotheses 7.16, 7.17 and 7.18

Hypotheses 7.16 (7.16.1/1 to 7.16.4/5), 7.17 (7.17.1/1 to 7.17.4/5) and 7.18 (7.18.1/1 to 7.18.4/5) stated that there would be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers of dramatic play, drama exercise and theatre respectively were grouped according to beliefs and actions in respect of less able pupils (see Key).

The results of testing hypotheses 7.16.1/1 to 7.16.1/5, 7.17.1/1 to 7.17.3/5 and 7.18.2/1 to 7.18.3/5 are reported in Table 10.12. It was not possible to test hypotheses 7.16.2/1 to 7.16.4/5, 7.17.4/1 to 7.17.4/5, 7.18.1/1 to 7.18.4/5 and 7.18.4/1 to 7.18.4/5 because no teachers in the sub-sample (n=16) had the necessary belief-behaviour characteristics and drama choices.

Hypotheses 7.16.1/1, 7.16.1/2, 7.16.1/3 and 7.16.1/5, concerning teachers of dramatic play believing in, and exercising, the creative abilities of less able pupils and pupils' gains/losses on measures of verbal and figural creativity, empathy and academic self-image respectively,
were rejected because t values were significant at the .03 level or higher (7.16.1/1 : t = -3.60) (7.16.1/2 : t = -3.24) (7.16.1/3 : t = -2.17) (7.16.1/5 : t = -3.00).

Hypothesis 7.17.1/2, regarding teachers of drama exercise believing in, and employing, the creative abilities of less able pupils and pupils' gains/losses on a measure of figural creativity, was rejected because the t value of 4.12 was significant at the .001 level. Hypotheses 7.17.2/2 and 7.17.2/5, concerning teachers of drama exercise believing in, but not employing, the creative abilities of less able pupils and pupils' gains/losses on measures of figural creativity and academic self-image, were rejected because t values were significant at the .03 level or higher (7.17.2/2 : t = 6.57) (7.17.2/5 : t = 2.33). Hypothesis 7.17.3/1, concerning teachers of drama exercise not believing in, but employing, the creative abilities of less able pupils and pupils' gains/losses on a measure of verbal creativity, was rejected because the t value of 5.79 was significant at the alpha level of .000.

Hypotheses 7.18.3/2 and 7.18.3/3, regarding teachers of theatre not believing in, but employing, the creative abilities of less able pupils and pupils' gains/losses on measures of figural creativity and empathy respectively, were rejected because t values were significant at the .01 level or higher (7.18.3/2 : t = -2.59) (7.18.3/3 : t = 3.81). The remaining hypotheses were accepted because t values were not significant at the .05 level.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Belief- Behaviour</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean</th>
<th>TIME A s</th>
<th>TIME B Mean</th>
<th>TIME B s</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>p Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.6.1/1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>50.52</td>
<td>9.71</td>
<td>52.21</td>
<td>10.46</td>
<td>-2.99</td>
<td>.003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6.1/2</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>50.15</td>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>52.08</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>-2.52</td>
<td>.013*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6.1/3</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>16.87</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>17.22</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>-2.11</td>
<td>.036*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6.1/4</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>15.36</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>15.55</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>-1.22</td>
<td>.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6.1/5</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>10.93</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>11.37</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>-2.67</td>
<td>.008*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6.2/1</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>47.76</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>48.20</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6.2/2</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>50.69</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>47.95</td>
<td>8.04</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6.2/3</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>16.65</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>16.89</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
<td>.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6.2/4</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>15.36</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>15.17</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6.2/5</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>11.26</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>11.04</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6.3/1</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>52.97</td>
<td>10.29</td>
<td>48.57</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6.3/2</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>47.69</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>48.46</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
<td>.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6.3/3</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>17.31</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>16.73</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>.020*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6.3/4</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>14.56</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>14.81</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6.3/5</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>11.55</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>11.47</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>.753</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(df = n of pairs -1)

**KEY**

0 0 = teacher believed in, and used, creative abilities of less able pupils
0 X = teacher believed in, but did not use, creative abilities of less able pupils
X 0 = teacher did not believe in, but used, creative abilities of less able pupils
N.T. = hypothesis not tested - sample without belief-behaviour combination
* = rejected hypothesis
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Belief- Behaviour</th>
<th>Drama Type</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>TIME B Mean</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.16.1/1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>50.54</td>
<td>9.94</td>
<td>52.63</td>
<td>10.63</td>
<td>-3.60</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.16.1/2</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>49.94</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>52.58</td>
<td>8.97</td>
<td>-3.24</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.16.1/3</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>16.98</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>17.36</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>-2.17</td>
<td>.032*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.16.1/4</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>15.29</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>15.48</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.16.1/5</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>10.84</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>11.36</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>-3.00</td>
<td>.003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.16.2/1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>50.54</td>
<td>9.94</td>
<td>52.63</td>
<td>10.63</td>
<td>-3.60</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.16.4/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.17.1/1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50.31</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td>48.12</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.17.1/2</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>52.25</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>47.31</td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.17.1/3</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.81</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>15.93</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.17.1/4</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>16.25</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>.652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.17.1/5</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.81</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.17.2/1</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>49.80</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td>49.65</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.17.2/2</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>56.95</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>45.70</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.17.2/3</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.95</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>17.45</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>-1.42</td>
<td>.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.17.2/4</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>15.85</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>-1.45</td>
<td>.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.17.2/5</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>.031*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.17.3/1</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52.94</td>
<td>10.35</td>
<td>47.67</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.17.3/2</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>47.56</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>47.37</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.17.3/3</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17.58</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>17.47</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.17.3/4</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>15.03</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
<td>.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.17.3/5</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11.64</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>11.84</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>.494</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued over ...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Belief- Behaviour</th>
<th>Drama Type</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean s</th>
<th>TIME B Mean s</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.17.4/1 to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.T.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.17.4/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.T.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.18.1/1 to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.T.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.18.1/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.18.2/1</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>47.36</td>
<td>47.92</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
<td>.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.18.2/2</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>49.47</td>
<td>48.38</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.18.2/3</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>16.60</td>
<td>16.78</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>.433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.18.2/4</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>15.04</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.18.2/5</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>11.41</td>
<td>11.36</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.18.3/1</td>
<td>X O</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>53.04</td>
<td>50.65</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.18.3/2</td>
<td>X O</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>50.95</td>
<td>-2.59</td>
<td>.017*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.18.3/3</td>
<td>X O</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.69</td>
<td>15.04</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.18.3/4</td>
<td>X O</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14.13</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.18.3/5</td>
<td>X O</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11.34</td>
<td>10.60</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>.098*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.18.4/1 to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.T.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.18.4/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(df = n of pairs -1)

**KEY**

0 0 = teacher believed in, and used, creative abilities of less able pupils
0 X = teacher believed in, but did not use, creative abilities of less able pupils
X 0 0 = teacher did not believe in, but used, creative abilities of less able pupils
N.T. = hypothesis not tested - sample without belief-behaviour combination
* = rejected hypothesis
Dp = dramatic play
De = drama exercise
T = theatre
6.2 Discussion

Teachers who believed that less able pupils could be creative, and allowed them to be so in drama, produced significant pupil gains on pupil measures of creativity (verbal and non-verbal), empathy and academic self-image. Dramatic play teachers constituted the greater part of this group and were seen to reflect all of the significant gains. One drama exercise teacher also possessed this belief-behaviour combination, but generated a significant pupil loss on non-verbal creativity, and made no gains on outcomes elsewhere.

Teachers who believed that less able pupils could be creative, but who did not allow them to participate in drama, generated a significant pupil loss on non-verbal creativity and no gains on other outcomes. In this group, teachers of theatre made no inroads on pupil outcomes. However, one drama exercise teacher with this belief-behaviour configuration, produced a significant pupil loss on non-verbal creativity.

Teachers who believed that less able pupils were incapable of being creative, but who allowed them to be creative in drama, produced significant pupil losses on non-verbal creativity and empathy. One teacher of theatre possessing this particular belief-behaviour combination produced a significant pupil gain on figural creativity but produced a significant pupil loss on empathy.
Consistent dramatic play teachers who believed in, and made allowances for, less able pupils to be creative, produced significant pupil gains on four out of five outcomes. One consistent drama exercise teacher produced no significant gains and further managed to engender a significant pupil loss on non-verbal creativity. Similarly, inconsistent drama exercise teachers who did not allow less able pupils to participate in drama also failed to produce any significant pupil gains and generated a significant pupil loss on verbal creativity. It seems that both consistent and inconsistent drama exercise teachers failed to produce any significant pupil gains on outcomes and also generated significant losses on one or more measures.

7. **Hypothesis 6.7**

Hypothesis 6.7 (constituting 6.7.1/1 to 6.7.4/5) asserted that there would be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers were grouped according to beliefs and actions in respect of teacher centredness (see Key).

The results of testing hypotheses 6.7.1/1 to 6.7.1/5 and 6.7.3/1 to 6.7.4/5 are reported in Table 10.13. It was not possible to test hypotheses 6.7.2/1 to 6.7.2/5 because no members of the teacher sub-sample (n=16) had these belief-behaviour characteristics. Hypothesis 6.7.1/2,
concerning teachers believing in the need for, and adopting, a central stance in drama and pupils' gains/losses on a measure of figural creativity was rejected because the t value of 3.53 was significant at the .001 level. Hypothesis 6.7.3/1, regarding teachers not believing in the need for, but adopting, a central stance in drama, and pupils' gains/losses on a measure of verbal creativity, was rejected because the t value of 2.21 was significant at the .02 level. Hypotheses 6.7.4/1 and 6.7.4/2, concerning teachers not believing in the need for, or adopting, a central stance in drama and pupils' gains/losses on measures of verbal creativity and academic self-image, were rejected because t values were significant at the .01 level or higher (6.7.4/1 : t = -3.73) (6.7.4/2 : t = -2.55). All other hypotheses, relating to belief-behaviour characteristics of teachers in respect of centredness and pupil outcomes, were accepted because t values were not significant at the .05 level.

7.1 Hypotheses 7.19, 7.20 and 7.21

Hypotheses 7.19 (7.19.1 to 7.19.4/5), 7.20 (7.20.1/1 to 7.20.4/5) and 7.21 (7.21.1/1 to 7.21.4/5) asserted that there would be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers of dramatic play, drama exercise and theatre respectively were grouped according to beliefs and behaviour regarding teacher centredness (see Key).
The results of testing hypotheses 7.19.3/1 to 7.19.4/5, 7.20.1/1 to 7.20.1/5, 7.20.3/1 to 7.20.3/5, 7.21.1/1 to 7.21.1/5 and 7.21.3/1 to 7.21.3/5 are reported in Table 10.14. It was not possible to test hypotheses 7.19.1/1 to 7.19.2/5, 7.20.2/1 to 7.20.2/5, 7.20.4/1 to 7.20.4/5, 7.21.2/1 to 7.21.1/5 and 7.21.4/1 to 7.21.4/5 because no teachers in the sub-sample (n=16) had the necessary belief-behaviour characteristics and drama choices required for analysis.

Hypothesis 7.19.3/2, concerning teachers of dramatic play not believing in the need for, but adopting, a central stance in drama and pupils' gains/losses on a measure of figural creativity, was rejected because the t value of -7.51 was significant at the .000 level. Hypotheses 7.19.4/1 and 7.19.4/5, regarding teachers of dramatic play not believing in the need for, and not adopting, a central stance in drama and pupils' gains/losses on measures of verbal creativity and academic self-image respectively, were rejected because t values were at the .01 level or higher (7.19.4/1 : t = -3.73) (7.19.4/5 : t = -2.55).

Hypothesis 7.20.1/1 and 7.20.1/2, concerning teachers of drama exercise believing in the need for, and adopting a central stance in drama and pupils' gains/losses on measures of figural and verbal creativity respectively, were rejected because t values were significant at the .04 level or higher
Hypothesis 7.21.1/1, concerning teachers of theatre believing in the need for, and adopting, a central stance in drama and pupils' gains/losses on a measure of verbal creativity, was rejected because the t value of -2.21 was significant at the .03 level. Other hypotheses, relating to belief-behaviour characteristics of teachers in respect of centredness, drama choices and pupil outcomes, were accepted because t values were not significant at the .05 level.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Belief- Behaviour</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean</th>
<th>TIME A s</th>
<th>TIME B Mean</th>
<th>TIME B s</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.7.1/1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>46.57</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>45.36</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7.1/2</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>47.26</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>44.72</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7.1/3</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>17.13</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>16.89</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7.1/4</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>15.29</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7.1/5</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>.612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7.2/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7.2/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7.3/1</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>51.54</td>
<td>9.98</td>
<td>50.29</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>.028*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7.3/2</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>49.54</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>50.75</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>-1.59</td>
<td>.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7.3/3</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>16.76</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>.593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7.3/4</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>15.02</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>15.09</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>.670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7.3/5</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>11.04</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>10.97</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7.4/1</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>50.03</td>
<td>9.83</td>
<td>52.42</td>
<td>11.09</td>
<td>-3.73</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7.4/2</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>51.55</td>
<td>9.04</td>
<td>51.68</td>
<td>8.61</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7.4/3</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>17.06</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>17.41</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>-1.82</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7.4/4</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>15.37</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>15.54</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
<td>.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7.4/5</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>10.84</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>11.34</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>-2.55</td>
<td>.012*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(df = n of pairs -1)

KEY
0 0 = teacher believed in, and maintained, a central position in drama
X 0 = teacher did not believe in, but maintained, a central position in drama
X X = teacher did not believed in, or maintain, a central position in drama
N.T. = hypothesis not tested - sample without belief-behaviour combination
* = rejected hypothesis
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Belief-Behaviour</th>
<th>Drama Type</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>TIME B Mean</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.19.1/1 to 7.19.2/5</td>
<td>X O Dp</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53.03</td>
<td>10.33</td>
<td>53.65</td>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.19.3/1</td>
<td>X O Dp</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41.92</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>57.03</td>
<td>9.56</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.19.3/2</td>
<td>X O Dp</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16.57</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>17.07</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.19.3/3</td>
<td>X O Dp</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.88</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>15.19</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>.465</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.19.3/5</td>
<td>X O Dp</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10.84</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>11.46</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.19.4/1</td>
<td>X X Dp</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>50.03</td>
<td>9.83</td>
<td>52.42</td>
<td>11.09</td>
<td>-3.73</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.19.4/2</td>
<td>X X Dp</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>51.55</td>
<td>9.04</td>
<td>51.68</td>
<td>8.61</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>.862</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.19.4/3</td>
<td>X X Dp</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>17.06</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>17.41</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.19.4/4</td>
<td>X X Dp</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>15.37</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>15.54</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.19.4/5</td>
<td>X X Dp</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>10.84</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>11.34</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>-2.55</td>
<td>.012*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.20.1/1</td>
<td>O O De</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48.80</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>45.36</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.001*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.20.1/2</td>
<td>O O De</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48.63</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>46.02</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.003*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.20.1/3</td>
<td>O O De</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17.34</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>16.95</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.20.1/5</td>
<td>O O De</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15.27</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>15.44</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>.606</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.20.2/1 to 7.20.2/5</td>
<td>X O De</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>55.07</td>
<td>10.79</td>
<td>51.38</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>.007*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.20.3/1</td>
<td>X O De</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>52.61</td>
<td>7.88</td>
<td>48.07</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>.005*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.20.3/2</td>
<td>X O De</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16.88</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>17.45</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>-2.08</td>
<td>.044*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.20.3/3</td>
<td>X O De</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14.88</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>15.42</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>-2.22</td>
<td>.032*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.20.3/4</td>
<td>X O De</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10.14</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>9.69</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.20.3/5</td>
<td>N.T.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 10.14 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Belief-Behaviour</th>
<th>Drama Type</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean s</th>
<th>TIME B Mean s</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.20.4/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.20.4/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.21.1/1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41.57</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>-2.21</td>
<td>.039*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.21.1/2</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>44.19</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.21.1/3</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.21.1/4</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15.33</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.21.1/5</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.14</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.21.2/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.21.2/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.21.3/1</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>49.77</td>
<td>9.19</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.21.3/2</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>50.20</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.21.3/3</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>16.60</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>.407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.21.3/4</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>15.12</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.21.3/5</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>11.45</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.21.4/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.21.4/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(df = n of pairs -1)

### KEY

- 0 0 = teacher believed in, and maintained, a central position in drama
- X 0 = teacher did not believe in, but maintained, a central position in drama
- X X = teacher did not believe in, or maintain, a central position in drama
- N.T. = hypothesis not tested - sample without belief-behaviour combination
- * = rejected hypothesis
- Dp = dramatic play
- De = drama exercise
- T = theatre
7.2 Discussion

Teachers who did not believe that 'out-front' methods were the most effective classroom strategies, and who adopted a peripheral position in drama, produced significant pupil gains on verbal creativity and academic self-image. This group consisted of dramatic play teachers.

Some teachers believed that out-front teaching was not the most effective teaching strategy, but nevertheless took up a central position in drama. As a group they served to generate a significant pupil loss on verbal creativity. Within this group one teacher of dramatic play produced significant pupil gains on figural creativity, but not elsewhere. All theatre teachers sharing this belief-behaviour configuration failed to make any significant pupil gains. Teachers of drama exercise also sharing this belief-behaviour combination, accrued significant pupil losses on verbal and non-verbal creativity and empathy, but made a significant gain on self-esteem.

Teachers who believed that the most effective teaching was done out-front, and who took up a central position in drama, produced a significant pupil loss on figural creativity. One teacher of theatre within this group produced significant pupil gains on verbal creativity. On the other hand, drama exercise teachers with this belief-
behaviour combination, produced significant pupil losses on both verbal and non-verbal creativity.

Consistent dramatic play teachers managed to generate significant pupil gains on verbal creativity and academic self-image. The only inconsistent teacher of dramatic play managed to produce significant pupil gains on figural creativity. One consistent teacher of theatre who adopted a central stance in drama, generated a significant pupil gain on verbal creativity. Inconsistent theatre teachers did not produce any significant gains on pupil outcomes.

Consistent and inconsistent teachers of drama exercise accrued significant pupil losses on verbal and non-verbal creativity.

8. **Hypothesis 6.8**

Hypothesis 6.8 (constituting 6.8.1/1 to 6.8.4/5) stated that there would be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers were grouped according to beliefs and actions in respect of pupil mobility (see Key).

The results of testing hypotheses 6.8.1/1 to 6.8.2/5 and 6.8.4/1 to 6.8.4/5 are reported in Table 10.15. It was not possible to test hypotheses 6.8.3/1 to 6.8.3/5 because no teachers in the sub-sample had the necessary belief-behaviour characteristics. Hypotheses 6.8.1/2 and 6.8.1/5,
concerning teachers believing in, and encouraging, pupil mobility, and pupils' gains/losses on measures of figural creativity and academic self-image respectively, were rejected because t values were significant at the .03 level or higher (6.8.1/2 : t = -2.11) (6.8.1/5 : t = -2.76).

Hypothesis 6.8.2/2, regarding teachers believing in, but not encouraging, pupil mobility and pupils' gains/losses on a measure of figural creativity, was rejected because the t value of 2.00 was significant at the .04 level. All other hypotheses, relating to belief-behaviour of teachers in respect of pupil mobility and pupil outcomes, were accepted because t values were not significant at the .05 level.

8.1 Hypotheses 7.22, 7.23 and 7.24

Hypotheses 7.22 (7.22.1/1 to 7.22.4/5), 7.23 (7.23.1/1 to 7.23.4/5) and 7.24 (7.24.1/1 to 7.24.4/5) asserted that there would be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers of dramatic play, drama exercise and theatre respectively were grouped according to beliefs and behaviour regarding pupil mobility (see Key).

The results of testing hypotheses 7.22.1/1 to 7.22.1/5, 7.23.1/1 to 7.23.1/5, 7.23.3/1 to 7.23.3/5, 7.24.1/1 to 7.24.1/5 and 7.24.4/1 to 7.24.4/5 are reported in Table 10.16. It was not possible to test hypotheses 7.22.2/1 to 7.22.4/5, 7.23.1/1 to 7.23.1/5 and 7.23.3/1 to 7.23.3/5
because teachers in the sub-sample (n=16) did not have the necessary belief-behaviour characteristics and drama choices for purposes of analysis.

Hypotheses 7.22.1/1, 7.22.1/2, 7.22.1/3 and 7.22.1/5, concerning teachers of dramatic play believing in, and encouraging, pupil mobility and pupils' gains/losses on measures of verbal and figural creativity, empathy and academic self-image respectively, were rejected because t values were significant at the .03 level or higher (7.22.1/1 : $t = -3.60$) (7.22.1/2 : $t = -3.24$) (7.22.1/3 : $t = -2.17$) (7.22.1/5 : $t = -3.00$).

Hypotheses 7.23.2/1 to 7.23.2/5, regarding teachers of drama exercise believing in, but not encouraging, pupil mobility and pupils' gains/losses on measures of verbal and figural creativity, empathy and self-esteem respectively, were rejected because t values were significant at the .04 level or higher (7.23.2/1 : $t = 2.86$) (7.23.2/2 : $t = 2.96$) (7.23.2/3 : $t = -2.08$) (7.23.2/5 : $t = -2.22$).

Hypothesis 7.24.2/4, concerning teachers of theatre believing in, but not encouraging, pupil mobility and pupils' gains/losses on a measure of self-esteem, was rejected because the t value of 3.04 was significant at the .003 level. All other hypotheses, relating to belief-behaviour of teachers in respect of pupil mobility, drama choices and pupil outcomes, were accepted because t values were not significant at the .05 level.
Table 10.15 Belief-behaviour of teachers concerning pupil mobility and pupil outcomes: results of testing hypotheses

| Hypothesis | Belief-Behaviour | n of Pupils | TIME A Mean | TIME B Mean | t Value | p  
|------------|------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------|-----
| 6.8.1/1    | 0 0              | 202         | 50.13       | 50.94       | -1.54   | .126|
| 6.8.1/2    | 0 0              | 202         | 49.63       | 51.05       | -2.11   | .036*|
| 6.8.1/3    | 0 0              | 202         | 17.06       | 17.26       | -1.32   | .188|
| 6.8.1/4    | 0 0              | 202         | 15.29       | 15.47       | -1.24   | .216|
| 6.8.1/5    | 0 0              | 202         | 11.23       | 11.65       | -2.76   | .006*|
| 6.8.2/1    | 0 X              | 131         | 51.01       | 49.79       | 1.79    | .076|
| 6.8.2/2    | 0 X              | 131         | 50.94       | 49.54       | 2.00    | .048*|
| 6.8.2/3    | 0 X              | 131         | 17.03       | 16.99       | 0.24    | .812|
| 6.8.2/4    | 0 X              | 131         | 15.09       | 14.88       | 1.33    | .185|
| 6.8.2/5    | 0 X              | 131         | 11.00       | 10.85       | 0.079   | .430|
| 6.8.3/1    |                 |             |             |             |         |     |
| to         | N.T.             |             |             |             |         |     |
| 6.8.3/5    |                 |             |             |             |         |     |
| 6.8.4/1    | X X              | 37          | 46.72       | 46.91       | -0.15   | .880|
| 6.8.4/2    | X X              | 37          | 46.91       | 45.51       | 1.55    | .130|
| 6.8.4/3    | X X              | 37          | 15.43       | 15.72       | -0.68   | .500|
| 6.8.4/4    | X X              | 37          | 15.08       | 15.59       | -1.35   | .186|
| 6.8.4/5    | X X              | 37          | 11.37       | 10.81       | 1.51    | .139|

(df = n of pairs -1)

KEY

0 0 = teacher believed in, and encouraged, pupil mobility in drama
0 X = teacher believed in, but did not encourage, pupil mobility in drama
X X = teacher did not believe in, or encourage, pupil mobility in drama
N.T. = hypothesis not tested - sample without belief-behaviour combination
* = rejected hypothesis
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Drama Type</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean</th>
<th>TIME B Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.22.1/1</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>50.54</td>
<td>52.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.22.1/2</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>49.94</td>
<td>52.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.22.1/3</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>49.96</td>
<td>52.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.22.1/4</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>16.99</td>
<td>17.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.22.1/5</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>15.29</td>
<td>15.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.22.2/1</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>10.84</td>
<td>11.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.22.2/2</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.22.4/1</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.22.4/2</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.22.4/3</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.22.4/4</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.22.4/5</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>t Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00*</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>-3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01*</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>-2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.03*</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.06*</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>-1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>-2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td>8.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.007*</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td>8.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.007*</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td>8.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.007*</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td>8.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued over...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Belief-Behaviour</th>
<th>Drama Type</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean s</th>
<th>TIME B Mean s</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.24.1/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.24.1/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.24.2/1</td>
<td>O X</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>49.10</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.24.2/2</td>
<td>O X</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>50.15</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.24.2/3</td>
<td>O X</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>17.11</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.24.2/4</td>
<td>O X</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>15.19</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.24.2/5</td>
<td>O X</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>11.41</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.24.3/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.24.3/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.24.4/1</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46.72</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.24.4/2</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46.91</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.24.4/3</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15.43</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.24.4/4</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15.08</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.24.4/5</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11.37</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(df = n of pairs - 1)

**KEY**

O O = teacher believed in, and encouraged, pupil mobility in drama
O X = teacher believed in, but did not encourage, pupil mobility in drama
X X = teacher did not believe in, or encourage, pupil mobility in drama
N.T. = hypothesis not tested - sample without belief-behaviour combination
* = rejected hypothesis
Dp = dramatic play
De = dramatic exercise
T = theatre
8.2 Discussion

All teachers believed that drama provided a welcome opportunity for pupil mobility in the classroom. However, in practice, not all pupils were allowed to be mobile.

Teachers who believed in, and allowed for, pupil mobility in the classroom, produced significant pupil gains on non-verbal creativity and academic self-image. Teachers of dramatic play who had these belief-behaviour characteristics generated significant pupil gains on creativity (verbal and non-verbal), empathy and academic self-image.

Teachers who believed in, but did not allow for, pupil mobility in the classroom produced a significant pupil loss on non-verbal creativity. All theatre teachers were in this group, and did not make any significant pupil gains on outcomes. Drama exercise teachers generated significant losses on verbal and non-verbal creativity, but managed to produce pupil growth on empathy and academic self-image. Whether dramatic exercise teachers were consistent or otherwise, all of them produced significant losses on verbal and non-verbal creativity. Inconsistent drama exercise teachers made a significant gain on self-esteem. There were no inconsistent dramatic play teachers.
9. **Hypothesis 6.9**

Hypothesis 6.9 (constituting 6.9.1/1 to 6.9.4/5) asserted that there would be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers were grouped according to beliefs and actions in respect of pupil competition (see Key).

The results of testing hypotheses 6.9.1/1 to 6.9.4/5 are reported in Table 10.17. Hypothesis 6.9.1/2 concerning teachers believing in the value of, and using competition between pupils and pupils' gains/losses on a measure of figural creativity, was rejected because the t value of 4.34 was significant at the .000 level. Hypothesis 6.9.2/3, regarding teachers believing in, but not using, competition between pupils and pupils' gains/losses on a measure of empathy, was rejected because the t value of -1.99 was significant at the .04 level. Hypothesis 6.9.3/5, concerning teachers not believing in, but nevertheless using, competition between pupils and pupils' gains/losses on a measure of academic self-image, was rejected because the t value of 2.25 was significant at the .02 level. Hypotheses 6.9.4/1, 6.9.4/2, 6.9.4/3 and 6.9.4/5, concerning teachers not believing in, or using, competition between pupils and pupils' gains/losses on measures of verbal and figural creativity, empathy and academic self-image respectively, were rejected because t values were significant at the .03...
level or higher (6.9.4/1 : $t = -2.09$) (6.9.4/2 : $t = -2.33$) (6.9.4/3 : $t = -2.18$) (6.9.4/5 : $t = -2.71$). All other hypotheses tested, in relation to belief-behaviour of teachers regarding pupil competition and pupil outcomes, were accepted because $t$ values were not significant at the .05 level.

9.1 Hypotheses 7.25, 7.26 and 7.27

Hypotheses 7.25 (7.25.1/1 to 7.25.4/5), 7.26 (7.26.1/1 to 7.26.4/5) and 7.27 (7.27.1/1 to 7.27.4/5) stated that there would be no significant gain or loss on each measure of pupil outcome between Time A and Time B where teachers of dramatic play, drama exercise and theatre respectively were grouped according to beliefs and actions in respect of pupil competition (see Key).

The results of testing hypotheses 7.25.2/1 to 7.25.2/5, 7.25.4/1 to 7.25.4/5, 7.26.1/1 to 7.26.2/5, 7.26.4/1 to 7.26.4/5 and 7.27.1/1 to 7.27.3/5 are reported in Table 10.18. It was not possible to test hypotheses 7.25.1/1 to 7.25.1/5, 7.25.3/1 to 7.25.3/5, 7.26.3/1 to 7.26.3/5 and 7.27.4/1 to 7.27.4/5 because no teachers in the sub-sample (n=16) had the belief-behaviour characteristics and drama choices required.

Hypothesis 7.25.2/1, concerning teachers of dramatic play believing in, but not using, competition between pupils
and pupils' gains/losses on a measure of verbal creativity, was rejected because the t value of -2.28 was significant at the .02 level. Hypotheses 7.25.4/1, 7.25.4/2, 7.25.4/3 and 7.25.4/5, concerning teachers of dramatic play not believing in, and not using, competition between pupils and pupils' gains/losses on measures of verbal and figural creativity, empathy and academic self-image respectively, were rejected because t values were significant at the .02 level or higher (7.25.4/1 : t = -2.80) (7.25.4/2 : t = -3.18) (7.25.4/3 : t = -2.32) (7.25.4/5 : t = -3.28).

Hypotheses 7.26.1/1 and 7.26.1/2, regarding teachers of drama exercise believing in, and using, competition between pupils and pupils' gains/losses on measures of verbal and figural creativity respectively, were rejected because t values were significant at the .008 level or higher (7.26.1/1 : t = 2.77) (7.26.1/2 : t = 4.66). Hypothesis 7.26.2/1, concerning teachers of drama exercise believing in, but not using, competition between pupils and pupils' gains/losses on a measure of verbal creativity, was rejected because the t value of 4.12 was significant at the .000 level. Hypothesis 7.26.4/2, regarding teachers of drama exercise not believing in, and not using, competition between pupils and pupils' gains/losses on a measure of figural creativity, was rejected because the t value of 4.12 was significant at the .001 level.
Hypothesis 7.27.1/4, concerning teachers of theatre believing in, and using, competition between pupils and pupils' gains/losses on a measure of self-esteem, was rejected because the t value of 2.94 was significant at the .005 level. Hypothesis 7.27.2/4, regarding teachers of theatre believing in, but not using, competition between pupils and pupils' gains/losses on a measure of self-esteem, was rejected because the t value of 2.50 was significant at the .02 level. All other hypotheses tested, in relation to belief-behaviour characteristics of teachers regarding pupil competition, drama choices and pupil outcomes, were accepted because t values were not significant at the .05 level.
Table 10.17 Belief-behaviour of teachers concerning pupil competition and pupil outcomes:
results of testing hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Belief-Behaviour</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean</th>
<th>TIME A s</th>
<th>TIME B Mean</th>
<th>TIME B s</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.9.1/1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>47.90</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>47.12</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9.1/2</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>50.09</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>46.77</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9.1/3</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>17.60</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>17.37</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9.1/4</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>15.60</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>15.40</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9.1/5</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>12.03</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>11.91</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>.616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9.2/1</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>48.05</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>47.69</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9.2/2</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>48.65</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>49.29</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>-0.96</td>
<td>.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9.2/3</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>17.19</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>17.57</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>-1.99</td>
<td>.049*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9.2/4</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>14.64</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>14.76</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9.2/5</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>10.47</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>10.79</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>-1.56</td>
<td>.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9.3/1</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>49.15</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>48.35</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>.402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9.3/2</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>47.33</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>47.60</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>.726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9.3/3</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15.91</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>15.46</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9.3/4</td>
<td>X 0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>14.71</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>15.10</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>-1.44</td>
<td>.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9.3/5</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>55.20</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>56.94</td>
<td>9.77</td>
<td>-2.09</td>
<td>.039*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9.4/1</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>52.47</td>
<td>10.12</td>
<td>55.23</td>
<td>9.37</td>
<td>-2.33</td>
<td>.022*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9.4/2</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>16.44</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>16.95</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>-2.18</td>
<td>.031*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9.4/3</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>15.76</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>15.86</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>.616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9.4/4</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>11.05</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>-2.71</td>
<td>.008*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(df = n of pairs -1)

KEY
0 0 = teacher believed in, and used, competition between pupils
0 X = teacher believed in, but did not use, competition between pupils
X 0 = teacher did not believe in, but used, competition between pupils
X X = teacher did not believe in, or use, competition between pupils
N.T. = hypothesis not tested - sample without belief-behaviour combination
* = rejected hypothesis
Table 10.18 Belief-behaviour of teachers concerning pupil competition, drama choice and pupil outcomes: results of testing hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Belief-Behaviour</th>
<th>Drama Type</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean s</th>
<th>TIME B Mean s</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.25.1/1 to 7.25.1/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.25.2/1</td>
<td>O X</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>44.08</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>45.69</td>
<td>7.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.25.2/2</td>
<td>O X</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>46.97</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>47.76</td>
<td>6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.25.2/3</td>
<td>O X</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>17.45</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>17.59</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.25.2/4</td>
<td>O X</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>14.80</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>15.12</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.25.2/5</td>
<td>O X</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>10.77</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>11.05</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.25.3/1 to 7.25.3/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.25.4/1</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>56.14</td>
<td>9.64</td>
<td>58.65</td>
<td>9.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.25.4/2</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>52.51</td>
<td>10.43</td>
<td>56.75</td>
<td>8.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.25.4/3</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>16.56</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>17.15</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.25.4/4</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>15.72</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.25.4/5</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>11.63</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.26.1/1</td>
<td>O O</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>48.72</td>
<td>7.66</td>
<td>36.17</td>
<td>7.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.26.1/2</td>
<td>O O</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50.76</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>45.49</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.26.1/3</td>
<td>O O</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>17.66</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>17.47</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.26.1/4</td>
<td>O O</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15.03</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>15.35</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.26.1/5</td>
<td>O O</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11.94</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>11.70</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.26.2/1</td>
<td>O X</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>59.86</td>
<td>10.46</td>
<td>52.95</td>
<td>8.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.26.2/2</td>
<td>O X</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>48.68</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>50.22</td>
<td>7.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.26.2/3</td>
<td>O X</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16.81</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>17.45</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.26.2/4</td>
<td>O X</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14.54</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>15.04</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.26.2/5</td>
<td>O X</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.86</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>9.95</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued over ...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Belief-Behaviour</th>
<th>Drama Type</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean</th>
<th>TIME B Mean</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.26.3/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.26.3/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.26.4/1</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50.31</td>
<td>48.12</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.26.4/2</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>52.25</td>
<td>47.31</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.26.4/3</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.81</td>
<td>15.93</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.26.4/4</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>16.25</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>.652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.26.4/5</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>De</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.81</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.27.1/1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46.93</td>
<td>48.25</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.27.1/2</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>49.30</td>
<td>48.30</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.27.1/3</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17.53</td>
<td>17.25</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>.403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.27.1/4</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16.27</td>
<td>15.46</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.005*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.27.1/5</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12.13</td>
<td>12.16</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.27.2/1</td>
<td>O X</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>49.21</td>
<td>48.91</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.27.2/2</td>
<td>O X</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>53.91</td>
<td>53.17</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>.653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.27.2/3</td>
<td>O X</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.73</td>
<td>17.60</td>
<td>-1.89</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.27.2/4</td>
<td>O X</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14.21</td>
<td>13.39</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.020*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.27.2/5</td>
<td>O X</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td>-1.85</td>
<td>.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.27.3/1</td>
<td>X O</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>49.15</td>
<td>48.35</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>.402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.27.3/2</td>
<td>X O</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>47.33</td>
<td>47.60</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>.726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.27.3/3</td>
<td>X O</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15.91</td>
<td>15.46</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.27.3/4</td>
<td>X O</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>14.71</td>
<td>15.10</td>
<td>-1.44</td>
<td>.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.27.3/5</td>
<td>X O</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11.36</td>
<td>10.73</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.028*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued over ...
Table 10.18 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Belief-Behaviour</th>
<th>Drama Type</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A Mean s</th>
<th>TIME B Mean s</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.27.4/1 to 7.27.4/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(df = n of pairs -1)

**KEY**

0 0 = teacher believed in, and used, competition between pupils
0 X = teacher believed in, but did not use, competition between pupils
X 0 = teacher did not believe in, but used, competition between pupils
X X = teacher did not believe in, or use, competition between pupils
N.T. = hypothesis not tested - sample without belief-behaviour combination
* = rejected hypothesis
Dp = dramatic play
De = dramatic exercise
T = theatre
9.2 Discussion

Teachers who believed that competition between pupils in the classroom did not lead to higher standards of work, and who did not have pupils competing for parts in drama, produced significant pupil gains on creativity (verbal and non-verbal), empathy and academic self-image. This group included most dramatic play teachers who produced the same pupil outcomes as those mentioned above. There were no theatre teachers in this group. One drama exercise teacher who shared this belief-behaviour combination did not produce any significant gains and engendered a significant pupil loss on non-verbal creativity.

Teachers who did not believe in the value of competition between pupils, but who had pupils competing for parts in drama, produced a significant pupil loss on academic self-image. There were no drama exercise teachers in this group.

Teachers who believed in the value of competition between pupils but who did not have pupils competing for parts in drama, engendered a significant pupil gain on empathy. The only theatre teacher within this group produced no significant gains on pupil outcomes and further managed to produce a significant loss on pupil self-esteem. Similarly, one drama exercise teacher with this belief-behaviour characteristic generated no significant gains and also produced a significant pupil loss on verbal creativity.
There were teachers who believed in the value of competition between pupils and who also had pupils competing for parts in drama. Theatre teachers in this group accrued a significant pupil loss on self-esteem. Drama exercise teachers who shared this belief-behaviour combination generated significant pupil losses on both verbal and non-verbal creativity.

Both consistent and inconsistent dramatic play teachers managed to produce significant pupil gains on verbal creativity, while the former also accrued significant pupil gains on non-verbal creativity, empathy and academic self-image. Consistent drama exercise teachers, who encouraged competition between pupils, produced significant pupil losses on verbal and non-verbal creativity. The only inconsistent drama exercise teacher generated a significant pupil loss on verbal creativity. One consistent exercise teacher who did not value competition between pupils produced no significant pupil gains on outcomes, only a significant loss on non-verbal creativity. Consistent and inconsistent theatre teachers who believed in the use of competition between pupils, accrued a significant pupil loss on self-esteem. Inconsistent theatre teachers, who did not believe in the value of competition between pupils, generated no significant pupil gains at all.
10. A SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Significant pupil gains on educational outcomes were found to be associated with the belief-behaviour characteristics of teachers, whether or not drama options were taken into account.

10.1 Regardless of drama choice

Pupil gains on verbal creativity were produced via a belief in, and actions consonant with: low teacher direction; use of pupil ideas; encouragement of pupil autonomy; pupil mobility; indirect pupil control; teacher flexibility; low teacher centredness; absence of pupil competition; and, positive expectations held for less able pupils.

When non-verbal creativity is examined, it is notable that most significant pupil gains were associated with teacher beliefs and behaviour in concert with: indirect pupil control; low teacher direction; absence of pupil competition; and, teacher flexibility.

Significant pupils' gains on empathy were found to be associated with teacher beliefs and actions in accord with: low teacher direction; absence of pupil competition; teacher flexibility; and, positive expectations held for less able pupils.

Gains on pupil self-esteem were associated with teacher
flexibility, i.e., teacher confidence and a willingness to depart from predetermined plans where deemed relevant.

The academic self-image of pupils was seen to be optimised when teacher beliefs and behaviour were consistent with: use of pupil ideas; low teacher centredness; and, when positive expectations were held for less able pupils.

It is notable that teacher flexibility was the only characteristic common to all aspects of pupil gain on selected educational outcomes.

10.2 According to drama choice

10.2.1 Dramatic play

Most dramatic play teachers held beliefs and behaviour consistent with: low teacher direction; use of pupil ideas; teacher flexibility; indirect pupil control; pupil autonomy; low teacher centredness; pupil mobility; an absence of pupil competition; and, positive expectations for less able pupils. It follows that most dramatic play teachers produced gains on outcomes because they possessed the necessary belief-behaviour combinations.

Any departure by dramatic play teachers from the above belief-behaviour characteristics had an influence on pupil outcomes: dramatic play 'abdicators', who did not direct or organise any part of pupil drama, produced no significant pupil gains and further generated a significant pupil loss
on non-verbal creativity. Similarly, other dramatic play teachers who operated high rather than low teacher direction, encouraged pupil dependence rather than autonomy, and who adhered to set plans in drama, managed to produce pupil gains on non-verbal creativity, but not elsewhere. Moreover, dramatic play teachers whose beliefs and behaviour were inconsistent regarding teacher centredness and the use of pupil ideas, yielded significant pupil gains on verbal creativity, but managed no significant gains elsewhere.

10.2.2 Drama exercise

Although teachers of drama exercise differed among themselves regarding a number of beliefs, all were seen to act in accord with: high teacher direction; adherence to set plans; encouragement of pupil dependence; and, high teacher centredness. With these actions, regardless of held beliefs, drama exercise teachers generated significant pupil losses on verbal and non-verbal creativity. Even when drama exercise teachers possessed belief-behaviour qualities associated with pupil gains, they still managed to produce significant losses on verbal and non-verbal creativity and academic self-image. So whether or not drama exercise teachers are consistent would seem to hold little import for pupil outcomes.

Drama exercise is facilitative of high teacher
direction, low teacher flexibility, the encouragement of pupil dependence and a high degree of teacher centredness.

10.2.3 Theatre

Teachers of theatre, regardless of their beliefs, behaved in accord with: adherence to set plans; no use of pupil ideas; pupil dependence; high teacher centredness; and, low pupil mobility. These aspects of behaviour may be necessary if theatre is to be done in the primary school. However, these elements of behaviour were associated with significant pupil losses on measures of self-esteem, academic self-image and non-verbal creativity. It is seen that some gains were made on verbal creativity. Regardless of theatre teachers' intended pupil outcomes, most tended to produce neither gains nor losses on observed measures.

Both consistent and inconsistent teachers of theatre, on matters concerning expectations held for less able pupils and the use of competition, were seen to generate significant pupil losses on verbal creativity, academic self-image and self-esteem.

10.3 An overview

Few teacher beliefs were found to be associated with pupil success when behaviour was not taken into account. More aspects of teacher behaviour were related to
significant pupil gains on outcomes than held beliefs. There is a suggestion here that what teachers do is more relevant to pupil outcomes than what teachers believe. However, the most productive insight on the attainment of optimum pupil outcomes was rendered when both beliefs and behaviour of teachers were examined simultaneously. The belief-behaviour consistency of teachers influenced the outcomes of pupils relative to the kind of drama being done. Consistent dramatic play teachers generated significant pupil gains on verbal and figural creativity, empathy and academic self-image. Inconsistent dramatic play teachers only made significant pupils' gains on figural creativity and generated no pupils' gains on other outcomes.

Drama exercise teachers, consistent or otherwise, tended to produce significant losses on pupil outcomes. Similarly, theatre teachers, consistent or otherwise, generated significant pupil losses on self-esteem, academic self-image and non-verbal creativity while significant gains were absent elsewhere. This latter finding may give support to the views of some writers about theatre's influence upon the depletion of pupil self-esteem.

When we examine the three kinds of drama, it is notable that most of the belief-behaviour characteristics associated with high or low pupil gains are fundamental to the nature of the option. For example, it is necessary for teachers to direct pupils when doing theatre, and yet teacher direction
was associated with an evident lack of pupils' gains on educational outcomes.

It may well be that the very act of doing theatre and/or drama exercise, will at best produce no pupil gains at all and, at worse, will engender significant pupil losses on outcomes. This kind of 'black box' theory is not likely to work with dramatic play. The act of doing dramatic play is not enough within itself to guarantee pupil success on outcomes. Departures from a number of consistent belief-behaviour characteristics resulted in diminished returns on pupil outcomes.

Examination is now made of the profile characteristics of teachers in order to gauge the extent to which present findings, regarding drama options and belief-behaviour consistency of teacher groups, are reflected in the classroom settings of individual teachers. In particular an analysis is made of teachers who produce either the highest or lowest degree of pupil gain on each educational outcome. To what extent are highest and lowest achieving teachers differentiated on their belief, behaviour and drama characteristics? It is this latter question which provided the impetus for the analysis of data reported in the following chapter.
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INTRODUCTION

So far in the research analysis a number of separate
teacher group characteristics (beliefs, behaviour and drama
choices) have been found to be associated with pupil gains
and losses on selected educational outcomes. When we look
at individual teachers within groups, it is notable that
they possess specific combinations of these teacher
characteristics. It is necessary to show which particular
combinations of teacher elements are likely to meet intended
pupil outcomes. What are the profile characteristics of the
highest and lowest achieving teachers on each outcome? To
what extent do individual differences on teacher character-
istics reflect group differences on pupil outcomes, reported
in Chapters Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten?

The present analysis is divided into six main parts.
Each of the first four parts consists of a comparative
profile of highest versus lowest teacher achievers on one
pupil outcome. Pupil outcomes under scrutiny are creativity
(verbal and non-verbal), empathy and academic self-image.
There is no comparison of self-esteem because no one managed
to promote any significant pupil changes on this outcome. It will be noted that one Teacher, A, managed to promote the highest degree of pupil gains on three out of the four pupil measures. It would have been possible to compare A with the three lowest achievers simultaneously, but for purposes of clarity separate teacher comparisons were made on outcomes where A was the highest achiever.

Each separate profile comparison consists of an examination of teacher beliefs (including drama choice), behaviour and general classroom interaction. The latter teacher-pupil element is introduced in order to provide further perspectives on those combinations of teacher characteristics associated with significant gains and losses on pupil outcomes.

The Classroom Observation Schedule (Appendix 8) was used to record four aspects of general classroom interaction (excluding drama). Only three of these aspects have been employed in the present comparisons of teachers, i.e., teacher warmth, teacher target and person talking. The fourth aspect, praise/blame, has not been included because the teachers under scrutiny did not use pupil praise or blame during periods of observation.

The fifth and sixth parts of the present chapter provide summaries of profile characteristics associated with highest and lowest pupil gains respectively on indices of verbal and figural creativity, empathy and academic
self-image. Because no individual teacher managed to promote significant pupil gains on indices of self-esteem,* it is not feasible to proceed with a comparison of highest versus lowest achieving teachers on this outcome. Overall we want to show those combinations of teacher beliefs, behaviour, belief-behaviour consistency and drama choices which may serve to optimise pupil gains on educational outcomes. Finding out what the characteristics of highest and lowest achieving teachers are, provides one way by which this may be done.

Before proceeding to compare highest and lowest achieving teachers on their beliefs, behaviour and drama choices, an outline is given of each teacher's personal characteristics.

A note on the personal characteristics of highest and lowest achieving teachers on pupil growth

1. Teacher A produced the highest degree of pupil gains on measures of verbal creativity, empathy and academic self-image and chose to operate dramatic play. A is a thirty-one to thirty-five year old female who works in a large rural primary school. Following two years training, A worked as a general class teacher for eleven years. Her present class is a grade six consisting of twenty-seven pupils.

* See Appendix 16 for pupils' gains/losses on self-esteem.
2. Teacher D achieved the highest degree of pupil gain on figural (non-verbal) creativity and chose to use dramatic play. D is a thirty-one to thirty-five year old male teacher who works in a large urban primary school. Since his initial two year training period D has taught for fifteen years as a general class teacher. D's present class is a fourth grade consisting of twenty-six pupils.

3. Teacher J promoted significant pupil loss on a measure of empathy and makes use of theatre. J is a thirty-one year old male teacher who works in a small urban primary school. He is a two-year trained teacher who has worked as a general class teacher for fifteen years. Teacher J's present class is a composite grade consisting of pupils from grades three to six. There are twenty-three pupils in J's class.

4. Teacher M produced significant pupil loss on verbal creativity. M is a forty-one to forty-five year old female teacher who works in a medium-sized urban primary school. She believed that she was operating dramatic play (child-invented drama), but used drama exercise instead. M is a four-year trained teacher who has fourteen years teaching experience. Her present class consists of twenty-two grade five pupils.

5. Teacher P promoted significant pupil losses on both figural creativity and academic self-image. P is a twenty-six to thirty year old female teacher who works in
a medium-sized primary school. Following three years basic teacher training, P has been a general class teacher for five years. As with teacher M, P believed that she was doing dramatic play with her class, but was seen to be operating drama exercise instead. P's present class consists of twenty grade five pupils. Between them, teachers A, D, J, M and P provide either the highest or lowest pupil gains on each educational outcome. A start is now made with a comparative teacher profile of D and P, highest and lowest producers of pupil gains on figural creativity respectively.

1. A COMPARISON OF TEACHERS D AND P: PROMOTERS OF HIGHEST VERSUS LOWEST PUPIL GAINS ON FIGURAL CREATIVITY

Inspection of Table 11.1 shows that teachers D and P have promoted highest and lowest pupil gains respectively on figural creativity.

1.1 The beliefs of D and P

Beliefs about the teacher

Teachers D and P believed that they should direct most pupil activities because they know more than the child. However, they were seen to differ on their respective liking for direction: teacher D liked to direct the work of other people, but said of his role in the classroom:
I'm more of a guide than a director. However there are a number of pupils who need a little more directing than others. (Appendix 5)

On the other hand, teacher P did not like directing the work of other people but, because of her beliefs about pupil behaviour said:

You have to direct them ... and yet I'd like to guide them more ... (Appendix 5)

Neither D nor P believed that 'out-front' teacher direction is the best strategy to be employed in their work. It is notable that both teachers believed that pupils prefer to be directed rather than use their initiative.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case*</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A M</th>
<th>TIME A s</th>
<th>TIME B M</th>
<th>TIME B s</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
<th>p*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>56.74</td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td>60.74</td>
<td>9.27</td>
<td>+4.00</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>57.90</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>52.93</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>-4.97</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48.83</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>47.50</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>-1.33</td>
<td>.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41.92</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>57.03</td>
<td>9.56</td>
<td>+15.11</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45.46</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>48.90</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>+3.44</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>46.22</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>-0.78</td>
<td>.462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50.07</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>49.50</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>53.91</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td>53.17</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
<td>.653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>43.08</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>-1.92</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>50.95</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>+2.95</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>54.18</td>
<td>7.74</td>
<td>54.50</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>+0.32</td>
<td>.748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>44.19</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>41.80</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>-2.39</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>48.68</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>50.22</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>+1.54</td>
<td>.353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>46.77</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>45.35</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>-1.42</td>
<td>.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>52.25</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>47.31</td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>-4.94</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>56.95</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>45.70</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>-11.75</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>49.83</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>49.96</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>+0.13</td>
<td>.763</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ = highest gain
- = greatest loss
* Note: Case = Teacher in sub-sample
Beliefs about significant others

D and P were of the opinion that most pupils are capable of self-discipline and that they are likely to behave well when faced with novel learning situations. Although both teachers liked having others rely upon them for ideas and opinions, they both agreed that the ideas of pupils should always be tolerated even if they conflict with their own.

In respect of less able pupils, D and P believed that all children are capable of being creative regardless of their abilities elsewhere in the curriculum. Whether or not pupils need extrinsic motivators in order for learning to take place is a matter of contention between D and P. Teacher D saw no value in competition between pupils and disliked encouraging a competitive classroom ethos. In contrast to D, teacher P believed that competition between pupils leads to higher standards of work. Furthermore, P liked to encourage a competitive classroom atmosphere.

With reference to colleague support, neither D nor P felt that they had to keep their failures and mistakes to themselves. Teachers D and P also agreed that colleagues should be mutually supportive of each other's methods even if they differ from their own.

Beliefs about the aims and organisation of learning

D and P rejected the notion that the teacher's main aim should be to encourage pupils towards academic excellence.
Moreover, they did not believe in postponing aspects of the curriculum likely to conflict with time to be spent on the 'basic curriculum'. In reference to goal setting, D and P believed, along with most of the outer teacher sample (n=235), that they should have set targets of work content to complete within the year. When pursuing their goals, D and P liked to plan well ahead so that they knew every step of a lesson before it was reached. They believed that spontaneous teaching is just as likely to achieve desired results as set plans. Both teachers welcomed order in the classroom and liked having a special place for everything and seeing that everything was kept in place.

Beliefs about drama

Both teachers D and P believed that they were doing dramatic play, but P was seen to be operating drama exercise instead. It seems that P's use of drama had lessened during her five years of teaching.

P said that:

when I first started teaching I had drama lessons regularly ... a time set aside. As time went on, and with too many kids and with all the noise ... the result was that I just abandoned it slowly. I still do it, but only five times a term at the most. (Appendix 4)

It would seem that P's beliefs about the potential behaviour of pupils has restricted their exposure to drama. How these beliefs effect the quality of drama may be assessed to some degree when we observe the drama session of P.
Teachers D and P believed that drama was not to be avoided due to any lack of expertise on their part. Further, they did not believe that drama should be left in the hands of teachers who can act or direct. It was made clear by both teachers that if drama was to be done at all, it was to be done by them only.

Drama was seen as a chance for pupils to use their own ideas, be mobile, practice self-discipline, and behave well. Teacher P believed that the main pupil benefits derived from drama use are centred upon aspects of socialisation - in particular the development of empathy. Teacher D believed that the main value of drama was that it served to promote pupil self-esteem and verbal creativity. Both D and P believed that drama was unlikely to attract criticism from other members of staff; it was not deemed to be a noisy activity. Teacher P has stated that drama time has decreased because of pupil noise and yet added that drama was not a noisy activity. This may not have been a contradiction: 'drama' for P was not as noisy as it once was because P now operates mimed exercises rather than dramatic play. This choice of option did not prevent P from believing that she was providing the fullest opportunity for pupil inventiveness.

Teachers D and P were seen to differ on very few beliefs and therefore served to reflect the high degree of teacher consensus evidenced within the Climate of Teacher Opinion. However, one belief they differed over was seen to
have import for pupil gains on figural creativity. Teacher P believed in the use of competition between pupils whereas D did not. Significant pupil gains on figural creativity were shown to be associated with those teachers who rejected the notion of competition altogether.

Whether or not beliefs about competition and other dispositions were put into action by P and D is now reported.

1.2 The belief-behaviour consistency of D and P

Prior to comparing teachers D and P on their respective ability to be consistent between beliefs and behaviour, a separate assessment of each teacher is made. For each belief-behaviour profile observations of data are divided into two parts. On the left hand side of the page is a verbatim report of the teacher's drama session centred upon the nine observational criteria fully reported via the Drama Inventory. On the right hand side of the page is the professed teacher belief which corresponds with each of the nine aspects of behaviour in question. Using this procedure it was possible to note the extent to which teacher beliefs were consistent with teacher behaviour.
1.2.1 The drama session of D

Teacher Behaviour

1. Teacher D organises his class to move their desks to the edge of the room in order to create a space for acting. A large open space is made in the centre of the room.

2. Teacher D asks all pupils to place themselves into groups of four or five. All pupils are invited to participate in the work.

3. Once in groups, D asks the class to find a suitable amount of space in which to work. A number of pupils go to the same space while some areas are left vacant. There is a suggestion here that pupils may not be used to this way of doing things.

4. D goes to the blackboard and writes down a number of titles from fables and nursery rhymes. The pupils turn to watch D. The teacher asks the pupil groups to select one title, but they are to make up their own action and dialogue.

5. D asks the pupils to choose and to keep to one title. They have to decide very quickly who is to play what character. However, a few minutes later D removes a girl from one group and places her in a different group. D says that this is to "balance numbers". It is notable that the girl's original group had cast her in a particular part and are now arguing over who should take her place. D ignores this problem and proffers his help to groups who have not sought his assistance.

6. It is observable that no child has had to compete to gain a part in the dramatic action: all pupils are given or choose parts.

Teacher Belief

1. It is not unfair to ask less able pupils to be creative.

2. Drama provides an opportunity for pupils to move freely around the room.

3. I like having other people rely upon me for ideas and opinions.

4. Spontaneous teaching is just as likely to produce desired results as set plans.

5. Children prefer to be told what to do rather than use their initiative.

6. Competition between pupils does not lead to higher standards of work.
7. After ten minutes has elapsed, pupils are still planning rather than doing their drama ideas. When D announces that they only have five minutes left to do their story there is hectic activity. Pupils are freely acting and talking. One group has entered the acting space of another, there is an argument between members, but this is resolved without the help of D.

8. Seven minutes later D asks all pupil groups to cease acting and sit around the perimeter of the acting area. Pupils sit down and face inwards towards the centre of the circle. D asks pupils to make two gaps in the acting space — one for exits and one for entrances.

9. D asks the first group to enter the acting space in order to perform; they are to enact their version of 'Goldilocks and the Three Bears'. The audience giggle as the three bears begin the action by eating their porridge very noisily. The more the spectators laugh at the bears, the more noisy the eating seems to become (in order to be heard above the laughter).

10. D stops the action and says to the acting group:
   "Alright move it now to the main part of the story."

   The teacher also asks Goldilocks to keep out of the action until it is 'her'turn.

11. It is notable that pupil spectators have also begun to whisper their own comments to the performance group. In particular they ask the performers to speak louder. Even though the performers are only about a metre away from spectators it is difficult to hear them.

   Teacher Behaviour
   Teacher Belief

   Pupils should not be kept quiet.

   I like directing the work of other people.
   The most effective teaching is not done 'out-front'.
Teacher Behaviour

12. The first group finish their play. D makes no comment and asks a second group to show their play. The title given to this effort is 'Red Riding Hood'. During the action teacher D interrupts the performance by asking pupils to speak up. D does this three times.

13. The next three groups take their turn to perform for spectators. In the fourth group D shouts to one boy: "Let us know what you are doing so we have an idea of what is happening."
This interruption occurs during a non-speaking part of the action where 'Jack' is creeping up on the 'Giant'.

14. In the final group pupils have invented their own ideas and action to show how the elephant got its long trunk. During this final group performance D stops the action twice by asking the pupils to speak up. One girl fails to do so and D shouts: "'X' make it clear so that we can all hear!"

15. The teacher concludes the session by choosing a few pupil performers to thank for their efforts. D said that they were 'good', but he did not make clear what his criteria for drama success were for the pupils.

15. D asks the pupils to stand up and move the furniture back to its original position and the session is at an end.

Teacher Belief
Teacher D was consistent between his beliefs and behaviour on seven out of nine items. Although D did not believe in the effectiveness of 'out-front' teaching, he insisted on maintaining a central stance throughout the drama. Furthermore, although D recognises the value of spontaneous teaching, he keeps to his set plans in the drama session.

Attention is now paid to the belief-behaviour consistency of teacher P. Observations were recorded in the same manner as teacher D.

### 1.2.2 The drama session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Behaviour</th>
<th>Teacher Belief</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The pupils are sat at their desks. Teacher P asks all pupils to stand quietly and move the class furniture with care to the back of the room.</td>
<td>Drama is a chance for all pupils to move freely around the room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When this is completed a large space, rectangular in shape, is left at the front of the room. Pupils are asked to stay sitting on the classroom furniture and face the cleared area.</td>
<td>Most effective teaching is not done 'out-front'. Teachers should not ensure pupils are kept quiet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. P sits on a chair in the acting area at the front and faces the pupils. She tells the class that &quot;volunteers are to be chosen to do non-speaking tasks&quot; (mime). She adds that &quot;Those who are not performing have to guess what the performers are doing&quot; (charades). It is clear that P is to be selective over who is to participate.</td>
<td>Competition between pupils leads to higher standards of work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher Behaviour

4. Volunteers are then asked to raise their hands and P chooses one pupil to take part. This person, a girl, comes forward and is given a card by P on which is written an instruction concerning what to perform. The girl glances at the care, goes to the acting area and mimes 'the cleaning of a house'. Pupil spectators giggle at this task.

5. Several pupils come out to the front in turn and each time P gives them a card with instructions of what to perform. It is seen that P is selective in her choice of performers. Six more pupils perform and the other pupils watching are beginning to get restless. They begin to talk among themselves.

6. The next pupil, a boy, pretends to climb an imaginary ladder and the spectators laugh aloud. P turns to the audience and shouts to them: "Stop talking, or else!"

   The teacher tells the performer not to worry about the distractions, but to continue to the end of his mime. This he does quickly.

7. Next comes a girl who is given the task of miming a telephone conversation with an imaginary person. Once more the spectators become more restless. The session has lasted forty minutes so far. A few spectators shout out comments to the girl. The girl stops her mime. She appears to be embarrassed by the comments of her peers. Teacher P looks disapprovingly at the spectators, says nothing to them, but asks the girl performer to resume her seat.

8. As each subsequent performer is asked to come out (volunteers have now ceased) audience interjections appear to increase.

Teacher Belief

Children prefer to be told what to do rather than use their initiative.

Drama is a chance for pupils to use their own ideas.

I dislike directing the work of other people.

It is not unfair to ask less able pupils to be creative ...

Spontaneous teaching is just as likely to produce desired results as set plans.
Teacher Behaviour Teacher Belief

9. The final pupil is selected - a girl is asked to read out (mime) imaginary television news, both 'good' and 'bad'. The spectators shout out comments before the act is completed - regardless of P's insistence that they should not.

10. The final performer is distracted by her peers. She stops performing and looks to P for guidance. P tells her to return to her seat. The teacher stands up and says that the lesson is at an end.

11. The class are asked to return their classroom furniture to its original position in silence. This latter instruction is ignored until all the furniture is returned. The teacher writes some instructions on the blackboard. Pupils get their pens and paper and the noise ceases.

Teacher P was inconsistent on seven out of nine belief-behaviour elements. Thus, regardless of P's beliefs, pupils were unable to use their own ideas; experienced high (but seemingly ineffective) teacher control; were unable to participate because they had no opportunity to do so; and, were not given an opportunity to be mobile in drama. Moreover, P directed pupil's work, occupied a central position and kept to set plans in the drama - all contrary to her professed beliefs.
1.2.3 Consistency of D and P and figural creativity of pupils

Teacher P did not possess any belief-behaviour characteristics found to be associated with significant pupil gains on figural creativity - the outcome on which she has produced the lowest degree of pupil success. On the other hand, teacher D who produced the highest degree of pupil success on figural creativity was seen to possess three out of five belief-behaviour characteristics associated with significant gains on this factor. These were beliefs and actions consistent with low or indirect pupil control, positive expectations for less able pupils, and an absence of pupil competition.

Attention is now paid to the general classroom observation of teachers D and P.

1.3 General classroom interaction of D and P

In order to add further perspectives on the characteristics of highest and lowest producing teachers, consideration is given to the general classroom interaction of the teachers under scrutiny. In particular a comparison is made of teacher warmth ('a teacher's ability to reduce interpersonal tension'), teacher target (the focus of the teacher's classroom attention), and person talking (who is speaking at any one time). The findings reported here are
based on observation data derived from the Classroom Observation Schedule (Appendix 8) described in Chapter Four.

1.3.1 Teacher warmth

Inspection of Table 11.2 shows that teacher D elicited three times the number of warm contacts with pupils than teacher P. Also teacher P had more neutral and more cold contacts with pupils than did teacher D. Teacher P spent more time listening to pupils than did D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Warmth</th>
<th>Teacher D</th>
<th>Teacher P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No contact</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3.2 Teacher Target

Table 11.3 shows that teacher D spent 30% more time than teacher P on addressing individual pupils. An approximately equal amount of attention was spent on pupil groups and the whole class. It is particularly notable that teacher P spent 26% more time than teacher D on the encouragement of pupil silence.

Table 11.3

Comparison of teachers D and P: teacher attention given to pupils during a random fifty minute period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target of Teacher Attention</th>
<th>Teacher D</th>
<th>Teacher P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual pupils</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/whole class</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No target</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3.3 Person Talking

It can be seen in Table 11.4 that D spent 20% more time talking to pupils than teacher P. Moreover, teacher D allowed for more pupil dialogue in his classroom than did
teacher P. Teacher P spent more time than teacher D on promoting silence in the classroom.

Overall, it may be seen that teacher D rendered more warm contacts, spent more time talking, and allowed more time for pupil dialogue, than did teacher P.

### Table 11.4
Comparison of teachers D and P: teacher-pupil dialogue recorded during a random fifty minute period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person Talking</th>
<th>Teacher D</th>
<th>Teacher P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher and Children</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silence</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.4 **A summary**

Overall, it may be seen that teachers D and P differed on a number of beliefs, belief-behaviour combinations and most components of general classroom behaviour. D was seen to possess certain characteristics associated with
significant pupil gains on figural creativity. These were beliefs and behaviour consistent with low or indirect pupil control, positive expectations for less able pupils, and, an absence of pupil competition. Teacher D was also seen to operate dramatic play which was found to be associated with significant pupil gains on figural creativity. It was also observed that teacher D gave more opportunities for his pupils to be creative than did teacher P.

Measures of classroom interaction show that D possessed greater warmth, gave more individual pupil attention, and promoted less classroom silence, than teacher P. Taken together this combination of characteristics possessed by D was seen to have some impact on the figural gains of pupils.

The next teacher comparison concerns teachers A and M, highest and lowest promoters of pupil gains on verbal creativity.

2. A COMPARISON OF TEACHERS A AND M: PROMOTERS OF HIGHEST VERSUS LOWEST PUPIL GAINS ON VERBAL CREATIVITY

Inspection of Table 11.5 shows that teachers A and M have promoted highest and lowest pupil gains respectively on verbal creativity.

2.1 The beliefs of A and M

Beliefs about the teacher

Neither A nor M liked directing the work of others, however M, unlike A, believed that teachers should direct
Table 11.5

Pupil gains and losses of the teacher sub-sample on pretest and posttest measures of verbal creativity (n=16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case*</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A M</th>
<th>TIME A s</th>
<th>TIME B M</th>
<th>TIME B s</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
<th>p.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+A</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>61.00</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>66.18</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>54.46</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>56.20</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>+1.74</td>
<td>.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42.45</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>43.83</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>+1.38</td>
<td>.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53.03</td>
<td>10.33</td>
<td>53.65</td>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>+0.62</td>
<td>.657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45.60</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>48.20</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>+2.60</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43.72</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>+0.28</td>
<td>.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>47.21</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>48.28</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>+1.07</td>
<td>.695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>49.21</td>
<td>8.46</td>
<td>48.91</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46.43</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>46.08</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>53.04</td>
<td>10.38</td>
<td>50.65</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>-2.39</td>
<td>.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52.04</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>51.00</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
<td>.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41.57</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>45.38</td>
<td>8.97</td>
<td>+3.81</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-M</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>59.86</td>
<td>10.46</td>
<td>52.95</td>
<td>8.81</td>
<td>-6.91</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>48.03</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>43.93</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>-4.10</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50.31</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td>48.12</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>-2.19</td>
<td>.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>49.80</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td>49.65</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>50.10</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>50.13</td>
<td>9.13</td>
<td>+0.03</td>
<td>.951</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ = highest gain
- = greatest loss
* Note: Case = Teacher in sub-sample
most learning activities because they know more than the child. It is further noted that teacher M felt that teachers had no other option than to direct pupils. She stated that:

The teacher has to be a director ... They've [teachers] got to be in control ... to have control. The teacher knows where he or she is going ... so in that sense you definitely direct. Then you give them [pupils] your philosophies ... You're giving them [pupils] their ideas ... (Appendix 5).

Both A and M welcomed pupils with any social problems. Unlike A, teacher M believed in the need to maintain a social distance between herself and the pupils.

Beliefs about significant others

Teacher M believed that most pupils are incapable of self-discipline and that children prefer to be told what to do rather than use their initiative. M also felt that pupils require extrinsic motivation in order to learn anything. Less able pupils were seen by M to have limited imaginations and thus be incapable of being creative. In contrast, A believed that pupils are able to exercise self-discipline and prefer autonomy to dependence upon the teacher. A also believed that less able pupils are just as creative as their more able peers.

In respect of colleague support, neither A nor M felt the need to keep their failures and mistakes to themselves. They did like to avoid arguments with principals and
inspectors by simply following their directives. Furthermore, they both believed that colleagues should be mutually supportive of each other's methods.

**Beliefs about the aims and organisation of learning**

Teacher M saw her main task to be that of encouraging pupils towards academic excellence. In relation to this overall purpose, M believed that all non-basic aspects of the curriculum should be postponed at any time in favour of the 'basics'. M liked to adhere to her timetable so that all the work would get done. Teacher M further liked to have other people rely upon her for ideas and opinions.

Teacher A did not believe that her main purpose should be to promote academic excellence - nor did she believe in postponing non-basic aspects of the curriculum in favour of the 'basics'. A disliked keeping to a set timetable. She further disliked having other people rely upon her for ideas and opinions.

Both teachers believed that they should have set targets of work content which they ought to complete in a year. Furthermore, in order to achieve this purpose A and M liked planning their work well in advance so that all steps of a lesson were known prior to being done. However, both teachers were of the opinion that spontaneous teaching was just as likely to achieve desired results as set plans.
Beliefs about drama

Teachers A and M believed that drama was not to be avoided due to lack of expertise nor did it pose a threat to necessary teacher attention. Both A and M saw drama as a means by which pupils may practice self-discipline, exercise classroom mobility, and be intrinsically motivated to learn. Unlike A, M saw drama as a noisy activity likely to disturb others.

Drama was seen to possess sufficient structure and content to be included in the curriculum of both teachers. What is more, A and M believed that drama provided a stimulus for other aspects of the curriculum.

Teacher A, unlike M, possessed the only three beliefs found to be associated with significant pupil gains on verbal creativity. These were a belief in indirect pupil control, pupil autonomy and positive expectations for less able pupils.

2.2 The belief-behaviour consistency of A and M

Before comparing the relative consistency of A and M, each teacher's ability to be consistent is examined separately.
2.2.1 The drama session of A

Teacher Behaviour

1. Teacher A sits on a chair in an open area of the classroom. Her class are sat on the floor facing the teacher. A tells the class that it might be a good idea if they were to have a go at putting together some television interviews.

2. The teacher asks the pupils what television interviews are like and what their purpose is. Just about every pupil has their hands in the air to give a reply. A number are chosen and replies centre on the informative nature of interviews. Added to this are ideas about the need for interviews to provide interest and "compulsive watching".

3. The teacher suggests that not all interviews are of a serious nature - "they can be funny". A asks the pupils for humorous examples. There are many examples given. A then congratulates the pupils on the variety of their responses. A then asks for examples of interviews which might contain both serious and humorous elements - more ideas are forthcoming. A asks the pupils to consider the people, situations and the content of the interviews that they are about to do.

4. Teacher A asks the pupils to stand up and choose who is to be in the group; this they do. There is no competition for parts. Pupils wander off to three main areas - inside the classroom; in the passage outside or towards a basement area further along the corridor. Some pupils take paper with them, presumably to record questions for Drama is a chance for pupils to use their own ideas. Competition between pupils does not lead to higher standards of work. Drama is a welcome opportunity for pupils to
Teacher Behaviour

the interview. This idea was suggested by one boy earlier and a number of other pupils took up the idea.

5. Teacher A makes her way around each group. She observes a group for a while, but does not intervene. In the corridor she has stopped to ask a group how they are progressing. A offers some advice on meeting the interviewer, i.e. likely opening words. The pupils take up the idea and A leaves them to it.

6. It is notable that some pupils are still discussing and preparing their work while others, particularly those doing humorous efforts, are acting out their situation. All pupils take part.

7. In the basement area some pupils are stood around giggling at one part of their interview where a 'Martian' is being asked about a new washing up detergent.

8. The attention of pupils has seemingly turned inwards towards their own group, i.e. group members appear to be unaware of pupils from other classrooms passing them on the way to the toilet nearby, or elsewhere.

9. Returning to the basement it is notable that pupils are using most of the room.

Teacher Belief

move freely around the classroom. Children prefer to use their initiative rather than be told what to do.

The most 'effective' teaching is not 'out-front'. Spontaneous teaching is just as likely to produce desired results as set plans. I dislike directing the work of others.

It is not unfair to ask less able pupils to be creative.

Teachers should not ensure that pupils are kept quiet.
Teacher Behaviour

10. After fifteen minutes of preparing or playing out their situations, A has sent one pupil to tell each group that they must be finishing their work now. One group frantically rushes to get to the end of their idea. Another group down the passage is sat working out the finite detail - in particular, who is to say what to whom.

11. Teacher A comes to tell everyone to stop and make their way to the staff-room. Pupils go to the staffroom where there is a partition half closed. All the pupils gather in one half of the room. Teacher A reminds the pupils that they are to proceed as with earlier drama sessions.

12. Teacher A tells the observer that each group shares their drama efforts with her alone. Meanwhile, the rest of the class remain in the other part of the staffroom to discuss their dramatic situations.

13. Where the majority of pupils are, one group is going through their drama in a corner of the room. Others are sat whispering - presumably planning their performance for teacher A.

14. In the other half of the room, teacher A is sat on a chair. A group of pupils are stood in a space chatting. A asks the group if they are ready now. A asks the pupils to get ready to begin, and to imagine that the cameras in the television studio are about to roll.

15. The teacher signals, 'now' and the group go through their interview about a number of people trapped in a fire.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Behaviour</th>
<th>Teacher Belief</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. Each group, in turn, comes from the other part of the staffroom and performs for teacher A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. At the end of each group effort teacher A turns to the pupils and asks them what they thought of it. The teacher then makes various suggestions about, e.g. a need to be audible ... physical movement ... and in one instance, the desirability of having a serious face when interviewing others.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. On completion of this evaluation teacher A asks the pupils if they would like to share their efforts with others (the rest of the class). Four out of the five groups say that they would like to show their peers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. The teacher walks back to the classroom with pupils following behind her. Pupils enter the classroom and sit at their desks. A asks a number of pupils to move a few desks out of the way to enlarge an open area in the classroom for performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The groups perform their interview ideas: Group One = 'The Fire' Group Two = 'Air Crash' Group Three = 'The Fire' (not the same as One) Group Four = 'Space Freaks'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. When all four groups have finished their performances, teacher A returns to her original points about the nature of television interviews, but uses the pupil's acted examples in a positive way, e.g. &quot;Did you note the way that Group One managed to get plenty of information about the fire?&quot; And A also says to her pupils: &quot;The last group was funny, but what did you think of the serious parts?&quot; (numerous answers came from the pupils).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher A then brings the session to a close. It has lasted just over forty-five minutes from action to reflection. Desks are returned to their original places and the pupils are asked by A to set about writing down their experiences. The pupils get out writing books, or write on loose sheets, and begin to record their experiences.

Teacher A was seen to possess all nine of the belief-behaviour characteristics associated with significant pupil gains on most pupil outcomes. These were beliefs and behaviour consistent with: low teacher direction; indirect pupil control; tolerance of pupil ideas; exercise of pupil autonomy; absence of pupil competition; teacher flexibility; and, positive expectations for the creative abilities of less able pupils. Attention is now given to the belief-behaviour consistency of teacher M.

2.2.2 The drama session of M

1. Grade five sit at their desks while teacher M selects and reads aloud a story about one man's experiences at sea in a storm. During the story M has to shout at various pupils.
Teacher Behaviour

2. On completion of the story reading, pupils are asked to stand in a space close to their own desks. M then tells the pupils that they are to act out the story in a moment. "First", she says, "you are all going to be sailors out at sea on a sailing ship. So get ready. Off you go!".
The pupils look around, apparently to see what other 'sailors' are doing in the same situation. They have not been given, or been invited to give, ideas as to what they should be doing.

3. The teacher shouts, "stop talking!" even though there is no noise whatsoever in the classroom. "Now", M says, "the weather changes from peaceful to stormy ... Begin!"
As children mime their fight with the inclement weather, M adds: "The sea becomes rougher and rougher". This experience of fighting an imaginary storm lasts for about two minutes. The pupils are then told to stop. There is complete quiet. Everyone has taken part in the action regardless of ability.

4. M allocates pupils into groups of five or six. She chooses who is to work with whom. Teacher M then selects two groups and tells them that they can work outside, provided that they do not misbehave.

Teacher Belief

Most effective teaching is not done 'out-front'.
I dislike directing the work of others.
Drama is a chance for pupils to use their own ideas.

Teachers should ensure that pupils are kept quiet.

It is unfair to ask less able pupils to be creative because their imaginations have limited scope.

Drama is a welcome opportunity for pupils to move freely around the room.
**Teacher Behaviour**

5. The teacher remains sitting at her desk and shouts at a group at the back of the room telling them that their efforts must be mimed, "because it says so in the 'guidelines'". She then adds that they can talk, "if really necessary".

6. There is no competition for parts in the drama. M says that the pupils would do more drama within the week if time permitted.

7. The teacher stands up, leaves her desk, and tells a number of pupils, (who are working on their mime), that they are to stop what they are doing and "arrange the acting area".

8. The teacher raises her voice to tell the pupils that everyone must stop what they are doing and return to the classroom. When the pupils have returned to their respective places in class, and the sound has died away, M reminds the pupils that they must not talk while other pupils "share their efforts" with them.

9. M selects one group to come out to the front of the class. As Group One make their way there, other pupils begin to talk, presumably about their own performance since conversation is restricted to group members.

10. The teacher stresses to Group One that their efforts must be mimed. This is regardless of Group One's rehearsal with the earlier verbal option in mind. Group One go through their mime and giggle at each other when actor's eyes meet each other. The mime is done very quickly. M tells them to sit down and says of Group One's efforts that: "It was a good effort".

**Teacher Belief**

- Spontaneous teaching is just as likely to produce desired results as set plans.
- Competition between pupils leads to higher standards of work.
- Children prefer to be told what to do rather than use their initiative.
11. Next, teacher M points to another group and tells them to come to the front. The group consists of six boys. Group Two begin their mime and when it comes to the stormy weather they embellish upon a fight scene with the storm waves. The fighters make a move towards two desks put at the side of the stage by the group. As they attempt to stand on the desks the teacher shouts out that they must take care. The action stops. Group Two look at the teacher. She nods and the mime continues. The action goes forward and the fighting is omitted.

12. Following the completion of the action, Group Two are sent to their place. The teacher, looking down at her book, says "Good that group". Group Two sit down.

13. M calls upon an all girls group to come out next. She tells them to: "Come out to the front and face everyone". Group Three mime their story, including a fight scene, but very little effort seems to be made to make it a fight. They keep looking at their watching peers with apparent embarrassment. As Group Three reach the end of their mime, Teacher M claps their efforts and nods to the audience to do likewise. Finally, M tells Group Three to sit down and that their efforts have been "Very good".

14. Before the turn of the final group, it is notable that the pupils who have already shown their efforts are now talking. Some are playing with rulers, others are giggling or chatting within groups at their desks. M tells everyone to stop talking otherwise Group Four will not have a turn. Group Four is not talking. Teacher M signals Group Four to come out and begin - even though other pupils are still talking.
15. Group Four quickly organise themselves and commence their mime. When it comes to the fight sequence, the boys who are doing the actual fighting fall in a heap on the ground giggling. The teacher and the remainder of the pupils (including the rest of Group Four), join in the laughter. M says to Group Four: "A fine effort, now sit down".

16. Teacher M concludes the session by turning to all the class and telling them to get out their reading books, "quietly". This the pupils do and the classroom is as quiet as when the Observer arrived.

Teacher M possessed six belief-behaviour characteristics which were associated with significant pupil loss on measures of verbal creativity. These were:

- a belief in low, but exhibition of high, teacher direction*
- a belief in, and active encouragement of, pupil dependence.
- a belief in, and use of, high pupil control.
- a belief in spontaneous teaching, but adherence to set plans.*
- a belief in low, but encouragement of high, teacher centredness.*
- a belief in, but no use made of, pupil ideas.*
Teacher M was also seen to possess three belief-behaviour characteristics related to nil pupil gains on verbal creativity. These were:

- a belief in, but absence of pupil competition.*
- a belief in, but absence of observed, pupil mobility in drama.*
- negative expectations held for the creative abilities of less able pupils, but an allowance for all pupils to take part in drama.*

Further, the three belief-behaviour characteristics mentioned above are the same ones which rendered significant pupil losses on verbal creativity for drama exercise teachers — of which teacher M is one.

All items marked with an asterisk (*) signify an apparent inconsistency between the observed beliefs and behaviour of teacher M. Thus, it is seen that teacher M was inconsistent on seven out of nine belief-behaviour characteristics. An important belief-behaviour inconsistency produced by M relates to drama choice: teacher M is one of four drama exercise teachers who believed that they were operating dramatic play (pupil invented/directed drama), but were seen to be doing drama exercise (teacher content/directed) instead.
2.2.3 Consistency of A and M and verbal creativity of pupils

On the nine belief-behaviour observations, the following differences are noted between the characteristics of teachers A and M respectively.

Although both teachers, A and M, disliked directing the work of other people, teacher M exhibited high teacher direction while teacher A manifested low teacher direction. Similarly, both teachers shared the belief that drama provides a good opportunity for pupils to use their own ideas, but only teacher A encouraged pupil ideas in drama. Teachers A and M believed that spontaneous teaching methods are just as likely to achieve desired results as set plans. However, only teacher A was seen to practice this belief. Teachers A and M also agreed that drama provides a welcome opportunity for pupil mobility in the classroom, only teacher A allowed for pupil mobility in drama.

Teachers A and M differed on some beliefs and yet shared the same behaviour: Teacher M believed in the value of inter-competition while teacher A did not. However, both teachers refrained from using competition in drama. In similar vein both teachers differed on their expectations for the creative abilities of less able pupils: teacher M held negative expectations for less able pupils, while teacher A had positive expectations. Although they disagreed in principle about the creative abilities of less
able pupils, both teachers allowed all pupils to participate in drama.

Teachers A and M differed from each other on two belief-behaviour characteristics. Teacher A believed that pupils prefer autonomy to dependence and provided opportunities for pupils to be autonomous in drama. In contrast to teacher A, teacher M held the belief that pupils prefer to be told what to do rather than use their initiative and also encouraged pupil dependence in drama. Moreover, teacher M believed that pupils should be kept quiet and maintained silence in drama. On the other hand, teacher A neither believed in, nor actually tried to maintain, pupil silence in drama.

Overall, it may be seen that there were a number of differences between teachers A and M: although both teachers believed that they were operating dramatic play, only teacher A was doing so. Thus, teacher M believed that she was allowing pupils to create their own dramatic efforts and directing their own work. In reality, this did not appear to be the case. It may be, that relative to other aspects of the curriculum, pupils were being inventive and directing their own work — however limited that invention and direction might have been.

Whereas teacher A was consistent on all nine belief-behaviour criteria, teacher M was only consistent on two of
them. It is also notable that all nine belief-behaviour characteristics of A were associated with significant pupil gains on verbal creativity.

Teacher A and M also possessed two contrasting belief-behaviour characteristics which may play no small part in predicting pupil success on verbal creativity: teacher A believed in, and actively encouraged, the verbal interaction of pupils in her class while teacher M did not. Further, pupils in M's class were not allowed to use initiative by creating and directing their own creative efforts. It is reasonable to assume that lack of creative opportunity will have implications for pupil gains and losses on verbal creativity.

Teachers A and M differed from each other on drama choices and all belief-behaviour characteristics associated with significant pupil gains on verbal creativity.

With a view to making further comparisons between A and M, attention is now given to an analysis of general classroom interaction - observed in curriculum contexts other than drama. The aim here is to locate a number of teacher influences which may, together with other present findings, add further insight regarding pupil gains and pupil losses on verbal creativity.
2.3 General classroom interaction of A and M

Three general classroom characteristics were examined in respect of teachers A and M. These were teacher warmth, teacher target and person talking. The findings reported here were based on data derived from the Classroom Observation Schedule (Appendix 8).

Table 11.6
Comparison of teachers A and M: teacher warmth recorded during a random fifty minute period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Warmth</th>
<th>Teacher A</th>
<th>Teacher M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No contact</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.1 Teacher warmth

Inspection of Table 11.6 notes that teacher A had eight times the number of warm contacts with pupils than M. Teacher M had more neutral contacts than A. Moreover,
M was seen to spend less time listening to pupils than A. Teacher M also elicited cold contacts with pupils whereas A did not.

Table 11.7
Comparison of teachers A and M: teacher attention given to pupils during a random fifty minute period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target of Teacher Attention</th>
<th>Teacher A</th>
<th>Teacher M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Pupils</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Whole class</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No target</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.2 Teacher target

Table 11.7 shows that teacher A spent more time talking to individuals and groups of pupils than M. On the other hand, M spent more time than A without any pupil target, i.e., in silence.
2.3.3 Person talking

In Table 11.8 teacher M was seen to spend more time talking than A. Teacher A allowed more opportunities for pupil dialogue than did M. Similarly, A allowed more simultaneous teacher-pupil dialogue than did M. Moreover, teacher M was seen to encourage more pupil silence than teacher A.

Overall, it was seen that teacher A elicited more warm contacts, spent less time talking, allowed more opportunities for pupil dialogue, and addressed individual pupils more than teacher M.
2.4 **A summary**

Teacher A had all nine belief-behaviour characteristics associated with significant pupil gains on verbal creativity (and other outcomes). Furthermore, teacher A used dramatic play which was found to be related to pupil success on verbal creativity. Moreover A exhibited high teacher warmth, appeared to encourage verbal contact in the classroom with individuals and groups of pupils alike. Teacher A was the only teacher to possess this combination of attributes and was also the sole teacher to promote significant pupil gains on three out of five selected outcomes. As stated, teacher A was the highest promoter of pupil empathy and will now be compared with teacher J, the lowest achiever on pupil empathy.

3. **A COMPARISON OF TEACHERS A AND J: PROMOTERS OF HIGHEST VERSUS LOWEST PUPIL GAINS ON EMPATHY**

Inspection of Table 11.9 shows that teachers A and J have promoted highest and lowest pupil gains respectively on empathy.
Table 11.9
Pupil gains and losses of the teacher sub-sample on pretest and posttest measures of empathy (n = 16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case*</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A M s</th>
<th>TIME B M s</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+A</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17.48 3.67</td>
<td>18.74 3.49</td>
<td>+1.26</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15.73 3.24</td>
<td>15.80 4.33</td>
<td>+0.07</td>
<td>.888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17.33 2.63</td>
<td>16.83 2.89</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16.57 3.80</td>
<td>17.07 4.04</td>
<td>+0.50</td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18.16 3.11</td>
<td>18.76 2.82</td>
<td>+0.60</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.44 2.79</td>
<td>16.66 3.59</td>
<td>+0.22</td>
<td>.709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.28 4.48</td>
<td>14.85 4.30</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.73 3.04</td>
<td>17.60 3.38</td>
<td>+0.87</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15.52 4.12</td>
<td>16.26 3.26</td>
<td>+0.74</td>
<td>.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-J</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.69 3.57</td>
<td>15.04 3.82</td>
<td>-1.65</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.36 3.12</td>
<td>17.72 2.78</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.66 3.23</td>
<td>16.76 3.59</td>
<td>+0.10</td>
<td>.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16.81 3.76</td>
<td>17.45 3.98</td>
<td>+0.64</td>
<td>.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18.12 3.74</td>
<td>17.48 3.69</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.81 3.92</td>
<td>15.93 4.21</td>
<td>+0.12</td>
<td>.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.95 3.50</td>
<td>17.45 3.79</td>
<td>+0.50</td>
<td>.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>16.89 3.53</td>
<td>17.01 3.71</td>
<td>+0.12</td>
<td>.285</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ = highest gain
- = greatest loss
* Note: Case = Teacher in sub-sample
3.1 The beliefs of A and J

Beliefs about the teacher

Both A and J believed that teachers should not direct most pupil activities. However, unlike A, J liked to direct the work of other people and further believed that pupils prefer to be directed rather than use their initiative. Neither A nor J believed that the most effective teaching is best done 'out-front'.

Beliefs about significant others

Teachers A and J both believed that keeping pupils quiet was not a high priority. Moreover, they thought that most pupils are capable of self-discipline. Teacher J, unlike A, believed that pupils need to compete against each other in order to achieve higher standards of work although he did not wish to use competitive strategies. A, as we have observed earlier, had little faith in the notion of pupil competition as an extrinsic motivator for learning.

Teacher J believed that it was unfair to ask less able pupils to be creative because their imaginations have limited scope. A rejected this idea.

It is also noted that J liked to have others rely upon him for ideas and opinions whereas A did not entertain this notion. In respect of colleague supportiveness, neither A
nor J felt the need to hide their feelings from others. They believed that mistakes may be shared with colleagues. Furthermore, they also believed that colleagues should be mutually supportive of each other's methods.

Beliefs about the aims and organisation of learning

A and J did not believe that the main aim of the teacher should be to encourage pupils towards academic excellence. Both stated that they would not postpone non-basic aspects of the curriculum in preference for work on the 'basics'. In pursuit of their goals both J and A believed that teachers should have set targets of work content which they strive to complete within a year. With regard to views on orderliness, both teachers liked to plan every step of a lesson before it is reached. They also liked to have a special place for everything and see that things are kept in place. Both teachers believed in the value of spontaneous teaching as a valid alternative to set plans.

Beliefs about drama

For J, 'drama' was "theatre with an adult and/or school audience" (Appendix 5). Teacher J used drama "to develop confidence in a child ... develop self-esteem and get rid of inhibitions" (Appendix 5). 'Drama' for A is: "getting a
basic idea and allowing children to explore different facets of that idea ... often giving them [pupils] a starting point, but not giving them the end result ... leaving them to figure it out for themselves" (Appendix 5). A said of scripted plays (the type used by J) that: "To get any improvement in children's abilities to express themselves, they [scripted plays] are a waste of time. It [theatre] inhibits the freedom of children to express themselves" (Appendix 5). Both A and J did agree that 'drama' is: a chance for pupils to use their ideas; practice self-discipline; an opportunity for pupil mobility; something that is not abandoned due to the lack of time; a stimulus for social interaction; not an excuse for children to misbehave; unlikely to be criticised by other staff; and, it is not a noisy activity.

It is observed that teachers A and J differed on two beliefs which were particularly associated with significant pupil gains on empathy. A disliked directing the work of other people and also believed that less able pupils can be as creative as their more able peers. Both of these dispositions held by A were associated with significant pupil gains on empathy.

In contrast to A, J liked directing the work of others and also believed that it is unfair to ask less able pupils
to be creative because their imaginations have limited scope. J's belief about direction was seen to yield neither pupil gain nor loss on empathy. However, J's disposition towards less able pupils was associated with significant pupil loss on empathy.

3.2 The belief-behaviour consistency of A and J

We now wish to show the extent to which teachers A and J differed on their ability to put beliefs into practice. Having reported on the drama session of A in Section 2.2.1 of the present chapter, attention is now given to the belief-behaviour consistency of J. A comparison may then be made of the relative consistency of teachers A and J.

The drama session of J was recorded and then matched with his professed beliefs. Both belief and behaviour observations were centred upon nine predetermined criteria outlined in Chapter Five. We wish to know how consistent J was in respect of held beliefs and observed behaviour in drama.
3.2.1 The drama session of J

Teacher Behaviour

1. Teacher J asks his class to line up by the classroom door. J then sends the pupils outside in the playground where the boundaries of a theatrical stage have been marked by J.

2. As the pupils exit J tells the observer that the pupils are to rehearse a play written by him and called "Santa and the Sugarites". A look at the script shows it is written in rhyming couplets.

3. When outside the pupils sit on the grass. Two pupils stand up, enter the prescribed acting area and take it in turns to read out the narrator's part. The teacher stops them and says that they must speak up in order to be heard.

4. A number of pupil-actors come into the acting area. They read their respective parts and exit. It is noticeable that there is very little movement in the drama. Pupils come on 'stage', stay in one predetermined spot and then exit. Moreover, the action rhymes are not met by equivalent dramatic moves, e.g. "Let us hurry". Pupils do not "hurry" nor are they seen to go anywhere.

5. Teacher J stands in the centre of the acting area and shouts to small groups of characters to begin acting when it is their turn. The only actors to move are the 'elves' who circulate around the other static pupils on stage.

Teacher Belief

1. Drama is a chance for pupils to use their own ideas.

2. I like directing the work of others.

3. Drama is a chance for pupils to move freely around the room.

4. Spontaneous teaching is just as likely to achieve results as set plans.

5. Most effective teaching is not done 'out-front'.
Teacher Behaviour

6. The teacher comes to the observer and says that the narrators were chosen for "their good memories and clear voices". Thus in order to take part pupils require these attributes outlined by J.

7. It is observable that pupils not in the play are playing games on a piece of ground close to the acting area. Some of these pupils are shouting to each other.

8. The teacher shouts above the noise of the 'audience' to tell three boy actors to: "Remember the audience are at the front of you; they can't see you if you have your backs to them. Slow your voice down and project it. ... Throw your voice to hit the back of the stage".

Teachers should not ensure that pupils are kept quiet.

It is observed that there is no "back of the stage", the action is here outside and there is a strong breeze blowing making any kind of voice projection very difficult.

9. Now the noise made by non-actors has increased. The teacher ignores this sound and continues to direct specific parts of the play where there is action.

10. After fifteen more minutes of exit and entrance practice, the teacher announces to all pupils that the rehearsal is at an end. The teacher tells the observer that only half the play was rehearsed and the second half would be done on the following day.

11. Only one third of J's class were seen to take part in the play. The remainder of pupils spent their time playing on the grass.

12. Back inside the classroom the teacher tells all pupils to get out their 'project' books; this they do.

Teacher Belief

Competition between pupils leads to higher standards of work.

It is unfair to less able pupils to be creative.

Children prefer to be told what to do rather than use their initiative.

Teachers should not ensure that pupils are kept quiet.
3.2.2 Consistency of A and J and empathy of pupils

Teacher J appears to possess none of the belief-behaviour characteristics associated with significant pupil gains on empathy. In contrast teacher A exhibits four combinations of belief and behaviour related to significant pupil gains on empathy. These were beliefs and behaviour consistent with: low or indirect teacher direction; positive expectations for the creative abilities of less able pupils; an absence of pupil competition; and, the employment of spontaneous teaching strategies. Moreover, teacher J was inconsistent on seven out of nine observation criteria.

An examination is now made of the general classroom interaction of teachers A and J with a view to finding other relevant differences of behaviour between highest and lowest achievers on pupil empathy.

3.3 General classroom interaction of A and J

Attention is now given to a comparison of teachers A and J on aspects of classroom interaction, namely, teacher warmth, teacher target and person talking.
Table 11.10
Comparison of Teachers A and J: teacher warmth recorded during a random fifty minute period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Warmth</th>
<th>Teacher A</th>
<th>Teacher J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No contact</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.1 Teacher warmth

It is seen in Table 11.10 that there are few differences between teachers A and J on the number of warm teacher contacts with pupils. However, it is noted that teacher J elicits more neutral contacts than A. Moreover, teacher A spends more time listening to pupils than teacher J.
Table 11.11

Comparison of Teachers A and J: teacher attention given to pupils during a random fifty minute period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target of Teacher Attention</th>
<th>Teacher A</th>
<th>Teacher J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual pupil</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/whole class</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No target</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.2 Teacher target

Table 11.11 shows that teacher A spent slightly more time than J on addressing individual pupils. Teachers A and J gave equal attention to pupil groups. Once more it is noticeable that teacher J spent far more time than teacher A without any pupil-teacher contact, i.e. silence in the classroom.
Table 11.12
Comparison of teachers A and J: teacher-pupil dialogue recorded during a random fifty minute period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person Talking</th>
<th>Teacher A</th>
<th>Teacher J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher and Children</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silence</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.3 Person talking

Inspection of Table 11.12 suggests that teacher J spent more time talking than A. In the classroom of teacher A pupils were seen to spend slightly more time talking than A did herself. Moreover, teacher J encouraged more pupil silence than A.

3.4 A summary

It may be observed that there were several differences between the characteristics of teachers A and J which might well serve to influence pupil gains on empathy.
First of all, teacher J possessed no dispositions or belief-behaviour characteristics found to be associated with significant gains on pupil empathy. Further, J was inconsistent on seven out of nine observations. Teacher J used theatre with his class - an option which has been associated with a lack of significant pupil gains on all pupil outcomes.

In terms of general classroom observation, J, like A, elicited a high degree of teacher warmth, but in the case of J this was also accompanied by long periods of pupil silence.

If we look to the classroom experiences afforded to the pupils of J, it is noted that only one third of the class was allowed to participate in drama. Thus, regardless of J's drama aims only an elite group of pupils were able to gain from the activity. Thus, opportunities for pupils to view life from another's vantage point via dramatic role would appear to have been somewhat limited for some pupils and totally impossible for others.

The characteristics of teacher A have been outlined at length in Section 2 of this chapter. It is sufficient to
note that A possessed all the belief, behaviour and drama characteristics associated with significant pupil gains on empathy. This includes the opportunities afforded by A for pupils to work within guided social groups. Finally, a comparison is made of characteristics possessed by teachers promoting the highest or lowest degree of pupil gains on academic self-image.

4. **A COMPARISON OF TEACHERS A AND P: PROMOTERS OF HIGHEST VERSUS LOWEST PUPIL GAINS ON ACADEMIC SELF-IMAGE**

Inspection of Table 11.13 shows that teachers A and P have promoted highest and lowest pupil gains respectively on academic self-image.

Descriptions of the separate drama choices, beliefs, behaviour, and belief-behaviour consistency of teachers A and P have been given elsewhere in this chapter.* Thus, it remains to locate differences between the characteristics of teachers A and P which might render some account of highest and lowest pupil gains respectively on academic self-image. A start is made with an examination of teacher beliefs.

* See this chapter, Sections 1, 2 and 3.
Table 11.13

Pupil gains and losses of the teacher sub-sample on pretest and posttest measures of academic self-image (n=16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case*</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A</th>
<th>TIME B</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
<th>p.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+A</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10.96</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>11.23</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>11.29</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.84</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>11.46</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.23</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>11.83</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.38</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>9.44</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.92</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.65</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.34</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>10.60</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.09</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.14</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>10.57</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.86</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>9.95</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>13.19</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.81</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>11.17</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>11.28</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+= highest gain
-= greatest loss
*Note: Case = Teacher in sub-sample
4.1 The beliefs of A and P

Teachers A and P only differ on eight out of forty-three belief items on the Teacher Opinionnaire.

P believed that the majority of pupil work should be teacher directed. Allied to this view was the notion that pupils prefer to be directed rather than use their own initiative. In contrast, A held that most pupil learning should not be teacher directed and that pupils prefer to exercise autonomy rather than be given instruction by the teacher.

Teachers A and P disagreed on other views about pupils. P believed that pupil ideas should always be tolerated even if they conflict with her own. She also believed that, on the whole, pupils tend to behave well when confronted by new learning situations. On the other hand, teacher A did not think that all pupil ideas should be tolerated nor that pupils behave in a positive manner when confronted by novel learning contexts.

Teacher P also believed that pupils require the extrinsic motivation of competition if learning is to be successful. P liked to foster a competitive classroom ethos. A was of the opinion that competition between pupils does not lead to higher standards of work, nor was she willing to encourage a competitive atmosphere in her classroom. Elsewhere, A did not like to keep to her teaching timetable, but P believed that adherence to a timetable would ensure that all the work gets done.
Moreover, A did not believe that classroom furniture should be rearranged regularly to meet changing needs, yet teacher P did hold this belief.

An examination of group findings in Chapter Nine showed that no teacher beliefs were associated with pupil gains on academic self-image. Thus, it was not possible to locate which beliefs possessed by A and P were related to pupil gains on this outcome. Nevertheless, these respective beliefs ought to be borne in mind when we come to analyse the behaviour consistency of teachers A and P and subsequent effects upon pupil outcomes.

4.2 The belief-behaviour consistency of A and P

It is seen that teacher A believed in, and was doing, dramatic play with her class. However, even though P believed that she too was operating dramatic play, it was observed that drama exercise was being done instead. So, although P believed that pupils were being given opportunities to invent their own dramatic work, this was not the case.

Teacher P exhibited other inconsistencies between professed beliefs and observed behaviour. P believed in, but did not act in accord with: low teacher direction; the use of pupil ideas; low teacher centredness; indirect pupil control; positive expectataions for less able pupils;
teacher flexibility; and, pupil mobility in the classroom.

In Section 1 of this chapter it has been observed that P felt unable to do the amount of drama she would ideally have wished because of held beliefs about pupil behaviour. There was no reason to believe that P's dispositions towards pupils in drama would be confined to that context. It may well be that the observed inconsistencies between the beliefs and behaviour of P were due, in no small measure, to P's overarching beliefs about pupils. Although P's belief about pupils per se may have been generally positive, beliefs about one or more children in her own class might serve to inhibit intended teacher behaviour.

Teacher P was consistent to the extent that she believed in, and made use of, pupil competition in the classroom. Furthermore, P believed in, and encouraged, pupil dependence. None of the nine belief-behaviour elements possessed by P was associated with significant pupil gains on academic self-image.

When we look at A, it is noted that she possessed all nine belief-behaviour elements associated with significant pupil growth on academic self-image. That is, she believed, and acted in accord with: low teacher direction; the use of pupil ideas; exercise of pupil autonomy; low teacher centredness; indirect pupil control; positive expectations
for less able pupils; an absence of pupil competition; teacher flexibility; and, pupil mobility in the classroom.

Attention is now given to a comparison of teacher A and P on aspects of general classroom interaction.

4.3 General classroom interaction of A and P

Teachers A and P were compared on three elements of teacher pupil interaction, i.e. teacher warmth, teacher target and dialogue dominance. A definition of these terms is given in Chapter Five (Section 3.1).

Table 11.14

Comparison of teachers A and P: teacher warmth recorded during a random fifty minute period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Warmth</th>
<th>Teacher A</th>
<th>Teacher P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No contact</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.1 Teacher warmth

As Table 11.14 shows, teacher A was seen to initiate twice as many warm contacts with her pupils than teacher P. Moreover, teacher P elicited a greater number of neutral contacts than A.

Only teacher P exhibited cold contacts with pupils.

Table 11.15
Comparison of teachers A and P: teacher attention given to pupils during a random fifty minute period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target of Teacher Attention</th>
<th>Teacher A</th>
<th>Teacher P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual pupil</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/whole class</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No target</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2 Teacher target

In Table 11.15 teacher A spent more time talking with individual pupils than teacher P. Both teachers spent equal time on communicating with pupil groups or the whole class. Teacher P spent more time than A without any covert contact with pupils in the classroom.
Table 11.16
Comparison of teachers A and P: teacher-pupil dialogue
recorded during a random fifty minute period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person Talking</th>
<th>Teacher A</th>
<th>Teacher P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher and Children</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silence</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.3 Person talking

It can be observed in Table 11.16 that A and P spent approximately equal amounts of time talking to the pupils in their respective classes. However, it was noted that pupils in A's class were allowed greater freedom to talk, during these observation periods, than the pupils of teacher P. Further, teacher P encouraged a greater degree of pupil silence than teacher A.

4.4 A summary

Unlike teacher P, A possessed all of the nine characteristics found to be associated with significant
pupil gains on academic self-image. Furthermore, teacher A was consistent on all belief-behaviour elements, but P was not. Added to this observation was that A also chose to operate dramatic play which was deemed to be a more viable alternative than drama exercise (used by P) in promoting significant pupil gains on academic self-image.

When we examine general classroom interaction, it is observed that A elicited greater teacher warmth, gave more attention to individual pupils, and spent less time promoting pupil silence than teacher P.

5. CHARACTERISTICS OF TEACHERS ASSOCIATED WITH HIGHEST PUPIL ACHIEVEMENT

Teachers A and D were responsible for promoting the highest degree of pupil gain on outcomes. A produced significant pupil gains on verbal creativity, empathy and academic self-image. D promoted the highest degree of pupil gain on figural (non-verbal) creativity.

Both A and D believed in, and used, dramatic play with their respective pupils. This drama option was found to be associated with significant pupil gains on verbal and figural creativity, empathy and academic self-image, i.e. those outcomes upon which the pupils of A and D excelled.

Teachers A and D also shared a number of belief-behaviour elements associated with significant pupil gains
on outcomes. These were beliefs and actions consistent with: the use of pupil ideas; low or indirect pupil control; positive expectations for less able pupils; an absence of pupil competition; and, pupil mobility in the classroom. It was also noted that A (highest achiever on three pupil outcomes) possessed other belief-behaviour attributes associated with significant pupil gains. These were beliefs and actions consistent with low teacher direction, pupil autonomy, low teacher centredness and teacher flexibility. These latter characteristics were related to significant pupil gains on verbal creativity, empathy and academic self-image — where teacher D failed to make gains. Even though teacher D did not have these 'extra' characteristics possessed by A, it is notable that both teachers were highly consistent regarding held beliefs and observed behaviour; A was consistent on all nine observational criteria and D was consistent on seven of them.

In respect of general classroom interaction, teachers A and D: elicited more warm teacher contacts than neutral or cold; gave more attention to individual pupils than the whole class; and, allowed equal teacher-pupil dialogue in their classrooms.
6. CHARACTERISTICS OF TEACHERS ASSOCIATED WITH LOWEST PUPIL ACHIEVEMENT

Teachers J, M and P were responsible for promoting significant pupil losses on empathy, verbal creativity and figural creativity and academic self-image respectively.

Teacher J used theatre which was associated with lack of gain on all pupil outcomes. Teachers M and P both believed that they were doing dramatic play, but were doing drama exercise instead which was related to significant losses on pupil outcomes.

Only J had a belief-behaviour attribute which was related to significant pupil gain. This was a belief in, and action consistent with, low pupil control. However, teacher J, like M and P, was inconsistent on most other observational criteria.

All three teachers were only consistent on two belief-behaviour characteristics each. Teacher J believed in high teacher direction and the need for pupil dependence, and acted accordingly. M's beliefs and actions were in accord with high pupil control and the need for pupil dependence. P's beliefs and behaviour were consistent with the use of pupil competition and the need for pupil dependence. Thus, all three low producing teachers believed in, and encouraged, pupil dependence. With the exception of J's belief-behaviour characteristic relating to pupil control, all other attributes of low achievers were associated with significant loss or lack of change on educational outcomes.
When examination was made of the general classroom interaction of lowest achieving teachers, it was observed that all three: elicited a large number of neutral contacts with pupils; spent more time communicating with individual pupils rather than the whole class; and, tended to dominate the dialogue between themselves and pupils. It is also pertinent that only lowest achieving teachers exhibited cold contacts with pupils. Moreover, they spent more time than highest producing teachers on the promotion of pupil silence in class.

It is observable that most actions of lowest achieving teachers were consonant with behaviour one might have expected from persons with closed belief systems (Rokeach, 1960). If we examine the behaviour of lowest achieving teachers in relation to the closed belief characteristics of 'System B' persons, theorised in Table 3.1, there is an apparent association between them. This is shown in Table 11.17.
Table 11.17
A comparison of highest and lowest achieving teachers in respect of open (system 'A') and closed (system 'B') belief systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief of System 'A' (Open)</th>
<th>Behaviour of Highest Achievers</th>
<th>Belief of System 'B' (Closed)</th>
<th>Behaviour of Lowest Achievers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Authority not absolute</td>
<td>Pupils direct own work</td>
<td>Authority is absolute</td>
<td>Teacher directs all drama work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers low control</td>
<td>Indirect pupil control</td>
<td>Prefers high control</td>
<td>Indirect pupil control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Conformity low</td>
<td>Allowance of unusual pupil ideas and action</td>
<td>High conformity</td>
<td>Teacher ideas only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cognitively flexible</td>
<td>Spontaneous teaching</td>
<td>Cognitively rigid</td>
<td>Strict adherence to set plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Tender-minded personality</td>
<td>Allowance for pupil expression</td>
<td>Toughminded personality</td>
<td>No allowance for pupil expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Open to change</td>
<td>Allowance for pupil spontaneity</td>
<td>Closed to change</td>
<td>Pupils kept to set plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Imagination encouraged</td>
<td>All pupils to use imagination</td>
<td>Imagination discouraged</td>
<td>Selected pupils to follow teacher ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Teacher warmth high</td>
<td>Teacher warmth high</td>
<td>Teacher warmth low</td>
<td>Teacher warmth low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 View of pupil as autonomous</td>
<td>Pupil autonomy exercised in drama</td>
<td>Pupil as a dependent being</td>
<td>Pupil as a dependent in drama</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One presumes that both highest and lowest achieving teachers had a need to meet the perceived demands and responsibilities associated with the role of teacher. The way(s) in which teachers come to terms with role demands is likely to determine their subsequent classroom behaviour. It may be, as Rokeach (1960) suggests, that 'how' people hold their beliefs, has more consequences for action than 'what' they believe. We know that high and low achievers held a great many beliefs in common, but it was also observed that they differed on 'how' they put their beliefs into practice.

For lowest achieving teachers, it may be that they already had relatively 'closed' belief systems on their entry into the teaching profession, but agreed with other colleagues on the consensual view of the teacher's role. However, the need for lowest achieving teachers to survive by reducing classroom-based anxieties, may serve to produce behaviour consistent with closed belief systems. Whether or not lowest achieving teachers actually do possess closed belief systems, or just act as if they do, is seen to hold consequences for pupil outcomes, i.e., inferior pupil gains.

It may be seen that the drama choices, beliefs and behaviour of highest and lowest achieving teachers are apparently underpinned by their respective open-closed belief systems. Table 11.17 shows that highest achieving
teachers are characterised by relatively open beliefs-actions while lowest achievers are seen to behave as if they are adhering to closed belief systems.

Thus a basic influence on the optimisation of pupil gains on educational outcomes would appear to be the manner in which teachers hold their beliefs - as exemplified by this comparison of highest and lowest achieving teachers.
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CHAPTER TWELVE

SUMMARY OF THE MAIN FINDINGS AND SOME RECOMMENDATIONS

INTRODUCTION

This final chapter is divided into two parts. Part One summarises the main findings in relation to the somewhat evolutionary nature of the work. Part Two consists of recommendations based on views both from within and beyond study findings.

1. A SUMMARY OF THE PRESENT FINDINGS

Talks with many different primary teachers about what drama 'is' and how it might best be used to meet declared ends, revealed that choice of drama type was governed by teacher beliefs. When asked about drama, teachers tended to reply in terms of beliefs about their own role, the role of pupils, notions of learning, and colleague supportiveness. Teacher beliefs about drama and teaching provided the rationale for a data base for enquiry. Talks with teachers about the nature of their role and its likely influence on drama use prompted a need to ascertain the kind of beliefs climate in which drama was deemed to operate. It was thought that teachers with relatively open belief systems were likely to view their role and behave in ways different from teachers whose beliefs were predominantly closed. The
Teacher Opinionnaire was devised. Its main purpose was to locate the nature of the Teacher Belief Climate in which drama was deemed to operate. It also contained an invitation for teachers to indicate the kind of drama they do/would like to do with pupils. There was a need to know what degree of choice teachers believed they had in drama. The Teacher Opinionnaire was administered to 235 full time primary teachers. Results of the Teacher Opinionnaire proved surprising.

Rather than being differentiated on their open-closed belief systems, teachers exhibited a high level of consensus of opinion on 75% of all belief items. Results suggested that teachers held a common view of their role in the classroom.

This consensus of opinion appeared to overarch the open-closed nature of individual teacher belief systems. It was also noted that views about the benefits of drama attracted high teacher consensus.

On the face of it beliefs about teaching and drama appeared to be highly compatible so that the likelihood of drama being accepted in schools was greatly increased. This observed consensus of opinion did not include the kind of drama teachers chose to use in order to meet their beliefs.

Although teachers agreed on the benefits of drama, they were in essence referring to potentially very different means of achieving their desired ends.
Examination of actual versus ideal drama choices showed that many teachers were doing, or wanted to do, either child invented plays (dramatic play) or theatre with their pupils.

Given claims by teacher and protagonists alike, there was a need to find out how viable these particular options (dramatic play and theatre) were in achieving intended pupil outcomes. A sub-sample of teachers (n=17) was chosen in order to investigate the viability of these selected drama choices. It was necessary to determine the drama aims of the sub-sample of teachers. This was done during teacher interviews.

Although teachers professed to be using two very different kinds of drama, it was found that they shared common drama aims, all of which related to the personal development of pupils.

Even when the sub-sample of teachers stated that they were doing a particular kind of drama this was no guarantee that it was the case. Thus it was decided that teachers would be categorised according to the kind of drama they were seen doing. The Drama Inventory was used to check on the fidelity of teacher belief-behaviour in the classroom.

Observation of the sub-sample of teachers revealed that four out of seventeen teachers were not using dramatic play as professed. In fact they were using drama exercise. One teacher was not doing any kind of drama and for research purposes was abandoned.
The pupils of the remaining 16 teachers were then compared on indices (pretest-posttest) derived from the stated drama aims of the sub-sample of teachers.

It was found that teachers who employed dramatic play promoted significant pupil gains on four out of five educational outcomes while teachers using either drama exercise or theatre produced no change or significant losses on outcomes. No drama group promoted significant changes of self-esteem.

Because of the observed discrepancy between intended and actual drama choices of the teacher sub-sample, it was decided that the belief-behaviour consistency of teachers should be considered when pupil outcomes were examined.

Particular combinations of teacher beliefs and behaviour were seen to be associated with pupil gains and losses on educational outcomes. Those combinations associated with significant gains on pupil outcomes encompassed allowances for pupils to direct their own work; the use of pupil ideas, the teacher's use of spontaneity; an absence of pupil competition; and positive beliefs held for the creative potential of less able pupils. Moreover, belief-behaviour consistency was seen to be more important to the success of pupil outcomes when using one kind of drama and not another.

Finally, examination was made of the drama choices and belief behaviour characteristics of the highest and lowest achieving teachers in order to gain further perspective on those combinations of teacher elements likely to promote pupil success on educational outcomes.
Teachers who produced the highest pupil gains on educational outcomes were seen to differ from lowest producing teachers in terms of drama choices and belief-behaviour consistency. It was observed further that highest achieving teachers appeared to possess more open belief systems than their lowest achieving colleagues.

The profile characteristics of highest and lowest achieving teachers appeared to reflect group findings in respect of belief, behaviour and drama choices associated with relative pupil success on outcomes.

Overall, optimum educational outcomes were achieved by teachers with relatively open belief systems who used dramatic play, possessed high teacher warmth and who were consistent between held beliefs and observed behaviour. Numerous drama theorists would be very quick to observe that the findings of the present study are consonant with their own views regarding the implicit antecedents of 'effective' drama use. However it is noticeable that teachers did not always find it possible to put their beliefs into practice.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 From within the present research

Respondents (n=235) to the Teacher Opinionnaire were most accepting of drama use, but were divided over the kind of drama best suited to fulfil their educational purposes. Moreover, many teachers did not appear to choose drama
options consistent with their beliefs about drama or teaching. It was further shown that teachers of theatre and drama exercise had chosen drama options which were inconsistent with their aims and produced unintended outcomes. Common to these findings was the evident inability of some teachers to know which kinds of drama worked with what results. There was no reason to believe that teachers of theatre and drama exercise were not genuine in their attempts to make their option 'work'.

There is a clear need for teachers to be able to make explicit their drama purposes, select appropriate drama strategies and evaluate pupil changes (if any) when drama has been used. This 'drama effectiveness' may possibly be achieved in a number of ways. In establishments aimed at developing and training teachers, there is a need for guidance in respect of choosing those kinds of drama appropriate to specific educational purposes. There is also a need for teacher trainees to experience drama at their own level so that beliefs about the medium and its limitations might be put to the test. In order that work at a personal level is relevant to work with pupils, both should be done together under the guidance of an experienced drama supervisor. Trainee teachers also require exposure to a variety of drama strategies from which choices may be made. Above all, it is recommended that teacher trainees be given advice and practical experience in formulating relevant
aims, planning and executing a variety of drama strategies, and evaluating work with educational criteria in mind. Highest achieving teachers were seen to plan and operate drama with specific groups/individual pupils in mind rather than aiming to fulfil the educational needs of 'ideal' pupil models.

Within the context of schools, these same recommendations can be carried out in teacher centres, at in-service workshops or at the teacher's own school. Added to this an advisor would help teachers clarify their drama aims, put their beliefs into practice and evaluate work according to predetermined educational criteria - rather than personal prejudice.

Teachers who used dramatic play, but who 'abdicated' responsibility for guiding pupils in their endeavour, were seen to produce no significance gains on outcomes. As valid as one's beliefs may be about the abilities of pupils to create their own work without any help whatsoever, the results of the present study show that leaving pupils to their own devices is no guarantee of success. Advisors may demonstrate various drama strategies for teachers, but it is recommended that, ultimately, the responsibility for drama doing is left in the hands of the teacher.

It has also been seen that the majority of pupil gains have been achieved by teachers who believed in, and made use of, pupil ideas. It is far too easy for in-service drama
workshops to provide teacher participants with nothing more than a set of resources, rather than promoting means by which pupil ideas might be encouraged. A number of teachers from the drama exercise group stated that they had been given, in drama workshops, ideas that had little potential for development. It is suggested that advisors and drama workshop organisers provide the structural means by which ideas, aims, methods and evaluation of work might be conceived by teachers in relation to the educational development of pupils in their own classrooms.

The present research was begun at a time when a set of 'Drama Guidelines' was being given to teachers in various Australian states with the intention that drama should be done in the way(s) prescribed. Dramatic play may be conceptually close to the kind(s) of drama being promoted in the guidelines. However, present findings do not support the view that guidelines in schools will 'automatically' promote pupil gains. Unless teachers possess particular belief-behaviour combinations then pupil gains via dramatic play are likely to be minimised. It may be suggested that guidelines in themselves, however well intentioned, may be insufficient guarantee of teacher use or pupil success. These points are particularly borne out in the light of knowledge about teacher belief systems. The overall climate of opinion was seen to be 'pragmatic' in nature while drama literature tends to be child-centred in its approach. The
major difference is that pragmatic teachers were seen to be content-orientated - possibly to the exclusion of demands made by suggested drama guidelines. Pragmatic teachers may feel that pupils are given too much 'precious' time to use their own ideas.

The very act of following drama guidelines may invite teachers to take a more central part in the drama than would be recommended by the present results. Drama exercise teachers who followed set plans and who excluded pupil inventiveness were seen to generate significant pupil losses on creativity. What is needed is not simply a unidimensional set of guidelines but a number of alternatives which teachers may experience themselves in practice, and from which appropriate choices may be made.

The scope of the present research has only allowed for three options to be tested with a small sample of teachers. Clearly, if teachers are to be assisted in their choice of drama, and achieve their intended outcomes, then other drama options need to be scrutinised.

2.2 Beyond the present research

Given the observed influence of teacher belief-behaviour consistency on drama in schools, there is a desire to investigate the effects of these fundamental influences on other aspects of the curriculum. For instance, how important is it to the academic success of pupils that
teachers be consistent between their beliefs and actions? It may be that research could be carried out to ascertain the viability of teacher belief-behaviour consistency as an index of 'teacher effectiveness' — indicated by present findings and the work of Combs (1978) and others.

There is a clear need to probe further into possible relationships between the open-closed belief systems of teachers and pupil success on a wide variety of educational outcomes.

In respect of drama research, there are many claims which remain untested. Because of the scope of the present work, it was not possible to follow a number of apparent fertile leads. For instance, it would have been interesting to compare the relative educational gains of pupils guided by teachers who could or could not pursue their ideal drama option. More fundamental is the desire to locate, and find ways of removing, those particular variables which prevented teachers from using their preferred option.

Another example of possible research also involves notions of drama choice. Is one kind of drama more effective than another in the stimulation of other aspects of the curriculum? Although the present research sample almost uniformly agreed on the value of drama as a stimulus for other curriculum aspects, no evidence of this was witnessed. If claims are made about the value of drama as an integrating stimulus, then these require testing in the
light of pupil outcomes. Claims about the use of drama as a cognitive stimulus for pupils also remain untested. Since none of the teacher sample were aiming to develop the cognitive abilities of pupils then the notion could not be investigated. These and other drama claims are likely to remain unresolved until such time as more empirical work in the area is attempted.

It is hoped that the present work, although exploratory in nature, has provided some impetus towards the use of both quantitative and qualitative approaches in the investigation of research problems in the drama area. The work of past researchers has often been restricted to the use of qualitative data only, regardless of the research problem at hand. Given the process of turning a highly subjective area of research into a productive data base, information has been gathered from three main fundamental sources - teacher beliefs, teacher-pupil behaviour and pupil outcomes. Because drama research has been scant, these three sources of data provided a basic starting point for the school-based investigation.

During the course of the investigation a number of subtle relationships may have been overlooked in the desire
to examine the fundamental influences named overleaf. Finally, the present research process has involved the construction of a number of instruments specific to the tasks in hand. Beyond the value of the present findings, the invention of these measures proved to be a valuable exercise in itself, and hopefully will prove to be of worth to other workers.
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APPENDICES
A note on the content of the Appendices

Throughout the length of the study a great deal of data has been generated in respect of teacher beliefs, teacher and pupil behaviour and the educational outcomes of pupils. Owing to the large size of the data base, it has only been possible to include in the Appendices those essential items linked directly to the main text which lent themselves readily to concise expression. As a consequence, much of the idiosyncratic data (informal talks with teachers and structured interviews) and many tables have had to be kept and stored separate from the main text and Appendices. However, all instruments used in the present research have been included.
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CHECKLIST OF INFLUENCES ON DRAMA IN SCHOOLS
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CHECKLIST OF INFLUENCES ON DRAMA IN SCHOOLS

INFLUENCE

1. Doing drama fits into the teacher's picture of role.
2. The teacher's ego is enhanced by teaching drama.
3. The teacher is successful in doing drama.
4. The teacher believes drama to be a noisy activity.
5. The teacher is aware of the existence of drama.
6. The teacher is trained to do drama.
7. Drama has perceived value.
8. Drama is positioned within the cognitive area.
9. Drama is positioned within the affective area.
10. Drama is used to stimulate other activities.
11. The teacher sees drama in terms of performance.
12. The teacher sees drama in terms of personal development.
13. The teacher is able to use drama.
14. The teacher believes s/he has all round teaching ability.
15. The teacher is confident.
16. The teacher is able to work as part of a team.
17. The teacher is capable of working in isolation.
18. The teacher is able to wait for success.
19. The teacher has sufficient perseverance.
20. The teacher has a positive self-concept.
21. The teacher is able to set long/short term goals.
22. There is appropriate room to do drama.
23. The room is not cluttered with furniture.
25. Not too many children in the class.
26. The teacher has access to needed resources.
27. Other significant people are aware of the value of drama.
28. Other people recognise the teacher's ability to teach drama.
29. The children perceive the teacher's ability to teach drama.
30. The school is in agreement with the use of drama.
31. Other people use drama.
32. Pupils are not seen to inhibit the use of drama.
33. The teacher is given in-service opportunities.
34. The teacher's career prospects are enhanced.
35. The children can do drama.
36. The children are seen to benefit from the drama work.
APPENDIX 2

PILOT OPINIONNAIRE
The aim of this opinionnaire is to survey some of the beliefs which teachers hold concerning the role of the teacher in general and the use of classroom drama as an educational strategy. The purpose is to explore the uses and limitations of drama within the school.

NOTES:
This opinionnaire consists of three sections. Please read the instructions to each section before completing it. Do your best to respond frankly to the enclosed statements. Please complete statements relating to classroom drama even if you do not teach it.

There are no 'correct' or 'incorrect' responses. Anonymity is assured.

Name, initials or identification mark:

Sex:

Age: 20-25 years ( )
26-30 years ( )
31-35 years ( ) Place an 'X' in the appropriate
36-40 years ( ) space to indicate your age.
41-45 years ( )
46+ years ( )

Number of years teaching (including this year): ______

Initial teacher training: 2 years ( ) 3 years ( ) 4 years ( )
Any additional training (e.g. conversion courses) ... Type of Training: Infant ( ) Secondary ( )
Other ( ) (please specify) ... Present class or grade:

Name of present school:
GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS: Please read each statement and place a circle around the number which ON THE WHOLE represents your views IN MOST CASES.

1 = I strongly agree
2 = I agree
3 = I cannot say
4 = I disagree
5 = I strongly disagree

SECTION ONE

I like ...

1. Having children come to me with their personal problems .. 1 2 3 4 5
2. Competing against others for a prize or goal .. .... 1 2 3 4 5
3. Planning ahead so that I know every step of a lesson before I reach it .............. 1 2 3 4 5
4. Keeping my failures and mistakes to myself ........ 1 2 3 4 5
5. Having a special place for everything and seeing that everything is in its place .............. 1 2 3 4 5
6. Being more of a director than a guide when assisting children towards educational goals .............. 1 2 3 4 5
7. Following my timetable faithfully so that all the work gets done .............. 1 2 3 4 5
8. Being quite changeable in my likes and dislikes .... 1 2 3 4 5
9. Postponing creative work if it is likely to conflict with teaching the basics .............. 1 2 3 4 5
10. Following closely any directions given by the Principal/ Inspector to avoid arguments .............. 1 2 3 4 5
11. Having people rely upon me for ideas and opinions .... 1 2 3 4 5
12. Maintaining a constant air of authority to remind children of my role .............. 1 2 3 4 5

SECTION TWO: (Please continue to circle numbers as above)

I believe that ...

13. Teachers should have a set target of work which they strive to achieve in a year .............. 1 2 3 4 5
14. Few children can work on their own without continuous instructions .............. 1 2 3 4 5
15. The teacher's main purpose is to direct children towards academic excellence .............. 1 2 3 4 5
16. A child's ideas should be tolerated even if they conflict with those of the teacher.
17. Teachers should be formal in their dealings with children: otherwise children will take advantage of them.
18. In class, teachers need to sit brighter children together and duller children together.
19. Few children can work on their own without being distracted.
20. It would be very difficult to motivate children to learn without the use of grades, marks or stars.
21. On the whole children behave very well when faced with novel learning situations.
22. Teachers should make sure that all pupils meet specific work targets.
23. Children should spend most of their time in class sat down to avoid disturbing others.
24. Teachers should direct all learning activities: they know more than the child.
25. Teachers need to exchange ideas and methods as much as possible to increase their versatility.
26. It is no good asking less able children to be creative: they tend to lack imagination.
27. Frequent testing and examinations encourage children to strive harder towards academic excellence.
28. Teachers should ensure that their classrooms are kept as quiet as possible so that colleagues are not unduly disturbed.
29. Frequent competition between children leads to higher standards of work.
30. It is necessary for teachers to turn a blind eye to infringements of school rules at times.
31. Spontaneous teaching is just as likely to produce desired results as set lesson plans.
32. Children prefer set daily routines and do not welcome changes.
33. Often the best discipline is that which the child imposes upon himself.
34. Children are likely to respond negatively towards any new variation in teacher behaviour.
35. The sole purpose of the teacher should be to encourage children towards academic excellence ........................................ 1 2 3 4 5

SECTION THREE: Beliefs about classroom drama (i.e. group play making, improvisation, mimed plays, role plays, acted stories, performed plays etc...)
Understandably there are persons who have not experienced classroom drama activities, nevertheless, YOUR BELIEFS ARE PARTICULARLY WELCOME AND VALID. Please continue to indicate your opinion by circling the appropriate numbers in response to the statements below:

Classroom drama is ...

36. Something that has clear educational purpose ........................................ 1 2 3 4 5
37. An excuse for children to misbehave ........................................ 1 2 3 4 5
38. To be avoided due to problems of evaluation ........................................ 1 2 3 4 5
39. A good way to stimulate other aspects of the curriculum ........................................ 1 2 3 4 5
40. Something that is likely to be labelled a 'time waster' by parents ........................................ 1 2 3 4 5
41. Only successful with brighter children ........................................ 1 2 3 4 5
42. A welcome opportunity for children to express their personal values ........................................ 1 2 3 4 5
43. A valuable time for getting to know children better ........................................ 1 2 3 4 5
44. To be avoided due to lack of expertise ........................................ 1 2 3 4 5
45. Too inhibiting to try with older children ........................................ 1 2 3 4 5
46. Something that lacks progression ........................................ 1 2 3 4 5
47. A desirable opportunity for children to leave their seats. ........................................ 1 2 3 4 5
48. A noisy activity likely to disturb others ........................................ 1 2 3 4 5
49. Only an advantage for talented child actors ........................................ 1 2 3 4 5
50. To be avoided due to its apparent lack of subject content. ........................................ 1 2 3 4 5
51. A valuable problem-solving activity ........................................ 1 2 3 4 5
52. Preferably left to those teachers who can act and direct ........................................ 1 2 3 4 5
53. Which of the following TYPES of drama do you teach/would you like to teach?
   a. Theatre skills/theatre games ........................................ 1 2 3 4 5
   b. Teacher directed plays before an audience .......................... 1 2 3 4 5
   c. Teacher directed role play/directed mime ........................................ 1 2 3 4 5
   d. Drama Games ......................................................................... 1 2 3 4 5
   e. Child invented plays, mimes or improvisations .......................... 1 2 3 4 5
   f. Others (please specify) .......................................................... 1 2 3 4 5
   g. I would not wish to teach drama ............................................ 1 2 3 4 5

54. Which of the following MOST APTLY describes the way you ORGANISE or would WISH TO ORGANISE your classroom drama?
   Place 'X's in the appropriate spaces provided:
   a. Drama done by children, teacher only helps where necessary ( )
   b. Drama by children, closely directed by teacher ....................... ( )
   c. Combined effort in equal partnership ....................................... ( )
   d. Set drama directed by teacher ................................................... ( )
   e. Other (please specify) ........
   f. No drama at all ................................................................. ( )

55. How often do you teach drama/would like to teach drama?
   Once a day .............................................................. ( )
   Once a week ............................................................. ( )
   Once a fortnight ...........................................................( )
   Once a month ............................................................. ( )
   Once a year as in a school play ............................................. ( )
   Never ................................................................. ( )

MANY THANKS FOR YOUR VALUABLE COOPERATION WITH THIS OPINIONNAIRE
TEACHER OPINIONNAIRE

The aim of this opinionnaire is to survey some of the beliefs which teachers hold concerning the role of the teacher in general and the use of classroom drama as an educational strategy. The purpose is to explore the uses and limitations of drama within the school.

NOTES:

This opinionnaire consists of three sections. Please read the instructions to each section before completing it. Do your best to respond frankly to the enclosed statements. Please complete statements relating to classroom drama even if you do not teach it.

There are no 'correct' or 'incorrect' responses. ANONYMITY IS ASSURED.

Name:

Sex:

Age: 20-25 years ( )
     26-30 years ( )
     31-35 years ( )
     36-40 years ( )
     41-45 years ( )
     46+ years ( )

Place an 'X' in the appropriate space to indicate your age.

Number of years teaching (including this year): _____

Initial teacher training: 2 years ( ) 3 years ( ) 4 years ( )
(Please indicate)

Any additional training (e.g. conversion courses) ...  

Type of Training: Infant ( ) Primary ( ) Secondary ( )
     Other ( ) (please specify) ...

Present class or grade:

Name of present school:
GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS: Please read each statement and place a circle around the number which on the whole represents your views IN MOST CASES as they relate to your present class.

1 = I strongly agree
2 = I agree
3 = I cannot say
4 = I disagree
5 = I strongly disagree

SECTION ONE

I like ...

1. Having children come to me with their social problems ... 1 2 3 4 5
2. Encouraging a competitive classroom atmosphere ... ... ... 1 2 3 4 5
3. Planning ahead so that I know every step of a lesson
   before I get to it ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... 1 2 3 4 5
4. Keeping my failures and mistakes to myself ... ... ... ... 1 2 3 4 5
5. Having a special place for everything and seeing that
   everything is in its place ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... 1 2 3 4 5
6. Directing the work of other people ... ... ... ... ... ... 1 2 3 4 5
7. Following my teaching timetable faithfully so that all the
   work gets done ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... 1 2 3 4 5
8. Postponing any aspects of the curriculum that are likely to
   conflict with time to be spent on the basics ... ... ... ... 1 2 3 4 5
9. Avoiding arguments with principals or inspectors by simply
   following their directives ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... 1 2 3 4 5
10. Maintaining a certain social distance in order to give
    authority to my position ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... 1 2 3 4 5
11. Having people rely upon me for ideas and opinions ... ... 1 2 3 4 5

SECTION TWO: (Please continue to circle the appropriate numbers to indicate your opinion)

I believe that ...

12. Teachers should have set targets of work which they
    strive to complete in a year ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... 1 2 3 4 5
13. On the whole children prefer to be told what to do rather
    than to use initiative ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... 1 2 3 4 5
14. Teachers should direct most learning activities because they know more than the child \[1 2 3 4 5\]
15. The child's ideas should always be tolerated even when they conflict with those of the teacher \[1 2 3 4 5\]
16. Teachers should be formal in their dealings with children otherwise children will take advantage of them \[1 2 3 4 5\]
17. It is unfair to ask less able children to be creative when one knows that their imaginations have limited scope \[1 2 3 4 5\]
18. Teachers ought to rearrange their classroom furniture regularly to meet changing needs \[1 2 3 4 5\]
19. Most children are capable of self-discipline \[1 2 3 4 5\]
20. Spontaneous teaching is just as likely to produce desired results as set lesson plans \[1 2 3 4 5\]
21. Teachers should ensure that their children are kept quiet \[1 2 3 4 5\]
22. On the whole children tend to behave well when faced with novel learning situations \[1 2 3 4 5\]
23. The main aim of the teacher should be to encourage children towards academic excellence \[1 2 3 4 5\]
24. Most of the time, the more senior school staff are in the best position to make important decisions \[1 2 3 4 5\]
25. Colleagues should always tolerate other teaching methods even when they differ from their own \[1 2 3 4 5\]
26. Competition between children helps them to strive harder towards higher standards of work \[1 2 3 4 5\]
27. Integration of lessons only serves to 'dilute' knowledge \[1 2 3 4 5\]
28. On the whole the most effective teaching is done at the front of the class \[1 2 3 4 5\]

SECTION THREE: Beliefs about classroom drama (i.e. group play-making, mimed plays, role-playing, acted stories, performed plays etc ...)
Understandably, there are some teachers who have not taught classroom drama, nevertheless, all beliefs are welcome and valid.
(Please continue to indicate your opinion by circling the appropriate numbers).

Classroom drama is ...
29. To be avoided because I lack the expertise \[1 2 3 4 5\]
30. A chance for all children to be intrinsically motivated to learn \[1 2 3 4 5\]
31. A desirable way of promoting social interaction
32. Something which lacks any purposeful structure
33. An ideal way of stimulating other aspects of the curriculum
34. Preferably left to those teachers who can act and direct
35. A noisy activity likely to disturb others
36. To be avoided due to lack of subject content
37. Likely to attract criticism from other staff
38. A welcome opportunity for children to use their own ideas
39. An excuse for children to misbehave
40. To be avoided due to lack of time
41. Likely to remove too much attention from the teacher
42. A chance for all children to practice self-discipline
43. A good opportunity for children to move freely around the classroom
44. Which of the following types of drama do you prefer to teach the most? Indicate your preference by placing an 'X' in ONE space below:
   a. Theatre skills/theatre games
   b. Plays performed before an audience
   c. Role-playing
   d. Drama games
   e. Child invented plays/improvisation
   f. Others (please specify)
   g. No drama
   h. Mime
45. IDEALLY which type of drama WOULD YOU LIKE MOST to teach? Indicate your preference by placing an 'X' in ONE space below:
   a. Theatre skills/theatre games
   b. Plays performed before an audience
   c. Role-playing
   d. Mime
   e. Drama games
   f. Child invented plays/improvisation
   g. Others (please specify)
   h. No drama

MANY THANKS FOR YOUR CO-OPERATION WITH THIS OPINIONNAIRE
APPENDIX 4

INTERVIEW FORMAT
TEACHER INTERVIEW FORMAT

1. ROLE
   a. What were your main reasons for becoming a teacher?
   b. Do you think that these initial reasons still hold - or has your practical teaching experience altered your initial motives? If so, in what way(s)?
   c. On teaching now - who or what provides the greatest influence on your teaching? - significant persons?
      - literature?
      - In-service courses?
      - original training?
      - other influences?
   d. How do you see your role in the classroom?
      - director/guide? Most of the time?
   e. How far do your class facilitate your role as you see it?
   f. What do you consider to be the major tasks of the teacher?

2. AIMS
   a. What do you see to be your priority educational aims?
   b. How and in what ways does drama fit into your aims picture?

3. CHILDREN
   a. How much responsibility do you think children should have in the classroom: - in the way of tasks?
      - choice of seating?
      - choice of learning activities from a list?
      - discovery learning?
      - social grouping - co-operation/competition?
   b. Use of children's ideas:
      Suppose that you had planned a lesson in detail. In answer to a question posed by you in the lesson a child gives an unexpected, but original idea which, if accepted would veer away from your plans. Would you:
i. ignore the idea and keep to your plans?
ii. use the idea in some subsequent lesson, but keep to your plans for the moment?
iii. abandon your plans in favour of the idea and its subsequent direction?
iv. other?

4. DRAMA
a. What do you mean by .................. (Drama type) ..................?
b. Why did you choose this type ...... influences? special training?
c. How long have you been doing drama?
d. Would you say that your drama approach has changed over the time you have been doing it? If so, in what way(s)?
e. What short/long term benefits does drama contribute to learning, as you see it?
f. How do you see your role in drama – director/guide?
g. Do you take any part in the action?
h. How is the drama session formulated?
   i. all process?
   ii. mainly process some product?
   iii. equal process – equal product?
   iv. mainly product – some process?
   v. all product?
i. How long do you think a drama session should be?
j. Being honest - how big a priority is drama on your timetable?
k. What is your idea of a 'successful' drama session?
l. How do your children react to the drama you do?
m. What do you do if, and when, children misbehave in drama?
n. What advice would you offer to colleagues wanting to do drama with their class for the first time:
   - problems?
   - solutions?
o. Who or what prevents you teaching your ideal drama type? (Check for discrepancy first)
APPENDIX 5

INTERVIEWS WITH HIGHEST AND LOWEST ACHIEVING TEACHERS
1. **TEACHER A: HIGHEST ACHIEVER ON VERBAL CREATIVITY, EMPATHY AND ACADEMIC SELF-IMAGE**

Q. **What were your main reasons for becoming a teacher?**

A. "I drifted into it. I had no reasons at all to. There was a scholarship I'd got. I didn't want to do anything else ... I sort of drifted into it ... I didn't like it much for the first couple of years ... after that I was O.K., I stayed in it."

Q. **Influences upon your teaching?**

A. "Well, there are priorities depending on the grade you've got ... that type of thing is pretty heavy ... particularly for sixth grade. There are some things that have to be done ... so pressures from above as far as what the children are going to do next year are matters that have to be taken into consideration. After that ... usually ... it's up to the class teacher."

Q. **Role in the classroom?**

A. "Ninety per cent of the time it would be pretty well teacher directed."

Q. **Class facilitate role?**

A. "They're a very facilitative group of children. That's probably why I've kept it going (Role) as long as I have ..."

Q. **Educational aims? Tasks?**

A. "Again it depends on the grade ... I see my role with this class is getting them prepared in every way to face what they're going to face next year ... that's my role."
Q. What are your aims?

A. "To develop every child as much as I can ... not to
to their potential, I don't think anyone could kid
themselves that they can do that. To give them
confidence in what they can do which will lead on then
to develop into the things that they can't do. I think
certainty development is the major aim. As I've said
... any confidence will flow through."

Q. Pupil responsibility?

A. "In here, choice of seating is entirely up to them ...
Getting a task done or completed to the standard that I
set is a big responsibility ... that's the main
responsibility ... getting themselves organised to get
things finished ... I'd like to give them more choice
in learning activities but it just doesn't happen ...
As I've said it's 90% teacher directed so they don't
get much choice."

Q. Use of pupil ideas?

A. "It depends how far into the lesson it was. If you
were, say, two-thirds of the way through and some child
came up with a really good idea ... you'd say 'that's a
great idea ... let's try it tomorrow or the next day ...
', and keep going. But if it was right at the
beginning and it was a good idea that you could tell
was 'grabbed' by the other kids ... go to it ... feel
your way through it from there. Get the kid to
explain how he/she would want to go on with it ...
Again it depends where it comes."
Q. What do you mean by 'child improvisation'?

A. "Getting a basic idea and allowing children to explore different facets of that idea ... often giving them a starting point, but not giving them the end result ... leaving them to figure it out for themselves."

Q. Influences on drama choice?

A. "I think it's more effective than scripted plays for primary children ... scripted plays for primary children are a waste of time. They're O.K. if you've got to do a 'crash course' for an end-of-year production but to get any improvement in children's ability to express themselves they are a waste of time."

Q. And:

A. "There was a course I did through College X a few years ago. They suggested the idea of child improvised plays and I found it was really effective."

Q. Changes in drama during your career?

A. "Basically it [drama] has stayed the same. The only thing that has changed in the last couple of years is that I'm bringing in more games and activities like that. I'd never done that before. I get ideas given to me ... I've read a couple of books ... with ideas from other teachers."

Q. Drama benefits?

A. "It develops confidence in children. That's the major aim of the whole thing. I look at that as my aim in doing drama ... I'm not interested in putting on a
production. If you can get a child to develop confidence in a particular area, then it usually has outcomes in every other facet of education. If they feel that they are good at something, then it will spread itself out through other things."

Q. Role in drama?
A. "I play a very minor role. Once they've got the main idea they know what they've got to do ... I'm not a judge ... or a director ... or anything else. I might give them a few hints with the stuff, but that's all."

Q. Do you take part in the action?
A. "Only to the extent of advising, but occasionally if they're unsure of what I want I might get one of the kids to stand up and have a go. They were just doing interviews between two people ... If I think that they haven't got what I want from them, but not generally."

Q. "How do you mean?"
A. "If you're looking at a particular idea like you want to get across and the kids aren't getting it because of the types of questions you're asking. Or perhaps you're trying to get them to learn a technique ... 'meeting people' - and they start off and they don't know how to go about it - then I tell them what I want."

Q. Formulation of lesson?
A. "The majority of the lesson time is taken up in their exploration of a given topic. They might come together in groups of five or six, perform for that. Perhaps
when we come back in the room they might select one which might be interesting and then they see it. But the majority of the time is spent in just going through them."

Q. **Length of lesson?**

A. "With this group they can handle about 25-30 minutes ... that's about the limit on unscripted plays."

Q. **Drama as a priority?**

A. "It's only a very small priority. It's one thing that often gives a lesson break. There is a set time per week, but I find quite often something else has to be done in its place. No, it's not a huge priority."

Q. **Successful drama?**

A. "Enjoyment from them and participation from as many as possible - and the looks on their faces as I say 'we're doing drama today' - that tells you how successful your previous lesson was."

Q. **Evaluation?**

A. "I never write anything down ... if I have an idea which doesn't go across I don't do it again ... or change it so that it's more effective."

Q. **Pupil reaction to drama?**

A. "These children react really well; they're a very out-going group of children and the majority are pretty confident in front of their classmates. But, given an opportunity for doing something for the classmates by a third of the class ... for the kids next door ... that
is a totally different situation. In front of their own classmates they're a little bit inhibited."

Q. Problems with behaviour?
A. "Sit them down. If they're a disturbance to their group sit them down for five minutes. They're quite keen to do drama - especially this class. They make a heck of a lot of noise. Usually we do drama down in the basement which is a fairly open area. That's the only problem - I've got to keep the noise down a bit ... there's virtually nowhere else in the school where we can go."

Q. Advice to colleagues?
A. "The best thing I find, particularly with a new class, is to give them a simple story - get the kids enthused. Divide the kids into three or four groups. Preferably a story where every child can be a character. Give them ten minutes to sort it out themselves. Bring them back and in the first few lessons get them to put their group in front of the class and get the others to say, 'O.K. what could they have done to make it better?' It makes them think more about their participation. It makes them think more about their group as a group ... If the kids accept the advice - it's not a criticism ... how they could go about it, that's the best way of doing it because they know they've got to have a finished product; they've got to get somewhere - not muck around for twenty
minutes. I find that after one or two sessions like that they don't need to come back in and put it on for anybody. They could put it on for me; they could put it on for another group. But they don't need this. If they get the idea that they've got to finish up with something ... an objective I suppose. So the first three or four sessions they need to come back and say 'how could our group have been better? Could they have been better?' But after that they're right."

2. **TEACHER D: HIGHEST ACHIEVER ON EMPATHY**

**Q. What were your main reasons for becoming a teacher?**

**A.** "At the time I was in the bank and I got a little bit dissatisfied with that and I got a scholarship which came through so I just took the opportunity. I must admit that I hadn't really thought about the other side of it till I started off at college and from then on I enjoyed being at Teacher's College."

**Q. Reasons still hold?**

**A.** "I've really enjoyed being involved in teaching though I must admit it's getting a lot more hectic these days from what it initially was."

**Q. Influences on teaching?**

**A.** "Well I naturally work a lot of it out myself, but I think that these days I take the children's point of view a lot more into consideration. I do ask the
children what sort of things they'd be interested in doing. But of course I also work out the levels of the children which gets me to put work down to their level. Some in-service courses I must admit have changed my points of view and also I've a lot of influence from the previous principal."

Q. **Role in the classroom?**

A. "Well with these children I'm more of a guide than a director. However, there are a number of pupils who need a little more directing than others."

Q. **Pupil facilitate role?**

A. "They seem to be able to handle both the situations [guide-director] ... actually I'm quite pleased with the initiative they show ... Even if I'm out of the room ... maybe it's some influence but they do tend to get on with the task at hand."

Q. **Major tasks of teacher?**

A. "I think my major task is to be aware of the differences in the children's levels and interests and try to provide learning experiences and opportunities to develop these children at those particular levels."

Q. **Major aims?**

A. "Mainly language and maths, but I'm still interested in personal development too - I do go back to the basic skills that they need to develop but at the same time they should have a lot of enjoyment as well."
Q. **Aims-drama?**

A. "Drama fits in with lots of the units I've got ... incidentally when anything sort of pops up we do some drama activities. Language - talking about certain types of words I get them to express those sorts of feelings as well."

Q. **Responsibility given to pupils?**

A. "They should be responsible for certain jobs in the room because they enjoy doing these so they should be responsible enough to get on well with the other children. I feel they should be responsible enough to be able to work by themselves when the teacher might be out. As far as seating: I have a suggestion box where they put in suggestions - taking into account I may think it wouldn't be a good idea for one person to sit next to another particular person - they have their choice."

Q. **Pupil ideas, use of:**

A. "I do tend to go off the track if something of interest does come up."

Q. **What do you mean by child improvisation?**

A. "I use the children's ideas in drama rather than sort of bringing what I know to them - because I know very little myself. I have made up plays but we also do plays from favourite stories like the old fables or 'Jack and the Beanstalk' - where the children still show 'creativity' in making up the words as they go along."
Q. **Why this type?**
A. "I suppose it's through lack of confidence and training myself so I decided to take the children's lives and abilities into account."

Q. **How long?**
A. "About fifteen years - my teaching career. But I think I'm handling it better now because I'm less direct than what I was when I first came out teaching where I over-imposed things on them and didn't allow for their own choices and their own things."

Q. **Drama benefits?**
A. "Well I think it helps the children free themselves from their inhibitions and feel more relaxed which would lend itself to other subjects. It also helps you work out different talents and let them be exposed. Language development too ... "

Q. **Role in drama?**
A. "I still say I'd be more of a guide. I may suggest what activities we are going to do, but I let them ... children make up their own plays and at times if we are doing drama I'll even let the children suggest the sort of things we are going to do."

Q. **Drama role for teachers?**
A. "Not really I will make suggestions, but being a little bit self-conscious myself I find that 'put on the spot', I'm not very creative myself."
Q. **Formulation of drama?**

A. "I think as long as the interest is being maintained it could go on for quite a while, it's hard to determine. Also you could 'spin-off' the drama into some language experiences ... up to about 30 minutes ... given the interest of the children."

Q. **Drama as a priority?**

A. "Not a great priority ... it is an integral part of a lot of the day though ... for example even in the morning we might loosen up with a few activities and when we're singing, I encourage the children to be dramatic in the way they feel or recite verse - so it wouldn't form a lot of the program, but during the day it would take up quite a bit of time.

Q. **Successful drama?**

A. "A 'successful' drama lesson would mean that all of them are involved, that they learn something by it, that they enjoy themselves mainly, but not being foolish or anything but they do learn to improvise - bring in some speech of their own."

Q. **Pupil reaction to drama?**

A. "The children do love the drama sessions actually - they ask for more during the day."

Q. **Pupil misbehaviour?**

A. "I must admit that children who have been given a warning and who have not been sensible, sit down and take no further part. Which means that they might
write some sentences down why their behaviour was contrary to what it should have been."

Q. **Colleague advice?**

A. "Well I think firstly they have to gauge their children to see whether they would be able to make up plays by themselves. Know their children so that there couldn't be any control problems. Probably it would be better to have little plays structured first where the groups could know what characters they are going to play."

---

3. **TEACHER J: LOWEST ACHIEVER ON EMPATHY**

Q. **What were your main reasons for becoming a teacher?**

A. "I worked for a year with the Water Board and found it horribly distasteful ... and saw teaching as perhaps something more interesting."

Q. **Reasons still hold?**

A. "Practical teaching has changed. It's a more demanding job than I saw it to be in the initial role. Generally, though it's much the same."

Q. **Influences on teaching?**

A. "Literature to a great extent ... some in-servicing, not a great deal really, primarily literature with some feedback from other people ... ideas."
Q. And:
A. "I decide exactly what to teach ... I've got a plan most of the time on what I'm going to do ... The play may vary ... I'm committed to certain approaches and I'll keep those unless I find better ways to go about it."

Q. Role in the classroom?
A. "Particularly in this school - guiding - child-centred."

Q. Class facilitate this role?
A. "Actually it's a coin I'm tossing up at the moment ... because some of them would actually prefer a more directed approach ... I'm beginning to question the rationality of educationalists who say that children tend to choose their own guidelines and work to it ... there are a lot of children who can't ... who want to be shown what to do."

Q. Proportion of directed - self-directed children?
A. "Probably the younger ones would need more guidance - about a third."

Q. Tasks of teacher?
A. "To develop a person who can leave here and fit into a society out there without being an 'outcast' or a 'strange fellow'."

Q. And drama? / priority aims?
A. "... Priority aim is developing the child academically but going hand-in-hand with that is social develop-
A child must be aware of what restrictions society has upon him ... An ability to question 'why?', but in a lawful way. To stay within the boundary of it and question it. That is social development ... and equally the 3Rs. Drama ... allows a child to express himself ... to 'get it out', role plays, they can act the part of the frustrated mother if they want to do that ... developing self-esteem. And for those who are not successful academically, drama is a good way of letting them do something ... non-oral opportunities."

Q. What do you mean by plays with an audience?
A. "There are two types of audience, one would be an adult audience, but one also is children - maybe a small group form a play and then they perform it for the rest of the children. Or it may be interview introductions or it may be for parents."

Q. Reasons for drama choice?
A. "I think it's good for the children. I like to think if they are doing something someone has to witness it. I think they're getting satisfaction in it if someone sees the end result. Children do it in a group and no-one sees it, it's restrictive in a way."

Q. How long have you been doing drama?
A. "As long as I've been teaching."
Q. **Change of approach during career?**

A. "Probably in so far as the change in curriculum goes ... I'm more aware of role play. Whereas I've always followed what might be called traditional plays - roles. But the actual role play where children assume ... well. Departmental changes, but some regional."

Q. **And books?**

A. "No, only the Department of Education Curriculum Guide for Social Studies."

Q. **Benefits of drama?**

A. "Short term I think it's a nice variation to a routine. It's a different way of approaching a subject instead of a chalk-and-talk approach, the children are participating in a role. Long term I like to think it's going to develop confidence in a child ... perhaps self esteem and 'de-hibit' the child. Any inhibitions they may have - they'd be free to talk."

Q. **Role in drama?**

A. "I like to set a goal or a question in the play: example, 'You are a mother and your child comes in dirty'. What do you do? I'm producer ... and script writer. I set the expectations and hope the children will come up to them."
Q. Who writes the script?
A. "I let them do that ... that's next ... actually it's this Friday. Children have actually written their own plays. We'll do regularly a two-three person play. I usually pick three or four scripts and they can get a partner and perform it to the others."

Q. Role yourself?
A. "I have actually but not at this school - I take a back seat."

Q. Drama lesson formulation?
A. "Two thirds of the work we do is the children as the audience themselves or the occasional parental observation (one third). All have some audience - probably - 'mainly product some process'. And parent performances are school initiated ... the concert is a regular thing, that is tradition. The concert this year has a 'radio set up' where the M.C. was a disc jockey and the plays and the records were simply children coming on ..."

Q. Length of drama session?
A. "About half an hour would be a minimum; it depends upon their concentration span as much as anything else."

Q. Advice to other colleagues?
A. "Need to be very aware of what you want them to do - to be well planned beforehand is terribly important ... I'd always be inclined in an initial program to have a
fairly directed type of play - so that each child knows exactly what they've got to do - and then you can enter into more freer use."

Q. **Priority?**
A. "At least fortnightly we are doing something. Obviously I have the 3R's taking all our morning session ... but then we've got social studies which is a couple of days a week. We have a lot that involves role-play - discussion work. About one half hour a fortnight."

Q. **Successful drama lesson?**
A. "Where the children feel satisfied ... from their point of view if they feel we've achieved something ... they're happy about it. I'm the producer ... who maybe wants more. If they've achieved the audience feel satisfied ... success."

Q. **Pupil reactions to drama?**
A. "They enjoy drama; they're quite a creative lot, a lot of 'prima donnas'."

Q. **Misbehaviour? In drama?**
A. "Sometimes you can really ignore them. A principal once told me that it was better to talk to the attentive 90% of the class and ignore the others - but that is counter-productive because the 90% will be watching what the 10% are doing ... sometimes it might
be just a couple of children chatting on one side. If
the 'chats' don't interrupt your work - let it go. But
there has to be a certain discipline when you get to
the finer points."

Q. Pupil responsibility?
A. "I give them a relative amount. For seating they can
generally sit where they wish to but there are four
grades - so they can sit within their grades because
that is much more easier for teaching ... Tasks - the
morning routine is usually a series of tasks and they
can choose when to do tasks - but they have to choose a
certain quota by the end of the week ... they must
achieve a certain amount. I begin by letting them do
what they wanted, but found that they would ignore or
neglect a subject that they didn't like or had trouble
with - so it was becoming counter-productive in that
respect."

Q. Pupil ideas - use?
A. "It would depend upon the particular lesson I was
giving ... If the subject was humanities type, I tend
to waive away. If I thought I didn't have the
resources I'd tend to stay where I was. To an extent
it would come to the question of 'what resources do I
have?'. Would I be able to follow that idea success-
fully or would it just be a waste of time ... you may
be able to cover the idea for 5 minutes within the session (ii & iii)."

4. **TEACHER M: LOWEST ACHIEVER ON VERBAL CREATIVITY**

Q. **What were your main reasons for becoming a teacher?**

A. "I'm not trained in primary education, my degree is a B.Sc. in Music Education. I went into Music Education rather than Applied Music because of the practicality of getting a job. It's a very practical reason and this is my x year of teaching and I've taught music for the last eight years ... so I came into primary education that way. I didn't decide I was going to be a teacher as such."

Q. **Who or what influences your teaching now?**

A. "I think fellow teachers throughout the years ... as you talk to them and get ideas from them and things of this nature ... Of course then there's your basic training ... your training and methodology ... on working with young children and observation and so on. But, though ... the actual practical aspects I would say fellow teachers really ... discussions ... really helpful."
Q. How do you see your role in the classroom?

A. "At the moment they're [children] a streamed class, an 'A' class, and they're quite bright so I ... think I would try to guide more than actively direct. I think that would be an aim that I would try to lead the children to working individually, to thinking for themselves and so forth ... trying to guide them towards this I think. The teacher has to be a director ... to be in control - to have control. The teacher knows where he or she is going and what they are aiming to teach in a given time, a year, a week, a unit, or whatever. So in that sense you definitely direct. Then you give them your philosophies and so forth. You're giving them their ideas, but then you are guiding them along to education generally."

Q. Do the class make your role easy?

A. "The class? - very! Last year I had the strangest group of children I think I'd ever had in my fifteen years of teaching. There were six or seven children with extreme psychological problems, emotional problems ... different types ... And then there were other disturbing factors in the class. There was an I.Q. range, although it was a 'B' class as such, being a small school ... the I.Q. range was from 89 to 123 ..."
and that class just had so many problems with it so really you had to be [a director] ... they couldn't be guided. But there were times when they were so beaut, they'd work together and be so cooperative."

Q. **Major tasks and aims?**

A. "I'm a practical person ... [tasks] ... to teach things that are relevant and useful to them [children] ... things that they can use. I mean they've got to have their basic skills. I think those [basics] are probably the most important things we have to do. If a child can't read and can't do simple maths ...

Alongside [this aim] I certainly have this idea of guidance and being like a friend to the child. Many times, especially with women teachers they'll call you mum ... even fifth or sixth grade children will often think of you as mother ... [more aims] ... to be a friend to them, to guide them, to help them when they need it."

Q. **How does drama fit into this picture?**

A. "My major hobby outside school is theatre, involving music with the thing; but in the classroom, to be completely honest, it's one of those things that just doesn't get done because of the priority on time ... and this has to be done and that has to be done and so forth. Like [for instance] ... we have grade tests"
here ... your program ... you just don't carry on with your normal program because of the extra testing in the main areas. So by the time you try to squeeze in what you have missed ... then time is of the essence. I did a drama workshop ... and we [participants] ... all said the same thing ... we came out of the workshop really enthusiastic. I think we should do an in-service at school ... but then to take the time to swallow it up in the classroom practically? ... it [drama] really takes a back picture."

Q. How much responsibility do you think children should have in the classroom?

A. "Tasks - they need to have [responsibility]. They don't all get a job because when you have 30 children ... you can't. I think it's very important that you try to alternate things so that they all have a chance to do something, you know, useful. I think that's very important for a child ... especially slower children to have little jobs to do ... they all enjoy it."

"Seating choices - I choose. Sometimes, once in a while there are a couple of activities. If they [children] can you know, behave themselves, stay quiet, they can choose where to sit."
Q. **Set timetable**

A. "I find it easier to work to a timetable, but mind you, the best laid plans of mice and men ... especially when it comes to children. Sometimes you have to take more time on something, or less time ... I try to work to a timetable. I find it easier."

Q. **Social grouping?**

A. "I would say that 70-75% of the time they [children] would be working on their own ... cooperation is very important in my book ... everything they do ... even if they're sitting beside a child they don't like ... they have to cooperate every minute of the day. If you [interviewer] are thinking when can they choose their own groups, do what they want etc., it's not too frequent, but the cooperation is there. I think it's [cooperation] one of those skills you have to try and teach. I guess it's one of those taught skills ... they have to cooperate with someone you know ... every minute of the day don't they? ... Like [e.g.] not putting their elbow in the middle of another person's book, you know things like that."

Q. **Competition?**

A. "I see competition as being healthy; it comes from my ex-Americanism. Inter-competition, between children, in a sense comes from being an ex-American. It comes
from being very competitive academically and especially if it's a bright class. But even if it's a slow class I think the child should know when they do well and of course there are going to be some who don't do well in all subjects. I think here again the children have to know their strengths and weaknesses and so forth. So being aware of how they're doing in relation to somebody else ... it's up to them. I always tell the children who have the highest marks in a particular test ... and it's up to them whether or not they tell their friends. I don't think it's damaging ... whether or not it does any good?"

Q. Use of children's ideas?

A. "When you're talking about 30 children, you are talking about 30 individual minds and all that creativity in children ... so sometimes they're more creative than we are as adults. I always try to listen to them [children] ... of course it depends on the importance of the idea ... No! ... I think it's nice to get sidetracked and talk about other things. The other day I was giving listening skills and it [the exercise] was about somebody going through customs ... and then we had time to share, instead of doing something else which was normally planned - they were not overly keen on reading activities - we just spent the rest of the
lesson talking about all their ... [experiences]; it was quite interesting. Being a rather affluent community and being a well-educated community ... the places they've been to ... and the experiences they've had going through customs ... we had a beaut conversation you know. We still squeezed in the listening skills, contracted it. Then we went back to further discussion. I think you've always got to be open to their mind, their ideas, their creativity ... but it depends on the children."

Q. **What do you mean by child improvisation?**

A. "The only thing I can think of is like in oral work or in oral expression or if and when ... the children are allowed to choose their own ideas."

Q. **How long have you been doing drama?**

A. "About six years."

Q. **Would you say that your drama approach has changed over the time you've been doing it?**

A. "I'm sure. I would have had some disasterous lesson failures and learnt from them. Drama by itself ... I found it was rather a noisy activity. You give them an idea, put them into groups, that kind of thing ... and I did that at the start; I got the ideas from a number of books. I still do it. I don't think that my
approach in that way will have changed. Reading plays etc."

Q. **What benefits does drama contribute?**

A. "Increasing a child's confidence in expressing himself. Confidence in himself ... especially slower learners ... If you can get them [slower learners] to express themselves in a group, or with a little play, or a little skit, or a little mime or an 'Olaff & Fisher' [Play books] or anything ... it will increase their confidence. They might do that [drama] and be quite creative at it whereas they can't ... they might be a very poor reader. So I think the benefits to the child are increased confidence in himself ... which I think is very important in the development of the child."

Q. **How do you see your role in drama?**

A. "Bystander. If I put them into groups to do something like that I don't interfere ... I just let them go and then they end up ... I've done only one this year ... they love it ... children love it ... It's so important for them. But I direct them in the sense that I give them an idea ... you know ... 'Your situation is this, make up a little skit about such and such ...'. There's a book I've found ... a whole series of them ... They give lots and lots of ideas. I direct them as
they're doing it. Those that are watching have to be still; they have to be a good audience. They have to give everyone a go. And if sometimes there are comments that can be made on their little play acting ... you have to sometimes encourage them to bring it [the play] to a conclusion."

5. TEACHER P: LOWEST ACHIEVER ON FIGURAL CREATIVITY AND ACADEMIC SELF-IMAGE

Q. What were your main reasons for becoming a teacher?
A. "Generally because I like it."

Q. Do you think that this initial liking still holds?
A. "Yes."

Q. On teaching now - whom or what provides the greatest influence on your teaching?
A. "Just the children ... those are the influences ... and curriculum guidelines, of course."

Q. How do you see your role in the classroom?
A. "You have to direct them [children] ... and yet I'd like to guide them more ..."

Q. What prevents you doing this [guiding]?
A. "Behaviour [the children's]."

Q. How far does your class facilitate your role as you see it?
A. "A lot of them prefer to be told what to do ... a few like to be guided."
Q. What do you see to be the major tasks of the teacher?
A. "Just teaching the kids ."

Q. End products?
A. "... respect for other people ... some knowledge ."

Q. What do you see to be your priority educational aims?
A. "There has to be some academic ... some social too ."

Q. How and in what way does drama fit into your educational aims picture?
A. "It generally doesn't, but if something comes up I do it ."

Q. How much responsibility do you think children should have in the classroom:
Tasks?
A. "It depends on the circumstances ... you get some who can [take responsibility] and some who can't. So, it all depends on who your kids are ."

Q. Seating?
A. "All my choice ."

Q. Choice of learning activities?
A. "Sometimes the children choose ."

Q. Competition?
A. "Competition, yes, outside in sport, particularly ... competition in certain work in the classroom ."

Q. The use of children's ideas?
A. "Sometimes I would use the idea [from a child] in some subsequent lesson, but keep to my own plans for the moment. Other times I might abandon my plan in favour of the child's ideas ."
Q. What do you mean by child improvisation?
A. "Plays from magazines or set units where the children work in groups and show their plays to others in turn."

Q. Why did you choose this type?
A. Because it was there on the list ... nearest to what I do."

Q. How long have you been teaching drama?
A. "As long as I've been teaching."

Q. Would you say that your drama approach has changed over that time?
A. "Yes, when I first started teaching I had drama lessons regularly, a time set aside. As time went on, and with too many kids and with all the noise ... the result was that I just abandoned it slowly. I still do it, but only five times a term at the most."

Q. What short/long term benefits does drama contribute to learning?
A. "Children enjoy it ... but mainly social benefits."

Q. How do you see your role in drama?
A. "Principally as a director ... but more so a guide with time."

Q. Do you take part in the action?
A. "No."

Q. How is your drama session formulated?
A. "Mainly process - some product [performance]."

Q. How long do you think a drama session should be?
A. "Thirty minutes at the most."
Q. Being honest - how big a priority is drama on your timetable?
A. "It is the least priority. I've done drama this year about five times."

Q. What is your idea of a 'successful' drama session?
A. "I don't know. I've never had one."

Q. How do the children react to the drama you do?
A. "A mixture ... the more out-going children get more involved and enjoy doing it."

Q. What do you do if and when the children misbehave?
A. "I wipe the drama lesson completely or I get rid of problem children - those who are bothering others."

Q. What advice would you offer to colleagues wanting to do drama with their class for the first time?
A. "There will be behaviour problems ... There is no play which involves everybody. Use magazines and library resources."

Q. Who or what prevents you teaching the drama you'd like?
A. "Me. Because I don't know much about it."
APPENDIX 6

THE PILOT DRAMA INVENTORY
DRAMA OBSERVATION INVENTORY

Venue ........................................
Class ........................................
Duration .....................................

PART 1 : PRE-DRAMA (comments)

a. Teacher Aims:
   General ........................................
       ........................................
   Specific ........................................
       ........................................

b. Children's Receptivity:
       ........................................

c. Teacher Role Focus:
   Director ............... Director/Guide ............... 
   Guide .................

d. Learner Role Focus:
   Dep ................. Dep/Aut .................
   Aut .................
### PART 2: DRAMA SESSION

1. Drama option observed: Exercise ____ Theatre ____ Child ____
   Other ____ None ____

2. Teacher allows for pupil direction: Yes ____ No ____

3. Teacher uses pupil ideas: Yes ____ No ____

4. Teacher keeps to set lesson plans: Yes ____ No ____

5. Teacher insists pupils are kept quiet all of the time:
   Yes ____ No ____

6. Teacher is the centre of all action: Yes ____ No ____

7. All pupils are able to participate: Yes ____ No ____

8. Pupils are involved in decision-making: Yes ____ No ____

9. Pupils have to compete for parts: Yes ____ No ____

10. Pupils able to use class space: Yes ____ No ____

### PART 3: SYNOPSIS OF SESSION

(use reverse)
APPENDIX 7

DRAMA INVENTORY
DRAMA OBSERVATION INVENTORY

Venue ........................................
Class ........................................
Duration ......................................

PART 1: PRE-DRAMA (comments)

a. Teacher Aims:
   General ........................................
   ........................................
   Specific ......................................
   ........................................

b. Children's Receptivity:
   ........................................

c. Teacher Role Focus:
   Director .............. Director/Guide ....
   Guide ................

d. Learner Role Focus:
   Dep .............. Dep/Aut ..............
   Aut ..............
PART 2: DRAMA SESSION

1. Drama option observed: Exercise [ ] Theatre [ ] Child [ ]
   Other [ ] None [ ]

2. Teacher allows for pupil direction: Yes [ ] No [ ]

3. Teacher uses pupil ideas: Yes [ ] No [ ]

4. Teacher keeps to set lesson plans: Yes [ ] No [ ]

5. Teacher insists pupils are kept quiet all of the time: Yes [ ] No [ ]

6. Teacher is the centre of all action: Yes [ ] No [ ]

7. All pupils are able to participate: Yes [ ] No [ ]

8. Pupils are involved in decision-making: Yes [ ] No [ ]

9. Pupils have to compete for parts: Yes [ ] No [ ]

10. Pupils able to use class space: Yes [ ] No [ ]

PART 3: SYNOPSIS OF SESSION

(use reverse)
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CLASSROOM OBSERVATION SCHEDULE
CLASSROOM OBSERVATION SCHEDULE

Subject ................................ School ................................
Grade .................................... Lesson .................................
Date ..................................... Time .................................

PART A: General Characteristics:

a. Teacher Focus -
   Out-Front ............ Mobile ............
   Both ............ Other ............

b. Teacher Role -
   Director ............ Director/Guide .......
   Guide ............ Other ............

c. Seating Organisation -
   Single seating ...... Pairs ............
   Groups ............ Other ............

d. Ability Grouping -
   Yes ............ No ............
   Comments ..................................

e. Work Display -
   Teacher's ............ Children's ............
   Both ............ Neither ............

f. Competition -
   Self ............ Self + Inter- ............
   Both ............ Neither ............

g. Use of Marks, stars, etc.
   Yes ............ No ............
PART B: THE LESSON

a. Session Entry -
Introduction ......... Routine .........
No introduction .........

b. Stimulus Source -
Teacher ......... Teacher+Child .........
Child ......... No stimulus .........

c. Pupil Understanding -
Rote/meaning (delete one)

d. Knowledge emphasis -
Compartment/Integration (delete one)
e. Content source -
Teacher ......... Teacher+Child .........
Child .........
f. Any comments -

PART C: INTERACTION
ONE TIME UNIT PER THIRTY SECONDS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY TO INTERACTION:

1. Contact-Teacher/Pupil - 2. Teacher praise/Blame
   W = Warm; N = Neutral;
   C = Cold; O = No contact
   p = Praise; b = Blame

3. Teacher Target - 4. Person Talking -
   I = Individual; G = Group
   T = Teacher;
   Ch = Child;
   S = Silence.
APPENDIX 9

PILOTING OF THE EMPATHY SCALE
THE PILOTING OF THE EMPATHY SCALE

An opportunity sample of 100 pupils aged between 8 and 12 years were invited to respond to the 12 item Empathy Scale. The first table (a) shows the frequency distribution of the sample (n=100) on each item. Nine weeks later the pupils were asked to respond again to the measure so that a Coefficient of Reproducibility could be determined. The second table (b) shows the frequency distribution of pupil responses on the first (pretest) and second (posttest) administration of the Scale.
(a) Frequency distribution for each item on the Empathy Scale (n=100)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(\bar{x})</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>(\sigma)</th>
<th>(\sigma^2)</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>YES TRUE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NOT SURE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I like to get my own way ..</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I would try to help a younger child ..</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I wouldn't share my lunch ..</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I like helping people ...</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I'd give away my best toy</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I like doing the things I want ...</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I like to think about other people's feelings ...</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I don't like going out of the way to help ...</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. It's fun to play jokes on people ...</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I don't mind pushing in a line ...</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I can often tell what other people are thinking ..</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I don't like helping out at home ...</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(b) Pretest-posttest scores used to determine Coefficient of Reproducibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Pretest Relative Frequency (%)</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency (%)</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Posttest Relative Frequency (%)</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>13-14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>99.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>23-24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[N = 100 \quad \text{S.E.} = 0.48 \quad \text{Mode} = 14.00\]

\[\bar{X} = 14.42 \quad \text{Median} = 14.72 \quad \sigma = 4.88 \quad \sigma^2 = 23.84\]

\[N = 100 \quad \text{S.E.} = 0.44 \quad \text{Mode} = 17.00\]

\[\bar{X} = 14.24 \quad \text{Median} = 14.61 \quad \sigma = 4.41 \quad \sigma^2 = 19.45\]
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EMPATHY SCALE
1. I like to get my own way in class

2. I would try to help a younger child if they were being bullied

3. I wouldn't share my lunch with anyone even if they were hungry

4. I like helping people as much as I can.

5. I'd give away my best toy to someone who really needed it

6. I like doing the things I want, not what others want

7. I like to think about people's feelings before I do anything

8. I don't like going out of my way to help others

9. It's fun to play jokes on people even if they don't like it

10. I don't mind pushing in a line if it means that I get to the front first

11. I can often tell what other people are thinking

12. I don't like helping out at home

YES, NOT TRUE SURE NO
APPENDIX 11

CREATIVITY TASKS
1. **VERBAL CREATIVITY TASKS - BOOKLET A (PRETEST)**

(a) **Just Suppose : Same Faces**

On this page you will see that there are lined spaces numbered from 1 to 30.

On these lined spaces I want you to write down all the things that might happen if suddenly, just suppose, everybody in the world had the same face ... (five minutes)

(b) **Unusual Uses : Matchboxes**

(Show matchbox)

Most people throw their matchboxes away when all the matches have gone but they have many interesting uses.

On the page I've given you marked 1-43, I want you to write down as many unusual uses as you can for matchboxes. To make it more interesting the matchbox used could be very small, ordinary sized, or very large, or you can put lots of matchboxes together to be used.

Alright go ahead and write down as many unusual uses as you can. (Ten minutes)
2. VERBAL CREATIVITY TASKS - BOOKLET B (POSTTEST)

(a) Just Suppose : Clouds with Strings

On this page you will see that there are lined spaces numbered from 1 to 30.

On these lined spaces I want you to use your imagination and write down all the things you can think of that might happen if clouds had strings on them that came all the way down to earth. What might happen because of this?

Now turn to the two pages of lines ... (Five minutes)

(b) Unusual Uses : Tin Cans

Most people throw their tin cans away or cash them in, but they have many interesting and unusual uses. On the page I've given you marked from 1 to 43, I want you to write down as many of these unusual and interesting uses as you can think of. Do not limit yourself to any size of can. You may use as many cans as you like. Do not limit yourself to the uses you have seen or heard about. Alright go ahead and write down as many unusual uses as you can. (Ten minutes)
UNUSUAL USES

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.
9.
10.
11.
12.
13.
14.
15.
16.
17.
18.
19.
20.
21.
22.
23.
24.
25.
26.
27.
28.
29.
30.
31.
32.
33.
34.
35.
36.
37.
38.
39.
40.
41.
42.
43.
3. FIGURAL CREATIVITY TASKS - BOOKLET A (PRETEST)

Circles

In the next ten minutes see how many objects or pictures you can make from the two pages of circles. The circles should be the main part of whatever you make. With pencil or crayons add lines to each circle to complete separate objects or pictures. You can place marks inside the circles, outside the circles - wherever you want to - in order to make your picture. Try to think of things that no one else will think of. Make as many different pictures or objects as you can and put as many ideas as you can in each one. Add names or titles below each one ... do not worry about spelling. Alright go ahead you have ten minutes.
(Two pages of circles were given to pupils)
Parallel Lines

In ten minutes see how many objects (things) or pictures you can make from the pairs of straight lines numbered on the two pages. The pairs of straight lines should be the main part of whatever you make. With pencil or crayon or textas add lines to the pairs of lines to complete your picture. You can place lines between the lines, on the lines and outside the lines - wherever you want in order to make your picture. Try to think of things that no one else will think of. Make as many different things or pictures as you can and put as many ideas into each one as you can. Only use one set of straight lines per thing/picture. Add names or titles below each one ... do not worry about spelling. Go ahead - you have ten minutes.
(Two pages of lines were given to pupils)
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T-SCORE CONVERSION TABLES FOR SCORING CREATIVITY TASKS
T-SCORE CONVERSION TABLE FOR FLUENCY, FLEXIBILITY AND ORIGINALITY FOR SELECTED VERBAL MEASURES IN BOOKLET A TAKEN FROM THE TORRANCE TESTS OF CREATIVE THINKING. CONVERSIONS ARE BASED ON THIRD TO SIXTH GRADE DATA USING AN AUSTRALIAN SAMPLE (n=370)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T-Score</th>
<th>Fluency</th>
<th>Flexibility</th>
<th>Originality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
T-SCORE CONVERSION TABLE FOR FLUENCY, FLEXIBILITY AND ORIGINALLITY FOR SELECTED VERBAL MEASURES IN BOOKLET B TAKEN FROM THE TORRANCE TESTS OF CREATIVE THINKING. CONVERSIONS ARE BASED ON THIRD TO SIXTH GRADE DATA USING AN AUSTRALIAN SAMPLE (n=370)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T-Score</th>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>Fluency</th>
<th>Flexibility</th>
<th>Originality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
T-SCORE CONVERSION TABLE FOR FLUENCY, FLEXIBILITY, ORIGINALITY AND ELABORATION FOR SELECTED FIGURAL (NON-VERBAL) MEASURES IN BOOKLET A TAKEN FROM THE TORRANCE TESTS OF CREATIVE THINKING. CONVERSIONS ARE BASED ON THIRD TO SIXTH GRADE DATA USING AN AUSTRALIAN SAMPLE (n=370)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T-Score</th>
<th>Raw Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fluency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
T-SCORE CONVERSION TABLE FOR FLUENCY, FLEXIBILITY, ORIGINALITY AND ELABORATION FOR SELECTED FIGURAL (NON-VERBAL) MEASURES IN BOOKLET B TAKEN FROM THE TORRANCE TESTS OF CREATIVE THINKING. CONVERSIONS ARE BASED ON THIRD TO SIXTH GRADE DATA USING AN AUSTRALIAN SAMPLE (n=370)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T-Score</th>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>Fluency</th>
<th>Flexibility</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Elaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 13

FREQUENCIES OF PUPIL RESPONSES TO PRETEST AND POSTTEST MEASURES
(a) VERBAL CREATIVITY: Frequency of pupil responses (n=370)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (%)</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency (%)</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (%)</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32-36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>32-36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-41</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>37.41</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42-46</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>42-46</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47-51</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>47-51</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52-56</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>52-56</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>86.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57-61</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>57-61</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>88.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-66</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>62-66</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67-71</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>67-71</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>98.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72-76</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>72-76</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>99.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77-81</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>77-81</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>99.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>82-86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 370  S.E. = 0.50  Mode = 43.00  
\[ \bar{X} = 50.10 \]  Median = 48.11  \( \sigma = 9.67 \)  \( \sigma^2 = 93.56 \)  

N = 370  S.E. = 0.48  Mode = 49.00  
\[ \bar{X} = 50.13 \]  Median = 48.97  \( \sigma = 9.33 \)  \( \sigma^2 = 87.11 \)
(b) FIGURAL CREATIVITY: Frequency of pupil responses (n=370)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (%)</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34-37</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38-41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42-45</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-49</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>55.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-53</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54-57</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>82.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58-61</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-65</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>95.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-69</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>98.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-73</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>98.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74-77</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>99.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (%)</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26-29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38-41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42-45</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-49</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-53</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54-57</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>81.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58-61</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>91.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-65</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>95.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-69</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>98.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-73</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>99.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74-77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>99.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82-85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>99.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-89</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 370  S.E. = 0.42  Mode = 45.00  N = 370  S.E. = 0.44  Mode = 48.00
\[ \bar{X} = 49.83 \quad \text{Median} = 48.40 \quad \sigma = 8.17 \quad \bar{X} = 49.96 \quad \text{Median} = 49.25 \quad \sigma = 8.47 \]
\[ \sigma^2 = 66.85 \quad \sigma^2 = 71.79 \]
(c) EMPATHY: Frequency of pupil responses (n=370)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
<th>Pretest Absolute Frequency (%)</th>
<th>Pretest Cumulative Frequency (%)</th>
<th>Posttest Absolute Frequency (%)</th>
<th>Posttest Cumulative Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-14</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 370
\( \bar{X} = 17.01 \)
\( \text{Median} = 17.55 \)
\( \sigma^2 = 12.50 \)
\( \chi^2 = 13.76 \)
\( s.e. = 0.19 \)
\( N = 370 \)
\( s.e. = 0.18 \)
\( \text{Mode} = 18.00 \)
\( \sigma = 3.53 \)

C2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (%)</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency (%)</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (%)</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-14</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>13-14</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>87.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>96.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>23-24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 370  S.E. = 0.21  Mode = 18.00  
\( \bar{x} = 15.20 \)  Median = 15.58  \( \sigma = 4.21 \)  \( \sigma^2 = 17.76 \)

N = 370  S.E. = 0.23  Mode = 16.00  
\( \bar{x} = 15.27 \)  Median = 15.81  \( \sigma = 4.46 \)  \( \sigma^2 = 19.94 \)
(e) ACADEMIC SELF-IMAGE: Frequency of pupil responses (n=370)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Pretest Frequency (%)</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- 4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- 6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- 8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-14</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>81.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Posttest Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- 4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- 6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- 8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-14</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 370  S.E. = 0.18  Mode = 12.00  
\( \bar{x} = 11.17 \)  Median = 11.15  \( \sigma = 3.54 \)  \( \sigma^2 = 12.55 \)

N = 370  S.E. = 0.19  Mode = 9.00  
\( \bar{x} = 11.28 \)  Median = 11.38  \( \sigma = 3.68 \)  \( \sigma^2 = 13.55 \)
APPENDIX 14

DESCRIPTORS OF THE SAMPLE OF TEACHERS AND PUPILS
1. DESCRIPTORS OF THE OUTER SAMPLE OF TEACHERS (n=235)

The following tables show the frequency distribution of the sample according to sex, age, length of teaching experience, length of teacher training, type of teacher training, grade/class of pupils taught, actual drama choice, ideal drama choice, size of school and type of catchment area of school, given below.

(a) Sex of teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of teacher</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Age of teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age range - years</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46+</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(c) Length of teaching experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length in Years</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- 5</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(d) Length of teacher training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length in Years</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>52.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(e) Type of teacher training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infant</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant-Primary</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(f) Grade/class of pupils taught

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade/Class</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Primary (5-8 year old pupils)</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Primary (9-10 year old pupils)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Primary (10-11 year old pupils)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(g) Actual drama choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual drama choice</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role playing</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mime</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama games</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dramatic play</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(h) Ideal drama choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideal drama choice</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role playing</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mime</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama games</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dramatic play</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(i) Size of school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of school</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large (501 or more pupils)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (181 to 500 pupils)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small (1 to 180 pupils)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>235</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(j) Type of school catchment area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catchment area</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>235</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. DESCRIPTORS OF THE INNER SAMPLE OF TEACHERS (n=16)

The tables which follow show the frequency distribution of the inner sample of teachers in respect of sex, age, length of teaching experience, length of teacher training, type of teacher training, grade/class of pupils taught, actual drama choice, ideal drama choice, size of school and type of catchment area of school, given below.

(a) Sex of teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of teacher</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Age of teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age range in years</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(c) Length of teaching experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length in years</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- 5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(d) Length of teacher training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length in Years</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(e) Type of teacher training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(f) Grade/class of pupils taught

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade/Class</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle Primary (Grades 3 and 4)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Primary (Grades 5 and 6)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(g) Actual drama choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual drama choice</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dramatic play</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(h) Ideal drama choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideal drama choice</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role playing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama games</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dramatic play</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(i) Size of school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of school</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>501 or more pupils</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181 to 500 pupils</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 180 pupils</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(j) Type of school catchment area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catchment area</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. DESCRIPTORS OF PUPILS (n=370) OF THE INNER SAMPLE OF TEACHERS

The tables which follow present the frequency distributions of pupils in respect of age, sex, grade/class and drama experience.

(a) Age of pupil

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age range in years</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8–9</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (1 month)-10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (1 month)-11</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 (1 month)-12</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 (1 month) or more</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Sex of pupil

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of pupil</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(c) Grade of pupil

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade/class</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>370</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(d) Drama experienced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drama experienced</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dramatic play</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama exercise</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>370</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 15

DRAMA SUPPLEMENTARY SHEET
Individual ............ Grade ..............

1. What type(s) of drama have you had time to do this year?
   Please tick one or more of the following:
   Child invented plays/improvisation with an audience ( )
   Child invented plays/improvisation without an audience ( )
   Drama games ( )
   Role play ( )
   Mime ( )
   Plays in front of an audience - assemblies - productions ( )
   Theatre skills ( )
   No time at all ( )
   Other ( )

2. How many sessions of drama have you had time to do
   i. between the distributions of Booklets A and B? ............
   ii. this term? ............
   iii. this year? ............

3. How important is an audience (of any kind) to your work in drama?
   It is important because ...........................................
   It is not important because ......................................

4. What approximate percentage of your drama sessions are shared with an audience? Please underline one:
   0%  10%  20%  30%  40%  50%  60%  70%  80%  90%  100%

5. a. Are you having an end of year concert? ............
   b. Will it include drama items? ............
   c. Will your class be participating in the drama items? ............

6. What value(s) do you place on end of year productions (if any)
   ........................................................................

7. What criteria do you use for selecting participants in end of year productions re:
   actors (main parts) ..................................................
   actors (minor) ......................................................
   non-actor helpers (lighting etc) ..................................
   others (please specify) .........................................
   No end of year production ............ I do not choose .......
8. What approximate percentage of your class would be chosen to take part in an end of year production as:

- actors (main parts) ..............................................
- actors (minor) ....................................................
- helpers (non-actors) .......................................... 
- non-participants ................................................
- Total = ............................................................
- No production/concert drama ..............................

9. How effective do you think drama is in promoting the following:
   Please comment.
   self-esteem ....................................................
   empathy .........................................................
   creativity ......................................................
   academic self-esteem ........................................
   reasoning skills ..............................................
   moral judgement .............................................
   problem-solving ability ....................................
   Other (please specify) ......................................
   ........................................................................

10. To what extent do you employ streaming practices in your classroom?
    Please indicate one of the following: I stream for -
    all lesson subjects (  )
    about three-quarters (  )
    about half (  )
    about one quarter (  )
    less than one quarter (  )
    no streaming at all (  )

MANY THANKS FOR COMPLETING THIS DRAMA-EDUCATION SHEET
APPENDIX 16

PUPILS' GAINS AND LOSSES ON SELF-ESTEEM
### PUPILS' GAINS AND LOSSES ON A PRETEST-POSTTEST MEASURE OF SELF-ESTEEM

(n=370)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>n of Pupils</th>
<th>TIME A M s</th>
<th>TIME B M s</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16.55 3.82</td>
<td>16.66 4.15</td>
<td>+0.11</td>
<td>.762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15.70 4.03</td>
<td>15.53 4.21</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>.646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13.91 4.93</td>
<td>14.70 5.65</td>
<td>+0.79</td>
<td>.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.88 5.33</td>
<td>15.19 5.30</td>
<td>+0.31</td>
<td>.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15.90 3.81</td>
<td>16.16 4.31</td>
<td>+0.26</td>
<td>.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.16 3.94</td>
<td>13.94 4.03</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.07 2.46</td>
<td>15.71 3.97</td>
<td>+0.64</td>
<td>.342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14.21 4.32</td>
<td>13.39 4.55</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15.08 2.98</td>
<td>15.52 3.75</td>
<td>+0.44</td>
<td>.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14.13 4.90</td>
<td>14.30 4.94</td>
<td>+0.17</td>
<td>.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17.18 3.37</td>
<td>16.09 3.43</td>
<td>-0.99</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15.33 4.69</td>
<td>14.80 4.71</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14.54 4.55</td>
<td>15.04 4.34</td>
<td>+0.50</td>
<td>.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14.90 4.56</td>
<td>15.03 4.51</td>
<td>+0.13</td>
<td>.759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.00 4.57</td>
<td>16.25 4.59</td>
<td>+0.25</td>
<td>.652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.25 3.11</td>
<td>15.85 4.25</td>
<td>+0.60</td>
<td>.163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total   | 370         | 15.20 4.21 | 15.27 4.46 | +0.07 | .456|

- = greatest loss

**N.B.** There were no significant gains.
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CHAPTER SEVEN

FEDERAL FUNDING AND THE STATE AID CONUNDRUM

1966 – 1975
The decision of the Menzies government to give direct assistance to non-government as well as government schools provided Federation with a new political problem. How could Federation continue to campaign for increased federal funds for public education and yet maintain its opposition to State Aid? The purpose of this chapter is to examine how the Federation sought to overcome that contradiction in the period from 1966 to 1972. In particular the attitude of Federation to the federal coalition government will be compared with the unions' attitude to the federal Labor government in office from 1972 to 1975.

Avoiding the Charge of Sectarianism

In October 1967, the federal Minister for the Interior, Peter Nixon, decided to accommodate children and two teachers from a Woden Valley (A.C.T.) Catholic school in a local public school. This meant that two separately administered primary schools would operate on the one site, with government school teachers working alongside Catholic school teachers, without the latter having any formal responsibility to the Principal or staff of the government school. This constituted a direct threat to the working conditions of Federation members. How then could the union counter this threat without being accused of opposing the proposal on sectarian grounds?

Sam Lewis reminded the Minister that government schools provided education for all children 'irrespective of class or creed'. If Catholic children were to be accommodated in a public school they should be under the control of the authority of that school. 'Either, children...receive a denominational education in a denominational school, or they attend a public school and
participate in a non-denominational, non-sectarian education'.\(^{(1)}\) The Australian Capital Territory Teachers Association expressed similar views and voted not to work with non-union members.\(^{(2)}\)

After some controversy, the Minister decided not to proceed with the proposal. This provoked a particularly vitriolic editorial in the *Canberra Times*. It chided the Minister for buckling under the pressure from the teachers. They, in turn, were accused of keeping 'the old sectarian fires a-burning when elsewhere they...\((3)\) (were) dying down'. Such sentiments were greatly feared by the Federation leadership. The Canberra teachers in particular, found themselves in the firing line of one of the national capital's moulders of public opinion.

Meeting two days after the *Canberra Times* editorial, Federation Council endorsed the actions of Lewis and the Canberra teachers. The Council resolution nevertheless concluded on a defensive note. The question was essentially a practical one of 'dual control on one campus of children attending on the one hand, a private school, and on the other hand, public schools ...'. It was not a religious matter, nor was it primarily a question of opposition to State Aid.\(^{(4)}\)

---


\(^{(3)}\) *Canberra Times*, 15 November 1967.

This incident is instructive for an analysis of Federation's tactical manoeuverings on the question. Both Lewis and the Canberra teachers saw the matter as primarily one of defending the non-sectarian and non-class nature of public schools. When the cry of sectarianism was raised, however, it was politically safer for Federation Council to retreat to more practical considerations.

There was another option for Federation. It could have turned the argument against those who cried sectarian. It could have emphasised Lewis' argument that if people wanted separate class-based or sectarian education, they were the ones who were promoting division, not the union. Federation could have presented itself as the defender of commonality, rather than as an apologist of division. But this was, indeed, a harder option. To accuse the proponents of State Aid of divisiveness was less likely to have the immediate political impact of the more pressing, less philosophical, more obvious, instrumental considerations. Moreover, by 1967, the political tide was running in favour of State Aid. It was post-Goulburn, it was after Menzies' breakthrough, it was the period of Whitlam's sustained advocacy of State Aid within the Labor Party.

The issue was not, moreover, the first priority of the union during 1967 and 1968. The rapid growth of enrolments, the accommodation lag, class sizes and the lack of relief staff were the immediate and concrete preoccupations of teachers. The impact of State Aid was real enough, but not so obvious to teachers, however much many of them might oppose it.
In this connection, it is interesting to note the electoral statements of the candidates in the 1967 senior officers' election. Neither Whalan, Mattick or Frederick, nor the Federation Reform Committee candidates Kelly, Salter or Stapleton, nor the 'non-aligned' candidates Whitton or Stanton made any reference to the question.\(^5\) There was no doubt that Whalan, Mattick and Frederick supported Federation's State Aid policy. On the other hand, the 'Reform' candidates probably did not support the policy. The failure of all candidates to mention the issue suggests, perhaps, that the issue was hardly foremost in the minds of Federation activists. Even Lewis in his final presidential message in \textit{Education}, did not mention the question as one of the unresolved problems to be faced by Federation in the coming years.\(^6\) This is not to suggest that the Federation leadership had gone soft on the issue. When opportunities arose, the policy was advanced, although in instrumental, rather than ideological terms.

In October 1968, Federation held the first strike in its history. The numerous inadequacies of the N.S.W government's performance in education were listed by Federation. State Aid was not among them. The list of grievances was designed to maximise the unity of the membership. Presumably listing the N.S.W. government's State Aid measures would not have assisted that process.

\(^5\) \textit{Education}, 18 October 1967, pp.140-142.
\(^6\) \textit{ibid.}, 29 November 1967, p.162.
On the eve of the strike, the *Australian*, ran a profile of Lewis' successor as President, Jack Whalan. It revealed that although he was 'a devout Roman Catholic, he was nevertheless a strong opponent of State Aid'. Whalan was quoted as saying that 'the state should provide aid to other school systems only after it has provided for all children in government schools'. Given the parlous state of public schools, State Aid, then would be a long time coming. Whalan's statement was hardly a ringing affirmation that schools organised along class and sectarian lines should not receive public funds under any circumstances. Such practical objections were, it seems, less likely to undermine unity than an uncompromising reaffirmation of principle.

By 1968 the instrumental objections to State Aid seemed, however, to be having some impact. The *Herald* called for funds to be allocated to both government and non-government schools in a 'purposeful', 'planned' and 'rational' manner. The *Catholic Weekly* called on all political parties to recognise that there was a crisis in all sectors of schooling. The *Herald*, however, doubted that this would happen while politicians believed that the first and last test of an aid measure was 'its vote-getting power'. What indeed would be the Federation's response if a 'rational' method of allocating funds was found? In the meantime how could it avoid the charge of sectarianism, maintain the unity

(7) *Australian*, 28 September 1968.
of its members and attract wider support for its traditional opposition to State Aid? These objectives were to be achieved by adopting the tactic of 'Government Schools First.'

1969: Government Schools First

1969 was a most significant year in the continuing State Aid debate. In 1968, the federal government had extended the 1963 science block initiative to the construction of school libraries in both government and non-government schools.\(^{(11)}\) More significantly however, in 1969 the federal government began to make direct per capita grants to non-government schools without government schools enjoying the same benefit.\(^{(12)}\) The State Aid argument, moreover, was largely settled within the Australian Labor Party with the adoption of a policy of recurrent funding to all schools on the basis of 'need'.\(^{(13)}\) With the political tide running in favour of State Aid, teachers' and parents' organisations adopted a 'Government Schools First' tactical position. The pro-State Aid lobby fought the issue with the anti-State Aid forces in a series of public meetings. The Council for the Defence of Government Schools was formed in New South Wales and one of its first actions was its significant intervention in the 1969 federal election. State Aid was an issue in a way it had not been in 1967 and 1968. This provided Federation with an opportunity to renew its campaign for federal funding of public education.

\(^{(11)}\) Don Smart, Federal Aid to Australian Schools, University of Queensland Press, St. Lucia, 1978, pp.97-98.

\(^{(12)}\) Ibid., pp.98-100.

The pro-State Aid forces, led by various Catholic Parents' and Friends' organisations and local clergy, organised a series of well-attended public meetings between September 1968 and March 1969. Leading politicians attended these meetings. The campaign culminated with an overflow meeting at Sydney Town Hall in May 1969 with 5,000 people in attendance. The Catholic Weekly warned that the public meetings were evidence that the hostility of Catholic parents could be translated into 'positive' action at the ballot box. The spectre of the 'Catholic vote', whether myth or reality, was to loom large in the calculations of leading politicians.

Indeed at one meeting, Gough Whitlam promised that a Labor government would establish a Schools Commission which would examine the needs of all schools. In the interim, a Labor government would provide an emergency grant of $50 million to schools; at least half to non-government schools. While this was not official A.L.P. policy, by going public, Whitlam disarmed the lingering opposition within the Party. By June 1969, it was, indeed, Party policy.

(14) Meetings took place at Lewisham (700 people), September 1968; St. Mary's (600), October 1968; Miranda (900), February 1969; Lane Cove, (1,200) March 1969. See Catholic Weekly, 3 April 1969, S.M.H., 4 June 1969. See also Bert Castelleris' article on the campaign, S.M.H., 9 August 1969.


The policy offered a 'rational' method of allocation of resources to all schools based on 'need'. It promised the end to the State Aid auction. It met the demands of both the State Aid lobby and the longstanding demand of the teachers' unions and their allies for federal funding of public schools. Indeed the Melbourne Age predicted that the policy 'would make Commonwealth aid to schools permanent and non-political. It would stop the electoral auction and revive education'.(18) Federation had frequently criticised governments for using the State Aid promise as little more than a political auction. Government schools would receive funds, but State Aid would be legitimised. Was that really a victory of Federation and its allies?

The union's immediate task, however, was to attempt to counter the mass meeting campaign of the Catholic lobby. Its task was not as simple as that of its opponents. The latter was largely a single issue pressure group. The Federation had a much wider responsibility of improving public schools and enhancing the working conditions of its members. Moreover, it had to press both state and federal governments for additional funds for public schools while at the same time attempting to stem the tide of State Aid. These various claims on its resources had to be met while avoiding charges of sectarianism and maintaining unity within the union. In these circumstances, the 'Government Schools First' slogan was an appropriate response to the State Aid lobby.

Federation and the two parents' organisations organised a series of suburban meetings.\(^{(19)}\) The culmination of the campaign was a widely reported meeting of 4,000 people at Sydney Town Hall on 10 August 1969.\(^{(20)}\) The principal speaker for the Federation at the main meeting was acting President, Elizabeth Mattick. She devoted the first half of her speech to the political and financial aspects of State Aid. The second half of the speech, however, was a forceful enunciation of the fundamentals of Federation's opposition to State Aid.\(^{(21)}\) She invoked Freeman Butt's\(^{(22)}\) prediction that State Aid would 'create or perpetuate stratified divisions in a culture...along economic, social class or racial lines'.\(^{(23)}\)

This speech epitomised the ambivalence of Federation's position. Elizabeth Mattick may have preferred to emphasise the liberal-secular basis of Federation's opposition to State Aid, but more immediate political impact was to be made by also paying considerable attention to the practical consequences of State Aid for public schools.

\(^{(19)}\) Meetings were held at North Sydney (1,200 present), Randwick (350), Eastwood (700), Hurstville, Parramatta (700) and St Marys (200). See Education, 21 May 1969, p.80; 4 June 1969, p.92; 2 July 1969, p.120; 10 September 1969, p.152; Parent and Citizen, September 1969, pp.7-8. It is interesting to note that the initiative for the meetings came from the parents' organisations, not the Federation. See N.S.W.T.F., Annual Report 1969, p.31.


\(^{(23)}\) Transcript, op.cit., p.4.
It was not, however, Elizabeth Mattick's speech which excited the greatest response. The exchanges between leading politicians, Tom Hughes and Gough Whitlam with the audience, attracted greater attention from the press. Amidst much heckling, Hughes accused the audience of being 'sectarian'. Whitlam made a similar charge when his claim that 'aid to Catholic schools' was 'an indispensable ingredient' of a proper program of federal aid to schools, was greeted with hostility by some sections of the audience. He told one persistent interjector to 'go back to Belfast'. While these meetings illustrated that the State Aid matter was not a settled issue, they also illustrated that the charge of sectarianism, so feared by Federation, could be readily made. The Sydney Sun said that the meeting had been characterised 'by arrogance and bigotry'. The Daily Mirror and the Sydney Morning Herald, accused the anti-State Aiders of missing the essential point. The crisis in all schools had to be addressed, not just that of public or private schools.

These reactions presented Federation and its allies with some difficulty. The sectarian cry was always a difficult one to

(25) S.M.H., 11 August 1969. Whitlam had made this the theme of his various addresses to pro-State Aid meetings, e.g. his speech in Young, 29 June 1969, S.M.H. 30 June 1969.
(26) S.M.H., 11 August 1969.
(27) Sun, 11 August 1969.
(28) Daily Mirror, 11 August 1969, and S.M.H., 15 August 1969. The Herald leader was a response to a letter to the paper from Jane Gray, the great grand-daughter of Sir Henry Parkes, which supported the resolutions carried at the Town Hall meeting.
counter. For the most part, Federation had avoided this charge by emphasising the instrumental aspects of the question. The second argument about a crisis in all schools was less easy to counter. The response was the 'Government Schools First' tactic. State Aid could not be countenanced until all the needs of government schools were met. The difficulty with that argument was that it conceded some theoretical case for State Aid. Secondly, it invited Whitlam's 'needs' response: funds could be allocated to both sectors without apparent 'injustice' to public schools. If this view was to prevail, and it was far from accepted in 1969, the instrumental objections to State Aid could be neutralised. In that case, Federation would either have to accept a compromise based on the concept of need or go back to first principles. In 1969, neither Federation nor its allies had to make that choice.


The formation of a branch of the Council for the Defence of Government Schools (D.O.G.S.) in N.S.W. in 1969, indicated some concern about the ability of the Federation and the parent organisations to lead and sustain a campaign against State Aid. By their very nature, the three organisations could not be single issue pressure groups. Their memberships were large and diverse, their interests and campaigns were many. Even if opposition to State Aid had been the first priority of the organisations, none of them could have concentrated on the issue.

The Catholic lobby was a single issue lobby able to agitate on a broad front. Its challenge called for a single issue anti-State Aid pressure group. A discussion of the Federation's relationship with D.O.G.S. will illustrate the difficulties the union faced in maintaining its opposition to State Aid.

D.O.G.S.' first major public activity was to endorse candidates for the House of Representatives in the 1969 federal election. For the most part, its candidates were impeccably middle-class and liberal humanist in approach. They could not be dismissed as radicals or industrial militants.

On 22 August 1969, Federation Council decided to urge members to support D.O.G.S. candidates in the election. It defeated a proposition to support all candidates opposing State Aid. It also rejected a proposal on the feasibility of running anti-State Aid candidates for the Senate. Ivor Lancaster announced this decision at a press conference held after a federal funding motorcade to Canberra a few days later.

Nevertheless, the Federation did not mobilise the membership to support D.O.G.S. candidates. The usual federal election activities were held. Candidates' meetings, however, were not primarily organised to publicise the policies of D.O.G.S.


(31) Council, Minutes, 22 August 1969, p.156.

candidates. In Benelong, for instance, the policy of the D.O.G.S. candidate, Alan Horton, received no more prominence than the views of other candidates. (33)

Moreover, Federation did not feature State Aid in its major media campaign that year. Since early 1969, Federation had run a series of commercials featuring a number of individual young children. They symbolised the great mass of children denied quality education because of the inadequacy of funding from state and federal sources. (34) This approach was sustained during the federal election. It could hardly be characterised as an all out attempt to secure support for anti-State Aid candidates.

Federation did not, however, retreat from the issue entirely in 1969. The Canberra motorcade, the 'Government Schools First' campaign and Federation's participation in the National Education Conference in Adelaide in June 1969, (35) indicated that the funding issue played a significant role in Federation affairs. Moreover, education in general, and State Aid in particular, were significant issues in the 1969 federal election, but it was hardly because Federation mobilised its considerable resources in support of the only group of candidates pledged to

---

(33) Education, 24 September 1969, p.168. Meetings were held at Lane Cove, Liverpool, Tamworth, Leichhardt, Blacktown, Randwick and Griffith.

(34) Outline of campaign in ibid. Advertisements were taken out in the S.M.H., Parramatta Advertiser, Illawarra Mercury and Newcastle Morning Herald. See N.S.W.T.F., Annual Report 1969, p.15.

end State Aid. On the other hand, an attempt to modify Federation policy on State Aid was easily defeated at the 1969 Annual Conference.\(^{36}\)

In 1969 Federation affiliated with D.O.G.S. Unlike the proposal to affiliate with A.I.C.D., this decision was taken without great controversy. The communist can could not be kicked about D.O.G.S., in the way it had been about A.I.C.D. By 1970 the Federation Reform Committee was a spent force. The dissidents within the union were to be found on the Left of the leadership. They had no argument with affiliation to D.O.G.S.

Encouraged by a 7.5 per cent vote in the Georges River by-election for the Legislative Assembly in 1970,\(^{37}\) D.O.G.S. decided to run candidates in the 1971 N.S.W. state election.\(^{38}\) Federation's priority in this election was not, however, State Aid. The first issue of *Education* in 1971 surveyed the parties' policies.\(^{39}\) While it was conceded that the Labor Party's State Aid policy was as undesirable as that of the state government, the A.L.P. had promised to establish an Education Commission. The Liberal Country Party government had failed to honour its 1965 election promise to establish a Commission. This had produced a deep bitterness within the Federation. The 1969

---

\(^{36}\) Annual Conference 1969, Transcript, pp.33-40. The motion proposed that all private school teachers be invited to join Federation and that all teachers be employed by the state.


\(^{39}\) *Education*, 3 February 1971, p.2.
Annual Conference called on teachers to vote against the government. Jack Whalan reminded members of this decision.\(^{(40)}\) It was clear that Labor's promise of an Education Commission, with a continuation of State Aid, was preferable to its continuation without a Commission.

Education's survey of the election policies made no mention of D.O.G.S.'s election policy. Stella Bath, a teacher and a D.O.G.S. activist, wrote to Federation asking why the union had failed to co-operate actively with the one community organisation which was working 'wholeheartedly' in the interests of public schools in N.S.W.\(^{(41)}\) Lancaster replied to Bath indicating that the decision to call an early election had necessitated a hurried re-vamping of Education and further, Federation had no record of a request for assistance from D.O.G.S.\(^{(42)}\) Bath accepted Lancaster's explanation, but expressed concern that Federation had given such prominence to the education policies of the major parties, all of which contravened Federation policy, but had not sought any statement from D.O.G.S. whose education policy was the same as that of Federation.\(^{(43)}\)

\(^{(40)}\) ibid.

\(^{(41)}\) S.A. Bath to Doug Broadfoot, 18 February 1971, Government Assistance to Non-Government Schools files, N.S.W.T.F. archives. Her letter was subsequently published in Education, 31 March 1971, p.46.


\(^{(43)}\) S.A. Bath to I.G. Lancaster, 14 March 1971, Government Assistance to Non-Government Schools files, N.S.W.T.F. archives. Federation had received a D.O.G.S. request for assistance in October 1970. It was not, however, dealt with by the Executive until after the election. See K. Taylor (Secretary, D.O.G.S.), circular to D.O.G.S. members, 14 October 1970, in Government Assistance to Non-Government Schools files, N.S.W.T.F. archives.
While it is not suggested Federation was hostile to D.O.G.S., this episode illustrates that fighting State Aid via active support for D.O.G.S., was not a high priority of the union. For Federation, the key issue in the 1971 election was that venerable question of an Education Commission. The achievement of a Commission was a more immediate and perhaps more obtainable goal than endeavouring to stem the tide of State Aid.

Just as Federation all but opted for Labor in the 1971 state election, the union was also being drawn towards making a choice between the parties at the federal level. Indeed, in that context, there was, perhaps, greater opportunity to intervene in the arguments about State Aid than at the state level.

The State Aid issue was not, however, a settled political question. While public opinion polls continued to show majority support for some measure of State Aid, they also indicated a sizable minority of 30 per cent absolutely opposed to it. The activities of D.O.G.S. and the teachers' and parents' organisations indicated that there was a resourceful and well organised anti-State Aid lobby. Whitlam attended nearly all the State Aid and 'Government Schools First' rallies in 1969, advocating Labor's 'needs' policies. On the other hand successive federal Education Ministers, Nigel Bowen, David Fairbairn and Malcolm Fraser, preached the virtues of direct per capita recurrent funding of non-government schools.

Indeed, by 1970, there began to be some doubt that State Aid was quite the vote-catcher that Menzies had envisaged. The D.O.G.S. vote in the Georges River by-election in 1970, was 7.5 per cent, compared with only 4 per cent garnered by the

---

(44) Canberra Times, 16 August 1971, (Fairbairn); Canberra Times, 26 October 1971, (Bowen).
There was even some disquiet among backbench Liberals about the methods used by the federal government in allocating funds to private schools. The Member for Diamond Valley, Neil Brown, led a sustained Party room attack on the mode of allocation.\(^{(46)}\)

In the latter part of 1971 and during the lead up to the federal election, Whitlam and Fraser fought out the merits and de-merits of their respective party's education policies. Whitlam mobilised the language of social equity and equality, popularised by such writers as Tom Roper and Henry Schoenheimer, in defence of the 'needs' policy.\(^{(47)}\) He argued strongly that governments and the public generally should stop talking about government schools, Catholic schools, Protestant schools and the like. The real differences were the varying levels of resources. It was a question of achieving a greater measure of equality among schools, he maintained.\(^{(48)}\)

\(^{(45)}\) *Australian*, 21 September 1970.

\(^{(46)}\) *Bulletin*, 31 October 1970. See also Peter Freeman, 'State Aid - reports of its death as a contentious issue are exaggerated', *Financial Review*, 12 February 1971.


Malcolm Fraser, on the other hand, argued that a 'needs' policy for recurrent funding would not work. Schools with poor pupil-teacher ratios would have little incentive to improve the ratio if it meant that the school would receive less funding from government sources. Prime Minister William McMahon said that the 'needs' policy would penalise dedicated parents. The harder they worked to provide funds for their children's schooling, the less money they would receive from a Labor government.

Whatever the deficiencies in detail of the 'needs' policy, it was a brilliant piece of politics in a context where education was consistently identified as the principal election issue in opinion polls taken in 1972. It promised to eliminate, or at least to lessen considerably, the controversy over State Aid. It was to be the 'great settlement' of the issue. It was designed to satisfy most of the pro-State Aid


(50) S.M.H., 2 May 1972.

(51) ibid., 22 June, 4 July, 30 October, 15 November 1972. Sun-Herald, 29 October 1972. Daily Telegraph, 10 August 1972. This was reflected in debates in Federal Parliament. From February to May 1971, there were 163 questions and 264 references to education in the Hansard index for the House of Representatives. 26 petitions on education were presented in the same period. By comparison the two sessions in 1965 saw only one petition presented and less than half the number of questions asked. C.P.D. House of Representatives, 16 March to 26 May, 17 August to 10 December 1965, and 16 February to 6 May 1971. See also R.T. Fitzgerald, 'Emerging Issues in the Seventies', Quarterly Review of Australian Education, Vol. 5, No. 3, September 1972, p.14.

lobby and disarm much of the vocal opposition to State Aid through the provision of direct recurrent funding to government schools.

How then was the Federation to take advantage of this situation?

During 1972 Federation was preoccupied with the attempt by the Public Service Board, supported by the N.S.W. government, to deregister the Federation as a trade union. As the federal election approached, however, the union began to show some interest in the federal funding issue. Education published two articles which advocated a Federation campaign against the federal government's education policies which, it was argued, favoured wealthy private schools. (53) This argument had been used frequently by opponents of State Aid, but it was not an argument which opposed State Aid per se and, more significantly, it was consistent with support for Labor's 'needs' policy. While this position was not formally adopted by the union, it was indicative of the thinking of many Federationists, particularly those committed to the election of a Labor government.

Federation, however, opted to conduct the usual candidates' meetings during October 1972. A number of suburban meetings were held, culminating in a major meeting at Sydney Town Hall on 22 October at which Whitlam and Liberal Senator John Carrick, were the main speakers. Education commented ruefully that all that really emerged from that meeting was that Whitlam and Carrick were 'unrepentant' State-Aiders. (54)

---

(53) Education, 13 September, p.192 and 8 November 1970, p.60. The author was David Koffel, secretary of the St. George Teachers' Association.

(54) ibid., 8 November 1972, p.266.
Nevertheless, Federation gave considerable support to the Australian Teachers' Federation $90,000 election campaign. As well as the usual activities, the A.T.F. and N.S.W.T.F. ran two television commercials featuring A.C.T.U. President Bob Hawke, talking about educational issues. At its Annual Conference in January, A.T.F. had decided against advocating a vote for the A.L.P., but the use of Hawke hardly gave the appearance of a non-partisan stance by the national teachers' body. To the casual observer, it seemed that the teachers' organisations were giving the nod to Labor. The promise of significant general purpose funds for government schools, albeit at the cost of further entrenching State Aid, made the Labor education policy a more attractive proposition than the continuation of the government's education policies.

D.O.G.S. also ran candidates in the federal election, but without any organisational support from Federation. Indeed, former prominent Federationist, Colette Tucker, was D.O.G.S.'s candidate in Phillip. While she received support from individual Federation members, the union was not involved in her campaign. In June 1972, however, Federation Council had decided to support financially a D.O.G.S.-organised challenge in

the High Court to the constitutional validity of federal government assistance to religious schools.\(^{(60)}\)

This decision, however, had set off a rather lively correspondence in *Education*.\(^{(61)}\) A decision to support D.O.G.S. in the election, therefore, would have been even more controversial. Moreover, such a decision would not have been compatible with participation by N.S.W.T.F. in the A.T.F. campaign.

While it could not be said that Federation gave any support to the federal government's education policy, it drew short of making an unequivocal commitment to Labor. The ambivalence of the Federation's position can be seen in *Education's* pre-election editorial. If the coalition was returned, it argued, public education would 'be in for a lean time'. If Labor was elected, education would probably be a top priority of the new government. Nevertheless, it should not be forgotten that Labor was also heavily committed to State Aid. Reservation was also expressed about the possible implications of Whitlam's proposed enquiry into educational needs. Rather reluctantly, the editorial concluded that

\(^{(60)}\) Council, Minutes, 25 August 1972, p.198. See also Lancaster to K. Taylor, (Secretary, D.O.G.S., N.S.W.), 30 August 1972, and J.R. Williams (Acting General Secretary) to S. Graves (Treasurer, D.O.G.S., Victoria), 13 October 1972, in Government Assistance to Non-Government Schools files, N.S.W.T.F. archives. Federation also urged members and its Associations to make financial contributions. Neil Pollock (Acting President) and J.R. Williams (Acting General Secretary), Circular to Association Secretaries and Federation Representatives, 5 September 1972. President Len Childs acted as a financial guarantor for the plaintiffs. The decision to support the challenge was, it seems, largely Childs' idea. Interview with Ivor Lancaster, 13 May 1983.

on balance...it is difficult to believe any Labor Government could produce a policy on education as lamentably inadequate in meeting the urgent needs of State education as the McMahon Government.(62)

This was hardly an enthusiastic endorsement of Labor'. In the final analysis, however, Labor's policies were preferred. In favouring Labor, Federation also preferred a needs policy as part of a consistent and more equitable approach compared with the piecemeal and less equitable approach of the coalition government. In the world of realpolitik such a choice could not be resisted easily. Did the election of the Labor Government and its establishment of an interim committee for the establishment of a Schools' Commission meant that Federation had accepted the logic of the needs policy and had, for all practical purposes, abandoned its historic opposition to State Aid?.

Consensus Politics 1972-1975

Federation was still pre-occupied with deregistration for much of 1973. Little was said about the federal funding issue until the release of the Report of the Interim Committee for the Schools Commission (the Karmel Report), in May 1973. Education, however, commented on the appointment of Kim Beazley as Minister for Education. It noted Beazley's record as a supporter of State Aid. There could be, it asserted, 'no doubt that under his

(62) ibid., 6 December 1972, p.286.
Ministry, the privileged will retain their perquisites and there is very little assurance that needy state schools will gain a fair hearing’. (63)

Some consideration of the political function of the Karmel Report is necessary in order to apprehend Federation's difficulties in responding to its recommendations. Whitlam was concerned that the Report be made by a body whose legitimacy could not be questioned by those who opposed Labor's 'needs' policy. He argued that the coalition government had sought to discredit the 1970 'Nationwide Survey of Educational Needs' which had been endorsed by the Australian Education Council. As this latter body consisted of State Ministers for Education and the survey itself had been conducted by the State Education Departments, it was not difficult to suggest that the 1970 survey reflected the 'vested interests' of the public education sector. The 'independence' of the Schools Commission was to guarantee the legitimacy of its recommendations. 'No Minister', said Whitlam, 'would dare abort its findings' in the way Malcolm Fraser had 'sought to abort the Nationwide Survey of 1970'. (64) An independent and unassailable report would legitimise State Aid through the rhetoric of social equity central to the allocation of funds on the basis of 'need'.


(64) See his address to the Catholic Luncheon Club, op. cit., p.7. See also his speech at Drummoyne during the 1972 election campaign. S.M.H. and Sun, 22 November 1972.
Labor policy stated that a Schools Commission should have regard to 'the primary obligation of the Government to provide and maintain government schools systems of the highest standard open to all children'.\(^{(65)}\) The terms of reference of the interim committee did not, however, contain such a provision.\(^{(66)}\) Moreover, the ten member interim committee did not contain any members who were identified with government school teachers' or parents' organisations. On the other hand, the committee included Father F.M. Martin, Director of Catholic Education in the Melbourne Archdiocese, P.D. Tannock, of the University of Western Australia, and Alice Whitely, a former non-government school principal, although these were 'balanced' by a number of members identified with the government school sector.\(^{(67)}\) When the A.T.F. and A.C.S.S.O. complained of this omission to Beazley,\(^{(68)}\) he replied that the members of the committee were government appointees, representative of a wide diversity of interests, but no individual member was representative of any particular interest.\(^{(69)}\)


\(^{(67)}\) Jean Blackburn, Greg Hancock, A.W. Jones and M.E. Thomas, *ibid.*, p.iii.

\(^{(68)}\) *S.M.H.*, 14 December 1972.

When the Report was released in May 1973, its discussion of 'equality of opportunity', its definition of 'needs', its commitment to educational diversity and community participation in education, and its commitment to significant general purpose grants to public schools, were largely overlooked amidst lively controversy about the recommendation that the wealthiest non-government schools would not receive Australian Government assistance after 1975. The controversy intensified when the interim committee released its lists of non-government schools classified into eight categories of 'need'. These lists revealed some glaring anomalies, with well-established schools in the higher funding categories and some 'poorer' schools in the lower funding categories. The non-Catholic, non-government schools, in particular, were enraged. The list was revised and re-issued with some of the anomalies removed. The endorsement of the Report by Ray Costello, President of A.T.F. was rather overshadowed by the controversy over the Category 'A' Schools.


(73) Australian, 1 August 1973.

(74) Mirror, 15 June 1973. See also letter from Costello, S.M.H., 5 September 1973. Category 'A' schools were to have recurrent funding phased out over a period of two years.
The Federation did not enter publicly into the controversy. It contented itself with welcoming the Report and emphasised that it envisaged a new financial deal to public schools. Len Childs in his 'President Writes' column called the Report 'encouraging'. The following issue of Education said the Report was a realisation of a thirty-year federal funding campaign and was thus 'a major breakthrough by Federation'. In its analysis of the Karmel Report, the journal made little reference to the funding recommendation for private schools. There was no public assent to the fact that the Report constituted a historic legitimation of State Aid after ten years of controversy. Indeed, such a reaction was hardly surprising. The funds to be made available for public schools realised a thirty-year campaign for federal funding. Ivor Lancaster, a central figure in that campaign, commenting in 1983, said that the Report represented all that Whitlam had promised the public education sector. Even Helen Palmer, long an advocate of secular education and a forceful opponent of State Aid, endorsed the general direction of the Report, while expressing some

(75) S.M.H., 13 June 1973.
(77) ibid., 4 July 1973, pp.165 and 175.
(79) Interview with Ivor Lancaster, 13 May 1983. Ray Cavenagh, commenting on an earlier draft of this chapter, said that he did not believe Federation understood all the implications of the Karmel Report - 'It was stunned by the amounts of money'.
reservation about its State Aid recommendations. The Federation, it seemed, had accepted the inevitability of State Aid in exchange for a significant federal commitment to the funding of government schools.

Nevertheless, the Federation did not withdraw its support for the High Court challenge, nor its affiliation with D.O.G.S. In mid-1973, however, the Federation was presented with an opportunity to publicise its historic opposition to State Aid. A by-election was to be held for the seat of Parramatta following the appointment of Liberal member, Nigel Bowen to the Federal Court. D.O.G.S. decided to field a candidate in order to indicate that, as far as it was concerned, the Karmel Report had not ended the State Aid argument. Its candidate was Federation publicity officer, Michael Hourihan, a resident of the electorate.

As editor of Education and publicity officer of the Federation, Hourihan, was a well known public figure. Hitherto, D.O.G.S. candidates had been respectable middle class, but largely unknown, citizens. Hourihan was also an officer of a union which had a reputation as an opponent of State Aid, a record of industrial militancy and a well-demonstrated capacity to organise an effective intervention into electoral campaigns on behalf of public education. The significance of Hourihan's candidacy was not lost on the metropolitan press.

---


(82) S.M.H., Australian, 22 August 1973. Both carried profiles of Hourihan. The Australian reported him as describing himself as a 'middle class anarchist'. 
Hourihan told the Parramatta electors that they would be able 'to register a protest against the neglect of State schools and against the flagrant filching of sectarian votes by the Labor and Liberal Parties'.(83) During the campaign, Henry Schoenheimer, in his column in the Australian, commented on the Karmel Report's recommendations. He remarked that 'Christ, Karmel and I, but presumably not the D.O.G.S., think that one helps the poor and the afflicted irrespective of creed or colour or class or classroom'.(84) Hourihan replied to the article. Funds for handicapped children, he said, should be provided 'for the whole community through government resources', not 'at the whim of private charity'.(85) If that was the case, Schoenheimer replied, perhaps O.O.G.S. could explain why children in non-government schools, 'whose education is handicapped by poverty, rather than physical or mental deficiency should not be helped to attain the same level of material provision as the child in the State school'.(86)

This exchange(87) illustrates the difficulty of campaigning against State Aid in the light of the Karmel Committee's legitimation of State Aid via the needs policy. By

---

(85) ibid., 10 September 1973.
(86) ibid., 18 September 1973.
(87) It should be noted that this exchange was a minor incident in the campaign. Most of the controversy centered on the Labor government's announcement that an airport was to be built adjacent to the Parramatta electorate.
running a candidate, D.O.G.S. was continuing its campaign against State Aid. Because its candidate was Hourihan, and because Federation was an affiliate of D.O.G.S., there would have been a reasonable expectation that the Federation was prepared to take a similar hard line publicly. Federation, however, neither formally endorsed Hourihan nor did it intervene in the by-election along the well-established lines of drawing the needs of education to the attention of the electors. Individual Federation members assisted Hourihan but the union was in no way formally involved in the campaign.

*Education* ran a short article on Hourihan's candidacy and its pre-election editorial urged a vote for D.O.G.S. or the Australia Party candidate. It expressed the hope that 'the voters grasp the opportunity to serve notice on Whitlam and Opposition Leader Snedden that public money should be spent on public schools'.

Otherwise there was silence.

If the Federation had endorsed Hourihan or actively intervened in the campaign, it would have left itself open to precisely the same charge that Schoenheimer had levelled against Hourihan, namely that he was opposed to funds being given to disadvantaged or handicapped students who attended non-government schools. That was, of course, the policy of the Federation, but in the context of the period, it was more difficult to advocate it publicly than it had been at any time since 1963. Government schools were to benefit considerably from federal funds. It was hardly a propitious time to launch an all out attack on the source

---


(89) *ibid.*, p.230.
of those funds. Hourihan was acting within Federation policy, but the union was in no position to mobilise support for him. The ambivalence of the union is revealed in the issue of the journal that carried the material on the election. It also carried a detailed article on the increased expenditure on education outlined in the federal budget, written by Research Officer, Ray Cavenagh, which made little reference to the State Aid issue.\(^{(90)}\)

When the legislation encompassing the Karmel Report's recommendations came before Parliament in September 1974, the Federation had to decide whether or not to campaign for it. The Liberal Country Party Opposition gave notice of a series of amendments which would have maintained, after 1975, funding to the wealthiest category of non-government schools. This would be achieved, by writing into legislation an official recognition of the prior right of parents to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children.\(^{(91)}\) This would have legitimised federal assistance being given to all schools.

Federation sent protest telegrams to the opposition parties when their proposed amendments became known. On 16 October, the union combined with representatives of A.T.F., A.C.S.S.O., the N.S.W. parents' organisations and the Australian Union of Students to lobby politicians to support the Labor

\(^{(90)}\) ibid., p.231.

government's Schools Commission Bill.\textsuperscript{(92)} Federation Executive subsequently resolved to organise 'the greatest possible protest' to the opposition parties 'at any moves to change the principles embodied in the Bill'. The Labor Party in turn, was urged to resist 'any changes that would alter those principles'.\textsuperscript{(93)} Subsequently, Federation Council declared that the Labor government had 'a clear mandate' to establish the Commission 'with the functions as outlined in the Bill'.\textsuperscript{(94)}

While the Opposition's amendments would have placed non-government schools in a stronger position than envisaged by the government's Bill, it was clear that the legislation was an historic legitimation of State Aid. The Federation and its allies had little choice but give public and enthusiastic support to the Labor government's initiative. To do otherwise would have endangered the whole legislation. The opposition parties had a majority in the Senate and could have effectively held up or amended the legislation. As it was, the measure only passed through the Senate when the Country Party broke ranks with the Liberals in exchange for a promise that the wealthiest category of non-government schools would continue to receive funds after 1975. While the principles underlying the legislation were preserved, a fundamental compromise had been made over the allocation of funds on the basis of need. The least 'needy' schools were to continue to receive funds.


\textsuperscript{(93)} Executive, Minutes, 23 October 1973, p.634.

\textsuperscript{(94)} Council, Minutes, 10 November 1973, p.307.
The new leadership of Eric Pearson, Col Rennie and Van Davy took particular interest in the activities of the Schools Commission in the early months of 1974. They saw the general purpose funds being directed to the states for education as the source of significant progress in such areas as improvement in class sizes. Indeed, the N.S.W. government was chided for not spending 'Karmel' money as quickly as it might. Van Davy took particular interest in the Schools Commission special programmes for the funding of educational innovations and of disadvantaged schools. Davy had taken an active part in raising these issues in the inner city area of Sydney, through the parent and teacher pressure group called the Inner City Alliance.

The Karmel Committee found that the most disadvantaged schools in Australia were in the inner city areas of Sydney and Melbourne. Its recommendations were of direct relevance to the activity of the Alliance. Moreover, the funding of educational innovations was, in part, directed at schools and their communities where it was perceived that curriculum changes would assist in the process of breaking down educational disadvantage. The formation of the Inner City Teachers'

---

(95) Education, 22 May 1974, pp.141-142.
(97) Schools in Australia..., pp.100-101.
Association (I.C.T.A.) in 1974,\(^{(98)}\) meant that a section of Federation was formally associated with the kinds of activities initiated by the Alliance and undertook its own campaigns designed to capitalise on the Karmel committee's concern with disadvantage and innovation.\(^{(99)}\) During 1974 Davy wrote about innovation\(^{(100)}\) and of the tardiness of the N.S.W. Education Department in indicating which schools would receive grants under the disadvantaged schools programme.\(^{(1)}\) Given all this, it is not surprising that Federation intervened in the double dissolution federal election of 1974. If Labor was defeated, the expectations of Federation for education funding would be in jeopardy.

Some time before the election was called, Pearson spoke of the Federation's well-established practice of examining the education policies of all political parties. The 'factual knowledge' gleaned from such a process, therefore 'could influence' individual Federation members when they were 'casting their votes'.\(^{(2)}\) When the election was called, however, both Pearson


\(^{(100)}\) 'Karmel, you and disadvantage', ibid., p.29.

\(^{(1)}\) 'Disadvantage: Good News and Bad', ibid., 27 February 1974, p.47.

and Rennie strongly advocated a vote for Labor. The Opposition should 'not be allowed to sabotage' the Karmel Report.

Federation allocated $40,000 to spend during the election, mainly in swinging seats. This included expenditure on a radio commercial which had the message; 'Education has taken a turn for the better since the Whitlam Government took office'. A television commercial informed viewers that 'the Snedden Opposition has clearly stated that, because of inflation, no additional money will be allocated to schools.' A newspaper advertisement concluded with the message 'Education has taken a turn for the better. Let's keep it that way.' In addition, Federation distributed 250,000 pamphlets outlining the parties' respective education policies.

A special effort was also made to convince Federation members that the return of a Labor government was in their interests. A special issue of Education was produced. It featured a statement which asserted that

the present Government has done more for State education in 16 months that the Opposition parties did in 23 years. It should be given a fair chance to carry out its policy, a policy which will, at long last, prevent education remaining a political football.

---

(3) ibid., 24 April 1974, pp.126-127.
(4) ibid., p.127.
(5) ibid., 22 May 1974, p.143.
(6) ibid.
(7) ibid., 24 April 1974, p.2.
This was followed by an outline of events leading to the double dissolution.\(^{(8)}\) There was also a plea from Col Rennie to sceptical members 'not to ignore the facts' about the Labor Government's education efforts, \(^{(9)}\) together with an article on the Karmel Report's initiatives in the funding of special education and an article by Max Taylor on the Kangan Report on the funding of technical and further education.\(^{(10)}\) Finally Davy, the most persistent and articulate advocate of the Karmel Report, told members that the needs policy was 'best'.

It is my earnest hope that old party allegiances will be dropped by all teachers - and a conscious vote cast for the greatest thing that has ever happened in Australian Education.\(^{(11)}\)

It is unlikely that Federation could have sensibly taken any other position in the election. The Labor government had made education its first priority in its first eighteen months in office. Education expenditure had been increased 92 per cent in its first budget.\(^{(12)}\) But to laud the government's education policy, to laud the needs policy and special programmes of the Schools Commission, had one inescapable consequence. It rendered irrelevant the Federation's traditional opposition to State Aid. Indeed a Federation member, Peter West, writing after the return of the government, noted that State Aid was 'here to stay'. The

\(^{(8)}\) ibid., p.3.
\(^{(9)}\) ibid., p.4.
\(^{(10)}\) ibid.
\(^{(11)}\) ibid.
\(^{(12)}\) Australian, 28 November 1973. This included expenditure on higher and technical education. The federal government assumed total financial responsibility for higher education.
election had marked the end of State Aid as a 'divisive issue'.(13) If indeed, that was the case, Federation had unavoidably contributed to the realisation of that state of affairs by its active endorsement of the Labor government in 1974.

Federation did not remain completely uncritical of the Labor government's efforts in education expenditure. When education cuts were proposed for the 1975 budget, Pearson, Rennie and Davy sought an interview with Beazley. If cuts were to be made, they argued, it should be in funds for non-government schools.(14) Federation was not, however, prepared to take the risk of demanding across-the-board cuts to all non-government schools. 'If there are to be cuts we say the wealthy private schools should bear them and not State schools'.(15)

A.T.F. launched a series of newspaper advertisements addressed specifically to Prime Minister Whitlam. One advertisement called on him to 'say something...on the education cuts'.(16) Whitlam's silence was contrasted with Beazley's statement that he wanted education programmes to be maintained.(17) It was 'not time' said another advertisement, '...to go back to the dark ages of Australian education.'(18) Another advertisement warned parents that 'your child's future' is in jeopardy', cut now - pay later...can we afford it?'.(19)

(15) ibid.
(16) Australian, 12 August 1975.
(17) S.M.H., 23 July 1975.
(18) Canberra Times, 14 August 1975.
(19) Australian, 14 August 1975.
These advertisements were the prelude to a one-hour nation-wide stoppage by teachers in protest against the cuts, which the A.T.F. Executive had called on its affiliates to organise for Thursday, 14 August.\(^{20}\)

This proposal caused some difficulty for the Federation. During 1975, there had already been a one-day strike on the N.S.W. government's decision to override the preference to unionists provision of the teachers' salaries award. There had also been a drawn out battle with the government over its proposal to establish school boards. Moreover, the 1972 decision to discontinue deduction of union fees from teachers' salaries had placed Federation in a parlous financial position in 1974 and 1975. Action against the federal government was not a greater priority than the more immediate struggle with the state government.

A one-hour strike, moreover, seemed to be somewhat of a token protest given Federation's willingness to hold twenty-four hour strikes when the issue warranted such action and usually after a sustained build up period among the membership. In this case, Federation was acting with other teachers' unions, some of which had never used the strike weapon. A one-hour stoppage was a major issue for some A.T.F. affiliates; it was hardly so for the N.S.W.T.F.

The organisation, however, did what it could to convince the members to support the stoppage. Special material was sent to schools and *Education* ran a full page spread on the matter.\(^{21}\)

\(^{20}\) D.T., 31 July 1975.

\(^{21}\) *Education*, 13 August 1975, pp.265-266.
Eric Pearson, perhaps conscious of Federation's support for Labor in 1974, suggested that strong support for the action would demonstrate that the Federation always upheld 'the development of education' as its 'number one priority'. Apart from these actions, however, there was barely an opportunity to build a sustained campaign in support of the proposed action. The stoppage received little support from the membership. The Department of Education claimed only six per cent of teachers stopped work, a figure not challenged by Federation.

As well as the particular difficulties associated with the stoppage, the actions of the federal government were not perceived as directly affecting the working conditions of teachers. Such issues as class sizes, salaries and the availability of specialist teachers, were seen as the prime responsibility of the state government. N.S.W. Education Minister, Eric Willis, had sought to embarrass the federal government over the proposed cuts. While Federation might have agreed, relationships with the state government were such that a joint campaign against the federal government's cuts was most unlikely to take place. Eventually, Education took the view that Willis' criticisms had been effectively answered by Beazley.

(22) ibid., p.266.
(23) The exception to this was the Preference to Unionists strike in 1975. Federation, however, was able to capitalise on the Government's reversal of an Industrial Commission decision.
(24) S.M.H., 14 August 1975.
(25) S.M.H., 6 September 1975.
Whatever criticisms the Federation had of the Labor government, they were put aside during the constitutional crisis in October, and the subsequent dismissal of the government on 11 November 1975. The 'needs' policy continued to be endorsed, despite some mild criticism that the 'needs' of non-government schools had been better addressed by the Schools Commission than the 'needs' of government schools. (27) In the same article, however, Pearson expressed confidence that the Governor General would not flout the convention 'that he must accept the advice of the Prime Minister while ever (he)...commands a majority in the Lower House'. (28)

Education printed, in full, Whitlam's speech on the constitutional crisis. Because schools had benefited by the actions of the Whitlam Government and because delay or rejection of the budget would affect education

the editor believes the Prime Minister's speech on the constitutional crisis precipitated by the Senate should be brought to the notice of the members of the New South Wales Teachers' Federation. (29)

On 23 October, Federation Executive expressed deep concern that education funds were being held up and that the deferment of the budget ignored parliamentary convention. It urged the Senate to pass the budget and called on members to support 'activities' designed to achieve that purpose. It authorised members to attend a special meeting of trade union

(27) ibid., 5 November 1975, p.367.
(28) ibid.
(29) ibid., pp.371-372.
delegates on 30 October. (30) While this was an encouragement to strike it hardly constituted a mobilisation of the membership in defence of the Labor government.

The dismissal of the government on 11 November 1975 provoked a dramatic page one 'President Writes' column from Pearson. He admitted that he had been wrong about the Governor-General's behaviour:

I believe that no other construction can be placed on this action other than that the Governor-General...has failed to keep himself absolutely above party political considerations and, instead, has entered the party political arena...the forthcoming election can in no way be viewed as a party political election. (31)

The election must demonstrate the Australian people's attachment to parliamentary democracy. This could only be achieved 'by the return of the elected Whitlam Government'. He concluded by urging Federation members 'to do all in their power as individual citizens' to achieve that end. (32)

The resources of the Federation were not immediately mobilised to achieve that purpose. There was no doubt, however, where the union leadership stood on the issue. Pearson endorsed the A.T.F. President's condemnation of Liberal Party education policy, particularly the suggestion that the 'needs' policy could be replaced by a 'voucher' system, (33) whereby parents would be

---

(31) ibid., 19 November 1975, p.379.
(32) ibid.
given a voucher for a specified amount of money for the education
of their children to be spent in either a public or a private
school. Although the policy had merely indicated that the voucher
system should be investigated, that was warning enough for
Federation. Education warned that if Labor was not returned,
prospects for public education were 'not auspicious'.(34)

On 15 November, Federation Council dealt with the matter
at length. It authorised expenditure of $18,500 on the federal
election. It reiterated, however, Federation could not be 'party
political', but stated that if members 'in conscience' attended
rallies, demonstrations or other forms of action, they would do so
with union support.(35) Significantly, Council returned, if
only briefly, to the anti-State Aid position of previous times.
It called on the federal and state governments not to carry out
the Schools Commission recommendations on funds for non-government
schools.(36) While there was not the remotest chance that
either government would comply, it is interesting to note the
revival of the policy, amidst this great political crisis.

Federation also established a Teachers' Defence of
Democracy fund to be financed by members' donations rather than by
direct Federation contribution. Nevertheless, union resources

(35) ibid., 3 December 1975, p.415. This included $1000 for
    The Citizen, a newspaper established by a number of Left
    unions and journalists during the election. Education
    editors, Michael Hourihan and Denis Kevans, were members
    of the organising committee of the paper.
(36) ibid. See M. Taylor to Senator Margaret Guilfoyle and M.
    Taylor to T. Lewis, 27 November 1975. Government
    Assistance to Non-Government schools files, N.S.W.T.F.
    archives.
were used to solicit funds. General Secretary Max Taylor made it clear that funds would be used to assist in the return of the Labor government. Associations, however, were reminded that they could not make direct contributions to political parties. (37)

Meanwhile, a group of prominent Federation members formed a group called 'Teachers for Democracy'. It held a public meeting, (38) organised committees in marginal electorates and distributed material urging the return of the Labor government. (39) A few days prior to the election, it took out a half-page advertisement in The Sydney Morning Herald reminding electors of '23 years of educational neglect'. It declared that:

1. The process of democracy must not be attacked.

2. Labor's tremendous achievements in education must not be threatened.

Teachers and parents were urged to 'return a Labor Government'. Over 600 Federation activists signed the advertisement. (40) No Federation funds were used directly to finance these activities, but informal networks developed over a long period were utilised, short of formal involvement of Federation as an organisation to further the campaign. Moreover a 'blind' eye was turned towards the activities of Research Officer, Ray Cavenagh in this period, who worked full-time on the Teachers' for Democracy campaign. (41)

(37) ibid., p.411. 'Federation Policy on Funds for Political Parties.'

(38) ibid., 3 December 1975, p.411.

(39) 'Teachers for Democracy', electoral material in possession of the author.

(40) S.M.H., 12 December 1975. The signatories were a who's who of Federation activists.

(41) Interview with Ray Cavenagh, 4 August 1983. Federation secretarial support was given to Cavenagh's efforts.
Federation endeavoured to tread a wary path between the advocacy of the preservation of parliamentary democracy, the gains made by public schools under a Labor government, and the Federation practice of not directly supporting particular political parties. Such distinctions were, however, sometimes lost on sections of the membership. When it was reported by the weekend press (42) that Federation Council had voted to spend $18,000 on the election and when Pearson called for a return of the Government, a lively correspondence in Education ensued. (43) In response to this criticism, Pearson denied that he was 'seeking support for a particular political party', per se, but he was rather seeking support for the preservation within Australia of a democratic way of life. He denied that Federation officers were using other than their own time in working for the defeat of the Fraser Government. (44) Cavenagh and Jack Williams did, however, co-ordinate members' contributions to the Federation's Teachers' 'Defence of Democracy' fund. (45)

The final 'President Writes' column and editorial in Education were a little less aggressive in tone than their predecessors. Pearson recognised the diversity of political allegiance among members, but argued that times were such that allegiance to party needs (is) to be subordinated to the allegiance to our traditional conventional system of parliamentary democracy. (46)

(42) Sun-Herald, 16 November 1975.
(43) See correspondence, Education, 3 December 1975, p.414.
(44) ibid., 19 November 1975, p.408.
(45) ibid., p.410.
(46) ibid., 3 December 1975, p.410.
Hourihan reviewed the education policies of the two major political groups and warned that a Liberal-Country Party government would abandon Labor's needs policy 'and return to the inequitable per capita grants system...'

Whatever one's political sympathies and whatever one may feel about areas of Federal Government performance, there is no doubt in my mind that in the field of education there is no acceptable alternative to that being carried on by the elected Whitlam government. (47)

Nevertheless, there can be no doubt where the Federation, as an organisation, stood during the 1975 election. Despite its material comparing respective education policies of the parties, and despite the disclaimers of Pearson and Taylor, the Federation did, for all intents and purposes, support the Labor Party in 1975. In doing so, Federation could not really criticise the historic legitimation of State Aid, so central to the 'needs' policy. The circumstances of the time and the logic of the position it adopted, made it virtually impossible for Federation to advance its traditional opposition to State Aid.

It illustrated the fundamental dilemma of the Federation's longstanding federal funding campaign, that it was difficult to separate the broadly based demand for federal funding of education from the sectional demand for State Aid. By concentrating on the financial and political implications of State Aid and putting aside the class and sectarian aspects of the question, Federation had been hoisted on its own petard. In 1975, Federation had no other political choice but to support the Labor Party and, by implication, much of what Labor stood for in the

(47) ibid.
education sector. Federation had played a central role in the federal funding movement. Its unresolved dilemma over State Aid illustrated, however, that, in the last instance, Federation did not determine the rules of the political game it was impelled to play.

At the federal level, Federation's methods of campaigning had not changed much over the years. The traditional methods of publicity, deputations and conferences had been the staple tactics of the federal funding campaigns. The use of industrial action was never really an option at the national level, as the abortive one hour national stoppage in 1975 had illustrated. At the state level, however, such an option was adopted in 1968. The reasons for the adoption of such a tactic, and the impact of its use are the subject of the next three chapters.
CHAPTER EIGHT

UNITED ACTION ... REDEFINED

THE 1968 STRIKE
During the 1950s and 1960s the tactics used by the Federation against both state and federal government were, to a large degree, similar. On 1 October 1968, however, members of the Federation took strike action against the N.S.W. government for its failures in the educational sphere. The purpose of this chapter is to explain why the Federation departed from its traditional tactics and engaged in strike action for the first time in its fifty year history.

After the strike Federation President, Jack Whalan, wrote of a 'new dynamism' within the union. The tradition of 'united action' he said, had taken a new direction. The union was 'unified and active as never before'.\(^{(1)}\) What had brought about this redefinition of 'united action'? What had produced this 'new dynamism'?

**Changes Within the Teaching Force**

At the most fundamental level the teaching force itself had undergone considerable change in the post war period. These changes can be gauged from the figures on the number of teachers in training and teachers entering the service in the period 1958 to 1968. In 1958 there were 4066 teachers in training, in 1968

\(^{(1)}\) *Education*, 9 October 1968, p.154.
there were 8997. In 1958, 1421 teachers entered the service from training institutions; the figure for 1968 was 2613.\(^{(2)}\)

These figures, however, should be seen in the context of the net gain in teachers after losses through resignation,


**Teachers in Training 1958-1968**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>4066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>4557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>4909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>5279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>6390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>6740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>7242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>7968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>8313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>8017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>8997</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teachers entering Teaching Force directly from Training Institutions 1958-1968**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>1593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>1761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>2228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>2278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>2089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>2394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>2457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>2613</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Excludes teachers entering from other sources and from seconded positions).
retirement, or dismissal are taken into account.\textsuperscript{(3)} While there was a continuing entry of young teachers into the service, the net increase in the teaching force in the period 1958 to 1968 was modest. It barely kept pace with the increase in enrolments, particularly in secondary schools.\textsuperscript{(4)} Despite these increases, a shortage of teachers continued throughout the 1960s.

The influx of young teachers, nevertheless, had a considerable impact on the age structure of the teaching force. Throughout the 1960s, there was a growing proportion of teachers whose economic and political experiences were, predominately, in the post war period. They had not experienced the difficulties of

\textsuperscript{(3)} ibid.

\begin{center}
Net Teachers entering Teaching Force 1958-1968
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{ccc}
1958 & 1206 \\
1959 & 1035 \\
1960 & 836 \\
1961 & 1316 \\
1962 & 984 \\
1963 & 1753 \\
1964 & 1159 \\
1965 & 1221 \\
1966 & 1312 \\
1967 & 1320 \\
1968 & 1507 \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{(4)} ibid.

\begin{center}
Enrolments in Government Schools 1958-1968
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{ccc}
 & Primary & Secondary & Total \\
1958 & 425,932 & 135,514 & 561,446 \\
1959 & 433,375 & 146,653 & 580,028 \\
1960 & 435,686 & 159,969 & 595,655 \\
1961 & 441,366 & 169,517 & 610,883 \\
1962 & 445,154 & 178,204 & 623,358 \\
1963 & 444,252 & 181,999 & 626,251 \\
1964 & 449,342 & 184,075 & 633,417 \\
1965 & 457,158 & 196,273 & 653,431 \\
1966 & 468,382 & 204,103 & 672,485 \\
1967 & 479,605 & 221,184 & 700,789 \\
1968 & 489,718 & 236,901 & 726,619 \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}
war and depression as had many of their older colleagues. The Cold War had not tempered their potential for militancy. They were likely to be less hidebound in their outlook and perhaps less cautious in their political and industrial attitudes than their more experienced fellow teachers.

There was also considerable change in the number of secondary teachers, relative to infants and primary teachers. This was a consequence of the increased demand for secondary education, reflected in the growth in retention rates in secondary schools following the introduction of the restructured secondary school system. In 1968 there were 13,187 secondary teachers, whereas in 1958, there had been only 6,173. In 1958, there were 12,093 infants and primary teachers; by 1968 the number was 17,080. Whereas there were twice as many infants and primary teachers as there were secondary teachers in 1958, by 1968, there were only 4000 fewer secondary teachers than teachers in the infants and primary area. By 1968, 43.6 per cent of all teachers were in the secondary area of the service. (5)

(5) ibid.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Infants/Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Secondary as Percentage of all Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>12,093</td>
<td>6,173</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>12,420</td>
<td>6,701</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>12,601</td>
<td>7,283</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>13,108</td>
<td>7,878</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>13,525</td>
<td>8,495</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>14,510</td>
<td>9,207</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>15,286</td>
<td>10,068</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>15,869</td>
<td>10,813</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>16,413</td>
<td>11,576</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>16,837</td>
<td>12,199</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>17,080</td>
<td>13,187</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Secondary teachers, moreover, were increasingly products of universities rather than teachers' colleges. Because colleges tended to be highly ordered institutions compared with the less structured world of universities, it was more likely that secondary teachers would be less impressed with the admonitions of established authority. They were also more likely to have been influenced by the phenomenon of student dissent than infants and primary teachers, who were predominantly trained in institutions which were closer in nature to the organisation of schools than to universities.

Teachers were also an important section of the rapidly growing 'white collar' and 'professional' sector of the paid labour force. This sector of the workforce was emerging from a state of proper subservience as 'obedient servants' of their employers. They were beginning to act like other workers, even if many thought of themselves as a 'cut above' the manual worker.

The leadership of the Federation was not, for the most part, of the postwar generation. People such as Lewis, Lancaster, Mattick and their supporters were socialists who had learned to survive amidst the Cold War hysteria of the 1950s by propounding tactics which fell short of the use of the strike weapon. With the changes in the teaching force the older generation could speak to a new constituency, one less wary of militancy.

In early 1968 Ivor Lancaster embarked on an extensive tour of schools and associations to report on his overseas trip in the latter part of 1967. He had visited Great Britain, Sweden, Denmark, the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, and Canada. He contrasted the superior education conditions in these countries
with those of N.S.W. He was particularly impressed by the greater willingness of teachers to take industrial action in support of their demands. He told the 1967 Annual Conference that teachers overseas seemed less fearful about taking such action than teachers in Australia. He was convinced, however, that the time had come when Australian teachers would be prepared to take industrial action. While he did not seek directly to foment industrial action, his tour was designed, in part, to prepare teachers for that eventuality. A younger teaching force provided a new constituency for Ivor Lancaster and the growing number of people within the Federation advocating some change of direction in the political and industrial tactics of the union. There was nothing new, however, about the issues which preoccupied the Federation in the period 1966 to 1968: the Education Commission, salaries, class sizes, and the provision of relief staff. It is to these issues that we now turn our attention.

The Education Commission

On the eve of the 1966 Annual Conference, newspapers reported that the government did not intend to proceed with the

(7) ibid., p.148.
(8) Interview with Ivor Lancaster, 13 May 1983.
(9) On his tour of N.S.W., see N.S.W.T.F. Annual Report 1968, p.29; Northern Daily Leader (Tamworth), 24 April 1968; Mudgee Guardian, 27 May 1968; Lithgow Mercury, 8 May 1968.
establishment of the Education Commission.\(^{(10)}\) Education Minister Cutler, opening the conference, informed delegates that he would soon be announcing 'measures which will bring a greater degree of co-ordination to the administration of educational services in N.S.W.' He cautioned them, however, not to 'jump to conclusions' as to what those recommendations might be.\(^{(11)}\) A sceptical conference condemned the government for its tardiness. Sam Lewis warned that Federation might depart from its disinclination to give directions to teachers on how they should vote in state elections.\(^{(12)}\)

Federation's fears were confirmed when Premier Robin Askin announced the establishment of an enquiry into the matter on 11 August 1967. He said that the issue was more complex than the government had anticipated when it made its election commitment. Any Commission that might be established 'would not control educational policy', he said. That would remain the prerogative of the Minister and the Cabinet acting on the advice of the relevant heads of departments. The members of the committee of enquiry were prominent businessman Sir Norman Rydge, Professor R.H. Myers, Pro-Vice Chancellor of the University of New South Wales and State Industrial Registrar J.E. Whitfield\(^{(13)}\)

\(^{(10)}\) E.g., S.M.H., 21 December 1966.
\(^{(12)}\) ibid., 15 February 1967, p.23.
The committee's membership was the immediate point of attack for the Federation. Lewis noted that no member had any connection with primary education. Education said that the government had displayed a 'sorry lack of imagination' in entrusting the 'education future' of the state to 'a lawyer, a metallurgist, and a businessman'.

Although the union prepared a detailed submission, it was clear that the Federation leadership never really expected that the committee would produce a report recommending a Commission which would, in any substantial way, resemble Federation policy. The establishment of the enquiry intensified Federation's deep sense of betrayal about the Commission issue.

Salaries

The other issue which occupied the Federation in the early months of 1967 was the matter of salaries. The Public Service Board sought a three-year agreement with the Federation. The union, however, argued that as the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission was considering adjustments to margins, then any agreement should operate for only a twelve month period. When the Commission brought down an interim decision of 2.5 per cent increase in margins, the Board refused to renew its offer. After negotiations between the Federation and the Board,

(14) S.M.H., 14 August 1967.


it was agreed that salaries agreements would be varied automatically in accordance with decisions of the Arbitration Commission, which had general application. An agreement between the Board and the Federation was signed on 31 March 1967 which included a provision for automatic wage adjustments following national wage decisions. The Federation, with some reluctance, accepted an agreement lasting from 19 October 1966 to 30 June 1969.\(^{(17)}\) While the matter had been resolved for the time being, there was potential for conflict arising from the duration of the award. The fluid wage situation and the unresolved problems arising from the Board-Federation agreements established a basis for conflict during 1968.

During 1967, two other issues emerged as significant matters for the Federation; class sizes and relief staff for absent teachers.

**Class Sizes**

The prime topic debated at the Annual Conferences in 1958, 1960, 1961, 1962, and 1966 was that of 'Working Conditions'. Central to this topic was the question of class sizes. The 1966 conference established a Code of Minimum Standards. Classes in infants, primary, and the first three years of secondary school should not exceed thirty students. Moreover there should be no more than twenty students in fourth, fifth and sixth form, and general activity classes.\(^{(18)}\)


One of the prime methods used by Federation over the years was to dramatise the class size issue through the publicising of detailed surveys. A survey was carried out again in 1967 and published under the heading: 1967: A Problem Year. The figures for the first three years of secondary school were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of classes in excess of thirty students. (19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The situation was much worse in Form 4, which Federation regarded as a 'senior' class. (20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Form 4 classes in excess of 36 students. (21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Form 4 classes in excess of 27 students (22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey also revealed a shortage of graduate staff and specialist teachers. Action was needed to meet these difficulties. Particular emphasis should be given to an emergency building programme and a significant increase in teacher training.

(19) ibid., 29 March 1967, p.41.
(20) The basis of the Federation's attitude to Form 4 was that students undertook a public examination.
(22) ibid.
Federation Research Officer Nance Cooper, argued that the Department of Education was meeting the teacher shortage by 'overloading junior forms'. Lewis said that such class sizes 'should not exist in an affluent society'.

Another more detailed survey of primary classes taken later that year revealed that the number of classes with thirty students or less had declined between 1965 and 1967. In classes with thirty-five or more pupils, a small improvement between 1965 and 1966, had been more than offset by a deterioration from 1966 to 1967.

### First and Second Class Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of ...</th>
<th>1965</th>
<th>1966</th>
<th>1967</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classes of 30 and under</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot; 35 &quot; over</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot; 40 &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Third Class Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of ...</th>
<th>1965</th>
<th>1966</th>
<th>1967</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classes of 30 and under</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot; 33 to 39</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot; 40 and over</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

(23) ibid.

(24) S.M.H., 14 March 1967.


First class schools: More than 400 students.
Second class schools: 201 to 400 students.
Third class schools: 36 to 200 students.

A.L.P. member Vince Durick gave the following average English class sizes to the Legislative Assembly:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Federation estimated that 143 extra teachers would be needed to reduce all classes in first and second class schools to a maximum of 37 pupils. The employment of 350 extra teachers would bring class sizes within 'the range of Federation target figures.' (26)

The following issue of Education carried an article on the growing shortage of secondary teachers. Thirty-six teachers who had resigned in first term had not been replaced. There was no guarantee that the 150 teachers who would resign in second term would be replaced. Permanent teachers were being replaced by part-time casual staff. Moreover the lack of adequate relief staff meant that more and more secondary teachers were teaching extra classes for absent teachers. (27)

In a subsequent issue of Education, Nance Cooper stated that in British Columbia (Canada), only 4.9 per cent of classes had more than forty students whereas in N.S.W., 33.8 per cent of primary classes had forty or more pupils. (28) Indeed some classes had increased by 25 per cent since 1966. (29) The publicity given to these surveys had the effect of compounding the feeling that there was a growing crisis in education and that the authorities were either unable, or unwilling, to come to terms with it.

(27) ibid., 28 June 1967, p.96.
(28) ibid., 20 September 1967, p.128.
(29) ibid., 1 November 1967, p.145.
Relief Staff for Absent Teachers

It was the issue of relief staff which emerged, however, as the matter on which teachers were prepared to take industrial action. When a secondary teacher was absent, other teachers were asked to take 'extra' classes in the teacher's place. In infants and primary schools, when a similar situation arose, classes were split up and the children redistributed among the remaining classes. For secondary teachers this meant taking classes in excess of 28 periods which was regarded as the 'normal' teaching load.\(^{(30)}\) For infants and primary teachers their already large classes were further increased. In general, relief staff were only made available when a teacher was to be absent for more than ten consecutive days.

In July 1967, Lewis told Federation Council that three teachers from 'a high school in a near country area' had held extensive discussions with the senior officers of the Federation and of the Secondary Teachers' Association about the relief situation in their school. The staff were proposing to refuse to teach children where teachers had not been appointed or where no relief was provided for teachers absent through illness. Lewis

\(^{(30)}\) The 'normal' secondary teaching load was 27 or 28 periods plus 2 or 3 periods of sport supervision. Some teachers taught in excess of the 'normal' load as a matter of course, e.g. science teachers who were in very short supply. In 1979 and 1980 what constituted a 'normal' teaching load for a secondary teacher was the subject of a hearing before Bauer, J. in the N.S.W. Industrial Commission. He found it was 'normal' for a secondary teacher 'to teach either 27 or 28 periods ... occasionally more than 28, but rarely less than 27'. Industrial Commission of New South Wales, No. 681 of 1979, 28 August 1980, p.25.
said there had been much discussion about the ramifications of such a dramatic departure from what Federation had regarded as appropriate action.\(^{(31)}\) Subsequently Council carried a resolution offering 'support' to school staffs refusing to carry out 'additional burdens.'

It was not specified what the nature of this 'support' would be, but this was a resolution authorising a refusal of duty by members of the union. This was a most significant departure from the usual definition of Federation 'action', with its reliance on publicity and lobbying methods. While there was no great rush by schools to take such action, the seed nevertheless, had been planted.

In September, Executive considered a complaint from the A.C.T. Teachers' Association about Federation's lack of action on teachers' working conditions.\(^{(32)}\) Rather testily, Executive reminded the association that campaigns were usually only effective when there was active membership involvement in them. It decided to refer staffing prospects for 1968 to Council. It asked Councillors to canvas whether members would be 'prepared to refuse larger classes or extra periods' when teachers were absent for five or more days.\(^{(33)}\)

Meanwhile the state government brought down its budget for 1967-1968. Of particular concern to Federation was the proposal to reduce the number of teacher training scholarships by


\(^{(32)}\) Executive, \underline{Minutes}, 26 September 1967, p.434.

\(^{(33)}\) \textit{ibid.}
70 compared with 1966-1967. This contrasted with an increase of 512 in 1964-1965 and 703 in 1966-1967. A full report was given to October Council on the situation.\(^\text{(34)}\)

Council was also told of a meeting of eight high school staffs in the Ryde-Meadowbank-Epping area of Sydney, which had taken place on 12 October. Reports had been given that more than 8,000 extra periods had been worked during 1967. Two school staffs indicated that they were prepared to refuse extra classes after the fifth day of absence of a teacher. Another school staff was prepared to stop work to consider the situation.\(^\text{(35)}\)

The Executive proposed to Council that a meeting of Sydney metropolitan Federation Representatives be called to consider the matter. An amendment was successfully moved from the floor, pledging full support from Federation for schools taking action on the relief issue.\(^\text{(36)}\) What 'full support' meant was yet to be tested.

The Illawarra Teachers' Association was first to take up the Council resolution. A meeting of secondary teachers called by the Association demanded that the Department establish a 'pool' of relief teachers in 1968. If this demand was not met, then teachers were urged to refuse extra periods after five days of a

\(^{\text{(34)}}\) Council, Minutes, 14 October 1967, p.156. Report given by Nance Cooper.

\(^{\text{(35)}}\) ibid., the schools were Meadowbank and Epping Boys High Schools and Marsden High School.

\(^{\text{(36)}}\) ibid., p.159.
teacher's absence. Moreover, teachers were urged to exclude children from classes which exceeded the Federation determined maxima. (37)

This was a significant departure from established Federation practice. Previously Federation had authorised Primary Principals to send classes home when they did not have a teacher, but the notion of excluding children in excess of a given figure was not Federation policy. Whether this tactic would find wide acceptance within the membership, and what constituted 'full support' would be issues to be discussed at the 1967 Annual Conference.

1967 Annual Conference

The principal debate at the Conference took place on the topic 'working conditions'. The Illawarra Teachers' Association pressed its proposal that teachers should refuse extra classes after five days if the Department did not establish a 'pool' of relief teachers. After some debate the question was referred to a resolution committee which met overnight and brought back a composite proposition to the Conference incorporating amendments moved on the previous day. It contained a statement that Federation would 'give every support to members who refuse to take extra periods occasioned by the failure to appoint a teacher or the absence of a teacher through illness for more than five days.' (38) It rejected, however, Illawarra's proposition that

(37) 'Illawarra and North Illawarra Teachers' Associations. Decision of Emergency Meeting of Secondary Teachers, 26 October, 1967.' Illawarra Teachers' Association files, N.S.W.T.F. archives.

all teachers be urged to refuse extras if the Department did not establish a pool of relief teachers in 1968. In seconding the proposition, Joyce Clarke said that teachers who took such action should be supported, but that it was not clear how teachers might respond to Federation actively urging such action upon them. \(^{(39)}\) She also opposed any suggestion that children in oversized classes should be excluded from class on a roster basis. This would alienate children and parents and would 'not be done by most teachers'. \(^{(40)}\)

There was also a vigorous debate about whether individual members, or a group of members within a school staff, should have the right to refuse extra classes. Frank Harvison argued that individual members should be able to exercise such a right. \(^{(41)}\) Alan Cross warned against 'individualistic' action, which could 'embarrass Federation', \(^{(42)}\) but he said that there were cases where departments within a school could take such action with the support of the union. This formulation was adopted. School staffs and departments were authorised to take action by 'refusing to absorb staffing deficiencies resulting in additional period loadings or increased class sizes'. \(^{(43)}\)

This debate marks a significant shift in the Federation definition of 'united action'. The Conference resolution was largely a reiteration of the October Council decision in its

\(^{(40)}\) ibid.  
\(^{(41)}\) ibid., p.170.  
\(^{(42)}\) ibid., p.174.  
\(^{(43)}\) Annual Conference 1967, Minutes, p.31.
definition of action. The notion of Federation giving 'full support' to staff taking action was not a new one. What had changed was that a group of schools within one association had taken up the authorisation and endeavoured to develop a new kind of action. As such, the Illawarra Association had redefined the traditional notions of 'united action' and 'full Federation support'. Instead of being united action of the whole membership, it had become 'vanguard action' of a section of the membership. Some unresolved questions remained. Was 'full Federation support' to be anything beyond publicity campaigns, deputations and electoral interventions? Was the whole membership to be drawn willy nilly into actions taken by vanguard sections of the membership? The questions of local initiative and central control had become significant issues.

There was now a shift away from the centre of the union taking action to a section of the membership taking the initiative. The responsibility of the centre was now more one of organising support for the initiative of the section. The centre, hitherto, had taken most initiatives and exercised control in campaigns. The central decision-making bodies could legitimately claim to speak for the rest of the union. What would happen if the rest of the union was perceived to be unsympathetic to the initiative of one section of the union? If local action was legitimised by the policy of the union, could the centre's tactical perspective on the pursuit of a certain policy, override the desire of one section to pursue that policy? These questions were to be brought into focus early in 1968.
Teachers of Hairdressing

The 1967 Annual Conference also declared its support to teachers of hairdressing in their refusal to commence classes one week earlier than other classes at Sydney Technical College. Since 1966 these teachers had been in dispute with the Master Hairdressers' Association about college attendance hours of hairdressing apprentices. Their employers demanded that classes be suspended in the pre-Easter week, which was a peak period for hairdressing establishments. Teachers refused to commence classes a week earlier to compensate for this loss of time spent at college by the apprentices.

In October 1967 the Minister for Education directed that the classes for hairdressing students should commence a week earlier than other classes within technical colleges. The teachers resolved to refuse this direction and voted to hold a stop work meeting if any teacher was victimised for carrying out this decision. This action was supported by Federation.

The Public Service Board referred the matter to the Industrial Commission. It recommended that Federation, the Board and Minister have further discussions on the dispute. The Federation leadership successfully persuaded the teachers to withdraw their threat pending those discussions. Eventually

---

(44) ibid., p.28.
(45) Executive, Minutes, 6 February 1968 (attachment), report by W.J. Whalan.
(47) Executive, Minutes, 6 February 1968, (attachment).
a compromise was negotiated about the matter. Classes were cancelled in the pre Easter week, but this was compensated by other adjustments to the programmes of hairdressing teachers. (48)

In the short term, the tactical view of the union leadership prevailed over the willingness of a small group of teachers to maintain their resolve. Nevertheless, an important precedent had been established. The threat not to carry out the instructions of the employer had been supported by the union leadership. The teachers had forced the union, if only briefly, to support industrial initiative taken by a small section of the membership. They had not won their point, either with the employers, nor indeed with the central organs of the union. But initiatives taken by sections could only be stifled by tactical considerations, they could not be characterised so readily as assaults upon the principle of 'united action'. The union was now prepared to allow a group of members to take industrial action in defence of what they considered were their rights. The hairdressing teachers and secondary teachers in the Illawarra and elsewhere had acted, perhaps unwittingly, to change the rules of the game.

Illawarra Takes the Initiative

The Illawarra formulation of appropriate action had not prevailed at the 1967 Annual Conference. The conference's formulation, however, was sufficient for Illawarra to pursue its campaign in 1968.

The Illawarra Teachers' Association covered all teachers working in the Wollongong area. The North Illawarra Association, which had been founded in 1955, covered teachers working in settlements and suburbs north of the city. Teachers in the expanding suburbs south of Wollongong were members of the Kiama (later South Illawarra) Association.

Wollongong itself is an industrial city based on coalmining and the production of steel. The workers in these industries, together with the stevedoring workers, formed the basis of a strong and militant trade union movement in the area. The Illawarra Teachers' Association had formed close links with the industrial movement, particularly in the post-war period. The leadership saw themselves as a part of the working class movement, not as part of a professional association removed from the struggles of the mainstream of that movement. A visible and industrially conscious working class was a principal characteristic of political and economic life of the Wollongong district. (49)

Greater Wollongong experienced considerable industrial expansion in the 1950s and 1960s. Many of the workers were migrants who had been recruited to provide an 'unskilled' and 'semi-skilled' workforce for the steel and associated industries. As the population grew, new suburbs were established. Many

teachers found themselves working in these new areas. They faced the problems inherent in providing sufficient teachers and accommodation in developing suburbs. Moreover, many of them taught the children of immigrants. In a real sense then, the teachers of the Illawarra district represented a microcosm of the development of public education in the post-war period.

Unlike teachers in Sydney and Newcastle, Illawarra teachers were organised in regional, rather than sectional associations. There was therefore, a greater potential for a united and comprehensive attack upon the problems facing teachers in the area. The industrial connections and experience of the leadership of the Illawarra Association brought the organisational skills of the wider labour movement to the organisation of the large number of younger teachers (50) who were themselves, less reticent about militant action than their older colleagues. Until 1968, however, the campaigns organised by the Association had fallen short of strike action. The 1967 Annual Conference had enabled the Illawarra leadership to encourage their members to move beyond the well-established campaign methods.

In February 1968, a meeting of secondary teachers called by the Illawarra Associations voted to refuse extra classes after a teacher had been absent for four days. The action was to begin on 1 March 1968. (51) The area office of the Department of

(50) West, ibid.

(51) Education, 20 March 1968, p.36. See also report of Max Graham (Secretary) to Illawarra Teachers' Association meeting, Minutes, 27 February 1968, Illawarra Teachers' Association files, University of Wollongong archives.
Education avoided a confrontation by generally providing relief staff in secondary schools by the fourth day of absence. This success prompted the Illawarra leadership to attempt to extend the action to infants and primary schools.\(^{(52)}\)

Federation could not ignore the success of the campaign. Organiser David Beswick, himself a former Illawarra teacher, urged other areas to follow Illawarra's lead.\(^{(53)}\) Education claimed that the Department had reviewed its provision of relief staff only after the Illawarra teachers had taken their stand.\(^{(54)}\) Whalan said that such a result was only achieved through the 'united action' of members working through proper 'Federation channels'.\(^{(55)}\) To operate outside those channels, he implied, threatened the integrity of the Federation tradition of united action.

Whalan's qualified enthusiasm for the action did not please the two Illawarra Associations. Their presidents, Jim Dombroski and Horrie Ford wrote a strongly worded article in Education, which argued that only a 'united and determined stand' like that taken in Illawarra would lead to real 'improvements in working conditions'.\(^{(56)}\) The older formulations of 'united action', it seemed, had become dated.

\(^{(52)}\) Illawarra Teachers' Association, Minutes, 26 March 1968, in ibid.

\(^{(53)}\) Education, 20 March 1968, p.36.

\(^{(54)}\) ibid., 3 April 1968, p.42.

\(^{(55)}\) ibid.

\(^{(56)}\) ibid., 17 July 1968, p.105.
On 19 March another meeting of Illawarra secondary teachers voted that children in classes in excess of Federation policy should be rostered out of class and be supervised by a teacher. Federation Executive however declined to endorse the action and urged the Illawarra Association to 'concentrate on the implementation' of the extras policy.\(^{(57)}\) There was fear that the vanguard elements could run too far ahead of the rest of the membership.

Indeed by the end of first term nearly 150 secondary schools had followed the Illawarra lead on the extras issue. Until 23 April the Department usually managed to provide relief staff by the fifth day of a teacher's absence.\(^{(58)}\) The issue, however, came to a head at Vaucluse Boys High School in late April.

On 19 April an industrial arts teacher at Vaucluse went on indefinite sick leave. All efforts to replace him had hitherto, proved fruitless. On 23 April the Principal was directed by the Department to hand a number of teachers memoranda instructing them to take specific classes for the absent teacher. Eight teachers so directed refused to 'cover' the classes. The staff reaffirmed their decision not to work extras after the fourth day of absence. Whalan told a press conference that the dispute had important 'industrial and professional implications.'\(^{(59)}\) He was not prepared to commit Federation to


\(^{(58)}\) Education, 23 May 1968, p.65.

\(^{(59)}\) Australian, 24 April 1968.
industrial action, but warned that many teachers 'seemed prepared
to take extreme action.'\(^\text{(60)}\) This seemed more than posturing
when it became known that four other schools were contemplating
the same action as Vaucluse.\(^\text{(61)}\) A major confrontation was
looming.

The crisis was averted when the Department announced that
a relief teacher would be provided on Friday 20 April. Federation
then held extensive discussions with Director-General David
Verco.\(^\text{(62)}\) On 29 April Verco announced that Principals and
Infants Mistresses would be authorised to engage relief staff when
it was known a teacher would be absent for more than five
days.\(^\text{(63)}\)

The threat to 'refuse duty' had clearly strengthened
Federation's bargaining position with the authorities. It was a
significant addition to the industrial armoury of the union.
Nevertheless, industrial initiative had shifted away from the
centre, to union branches at the district and school level. While
the policies, and for the most part, the tactics of the union had
been the outcome of wide discussion within the Federation, the
initiative about priorities had remained with the central bodies
of the union. The well-established campaigning methods of the

\(^\text{(60)}\) \text{ibid.}
\(^\text{(61)}\) \text{ibid., Birrong Boys, Strathfield Girls, Woonona and
    Greystanes High Schools.}
\(^\text{(62)}\) \text{Executive, Minutes, 30 April 1968, pp.133-134.}
\(^\text{(63)}\) \text{ibid., p.135. See also Education, 23 May 1968, p.65.}
Verco also agreed to a Federation proposal that the
Department advertise extensively for relief teachers.
Federation had become the substance of the concept of 'united action'. Challenges to this concept had hitherto only come from conservative elements within the union. The challenge from local activists however, was of a different order and put to the test what, in fact, constituted 'full Federation support'. The power of the centre, relative to the constituent units of the organisation, was called into question. Nevertheless the relief campaign opened up new possibilities which could be built upon by the leadership.

**Timetable Rationalisation**

The apparent accord between the Department and the Federation was, however, not sustained. The sticking point was the supply of science teachers. Generally speaking, science graduates could find more financially rewarding careers outside teaching. The inclusion of science as a 'core' subject in the restructured secondary education system exacerbated the shortage. Science was increasingly taught by two year trained teachers or people with little or no science in their degrees. By the end of 1967 there were 60 vacancies for heads of science departments in schools.\(^{(64)}\) As science teachers resigned, they were not often replaced with qualified science teachers, or in some cases were not replaced at all.

By June 1968, fourteen high schools had reported to Federation that they had not received appropriate replacements for science vacancies. Eight other schools warned Federation of

\(^{(64)}\) S.M.H. 6 November 1967, statement by secretary of Federation Science Committee. To be eligible to be a Science mistress/master it was necessary to be a science graduate.
impending science vacancies. The Department directed schools to restructure timetables, by reducing the number of science teaching periods, increasing class sizes and allocating unqualified teachers to science classes.\(\text{(65)}\) Staffs at Goulburn, Seven Hills, and Arthur Philip (Parramatta) High Schools voted to refuse to comply with timetable rationalisation.\(\text{(66)}\)

Meeting on 8 June, Council called on the Public Service Board to permit superannuated teachers to return to teaching. It also called on the Director-General of Education to make a personal appeal on television for qualified relief teachers and for the Department to join with the Federation in sponsoring advertisements for teachers. It also demanded that the government provide funds in the 1968-1969 budget for the immediate relief of absent teachers.\(\text{(67)}\) Whalan told a press conference on 21 June that during first term, teachers had retired, or resigned, at a rate of 24 teachers per school day. He said that it was common for six or seven teachers to be absent from school on any given day, their work being performed by those remaining on duty.\(\text{(68)}\)

**Primary Teachers Join the Campaign**

Thus far, most of the emphasis of the campaign was on secondary schools. In infants and primary schools, however, the problem was more difficult. When teachers were absent and there was no relief, the classes of the absent teachers were


\(\text{(66)}\) Executive, Minutes, 11 June 1968, pp.215-216.

\(\text{(67)}\) Education, 3 July 1968, p.93.

redistributed among the classes of the remaining teachers. The education of the children was disrupted, as were the teachers' programmes. Once again the Illawarra associations took the initiative. They called a special meeting of infants and primary teachers on 23 April. They carried, unanimously, a resolution that teachers would refuse to teach students of absent teachers after the sixth day of absence. This resolution was referred to schools for endorsement with a plea that primary teachers act in a united way with their secondary colleagues.\(^{(69)}\) In the meantime Federation had endorsed a proposal from the Men Teachers' Association for a state wide conference of primary teachers.\(^{(70)}\) Executive therefore requested schools and associations to defer any action pending the outcome of the conference.\(^{(71)}\)

More than 550 infants and primary teachers took part in the conference on 29 June. It carried resolutions on class sizes, buildings and clerical assistance, and called for a general enquiry into primary education. On the salaries matter it called on teachers to refuse all extra curricular activities until the Board applied the metal trades decision to teachers' salaries. It also asked Council to consider calling meetings 'in school time' to discuss the matter.\(^{(72)}\)

\(^{(69)}\) Illawarra, North Illawarra and Kiama Teachers' Associations, circular to Federation representatives, (undated, but April 1968). Barrier Teachers' Association carried a similar resolution, Executive, Minutes, 25 June 1968, p.233.

\(^{(70)}\) Education, 5 June 1968, pp.77-78, article by Richard Walsham, secretary of Men Teachers' Association. See also letters from Col Rennie and Allen Culgin.

\(^{(71)}\) Executive, Minutes, 25 June 1968, p.233.

\(^{(72)}\) Executive, Minutes, 9 June 1968, attachment, p.4.
The Conference considered two propositions on extras. The first was that primary teachers refuse to accept extra children in their classes from the class of an absent teacher after the fifth day of absence. The second proposal was that minimum supervision be provided for the class of an absent teacher after the second day of absence. After a lively debate the latter proposition was adopted. Opponents of the first proposal argued that teachers would not be prepared to foresake all responsibility for children without a teacher. The provision of minimal supervision was regarded as a reasonable compromise between redistributing children among remaining classes, and refusing all responsibility for unattended children. It was nevertheless a considerable breakthrough from a traditionally more conservative section of teachers. The resolutions on salaries and relief were significant indications of growing unrest in the service.

Salaries

Amidst the growing concern about working conditions, salaries had again become an issue for the Federation. In March 1967, the Public Service Board had undertaken to adjust teachers' salaries in accordance with National Wage decisions. In December 1967, Federation requested the Board to apply the metal trades decision to teachers' salaries. Negotiations, however, were interrupted by the 'absorption' dispute involving metal workers and employers in early 1968. In May 1968, the N.S.W. Industrial Commission applied the metal trades standard to the administrative

and clerical division of the state public service. Federation joined with the Public Service Association and the Professional Officers' Association in an application to the Board to 'flow on' this latter decision to all state public servants. The Board, however, refused to re-open negotiations. It said it would consider the relevance of the metal trades standard when the 'salaries in question are next subject to review'.

Federation Council, meeting on 13 July, demanded that negotiations be reopened, in order to permit the application of the metal trades standard to teachers' salaries.

The Board's attitude enabled the leadership to link the unrest about working conditions with the salaries issue. Council decided to call mass meetings in the Sydney metropolitan area to consider whether stop work meetings should be called in order 'to obtain appropriate improvements in salaries and working conditions'.

Acting President Elizabeth Mattick, urged members to attend the meetings and noted that 'there had never been year like 1968 in which teacher activities ... (had) been so widespread and sustained'. With Whalan overseas Mattick, Lancaster and John Frederick and the group around them saw the time as propitious for action.

(74) N.S.W.T.F., Annual Report 1968, p.11.
(77) ibid.
(78) Whalan was attending a World Confederation of Organisations of the Teaching Profession Conference in Dublin and conducting other business in Europe in his capacity as President of the A.T.F. His absence at this time is considered important by many participants in Federation activity during 1968. When he returned, events were largely beyond his control.
The mass meetings took place. They endorsed the Council proposal, that by 16 August schools consider the question of stopwork meetings on salaries and working conditions, should 'the Board and government refuse the claims of the Federation...'.(79)

Some meetings went beyond this formulation. The Manly-Warringah meeting expressed concern at the Department's attempts to rationalise timetables.(80) The Illawarra meeting proposed to hold its own stopwork meeting early in third term. The Eastern Suburbs meeting narrowly defeated a proposal for a two day strike after a very lively debate in the presence of Elizabeth Mattick.(81) A group of secondary schools in the Bankstown area subsequently issued a manifesto declaring that classes above the maxima set by the 1967 Annual Conference would not be taught.(82)

It was clear that some sections of the membership were seeking a dramatic departure from the well-established methods.

**Staffing Proposals for 1969**

While the mass meetings were proceeding, but before August Council could make any decisions, Federation received information regarding staffing proposals for 1969. Secondary

---

(79) *Education*, 13 August 1968, p.117.
(80) ibid.
(81) ibid., see also 'Decisions of Mass Meetings', '1968' printed material file, N.S.W.T.F. archives. Interview with Tim Hornibrook, 17 March 1984, on Eastern Suburbs meeting.
Principals had been advised to adhere to the increased class size figures when assessing their staffing requirements for 1969. These involved an increase in class sizes in Forms I, II, IV and V. It was also proposed that, where possible, science and manual arts teachers be given thirty period teaching loads instead of being given a sports allocation. 'Practical' woodwork and metalwork classes would only be divided when they reached 27 students instead of the usual 24. Technical drawing classes could contain up to thirty students, while art (examination) classes could contain up to 34 students. Class sizes were now added to Federation's list of grievances, particularly after the Department declined to assure the union that the staffing situation would improve after 1969.

The staffing proposals mobilised one of the most closely knit groups within the Federation; the manual arts teachers. Both the Manual Art Teachers' Association and the Federation had urged the Department to provide teacher training for skilled artisans to compensate for the hiatus in manual arts graduates,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Sizes</th>
<th>1968</th>
<th>1969</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form I</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Activity</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Executive, Minutes, 23 July 1968, p.277.

Manual Arts classes of 24 had been the norm since the 1920s.

ibid., p.278.
caused by the change over from fifth year (Leaving Certificate) to sixth year (Higher School Certificate). No action had been taken by the Department. (86)

Lancaster told a large meeting of the Manual Arts Association on 25 July that there was an urgent need for coordinated action by all secondary associations. (87) This meeting called a further meeting which attracted manual arts teachers from Newcastle, Wollongong, and Nowra as well as the metropolitan area. It decided not to teach classes in excess of 24 students in 1969. It called for mass meetings to discuss stop work action. Finally it proposed a 'one day stoppage of all secondary teachers' to discuss staffing for 1969. Manual arts teachers were urged to influence their colleagues to support these proposals. (88)

Meanwhile a meeting of executive members of metropolitan associations called for mass meetings to consider stop work action on relief staff and salaries. (89) The option of industrial action was also canvassed at a well attended Council meeting of the Secondary Teachers' Association in mid-July. (90) A series of district meetings called by the Federation either voted for stop work action or referred that proposition to schools for comment. (91)

---

(86) ibid., 20 August 1968, p.374.
(90) ibid., 17 July 1968, p.108. No formal proposition was carried calling for strike action.
(91) Executive, Minutes, 13 August 1968, pp.335-336.
The Federation Executive meeting of 13 August had the results of these meetings before it, together with a letter from the Premier declining to meet a Federation deputation. The responses from the meetings, together with resolutions from school meetings, were regarded by the leadership as a strong indication that a one day strike would receive considerable support from the membership. Executive adopted a senior officers' recommendation that mass meetings be called on 26 September to consider a one day strike. The matter was referred to Council for endorsement.

Before the Council meeting, a Federation deputation met Education Minister Charles Cutler. He would not give any indication when three-year teacher training would be introduced, nor give any undertakings about other matters raised by the deputation. He accused Federation of painting an exclusively negative picture of education in N.S.W. Perhaps if Cutler had been more conciliatory, the Federation leadership may have been able to offer something to the membership which would have lessened the unrest. He provided the leadership with no such opportunity.

---


(93) Executive, Minutes, 13 August 1968, pp.335-336. The resolution was drafted by the ideologically heterogeneous duo of Des Brady and Nance Cooper. Interview with Des Brady, 22 May 1984.

When Whalan returned from overseas he was, it seems, dismayed by the trend of events in his absence. While he was away the leadership of the Federation had been exercised by Mattick, Lancaster and Frederick. All were firmly aligned with the Left of the Federation. None of them had any objection to strike action as such. They were, however, wary lest the leadership move too far ahead of the active membership. As events unfolded in 1968, there was a growing realisation that the level of discontent among the membership was such that it could be channelled into spectacular protest action by a mobilised membership. Whalan had not been witness to these developments. He argued that Federation should seek concessions from the government. The threat of a strike might be sufficient to move the government. Lancaster however was strongly of the view that the membership was sufficiently aroused that a great deal of effective preparation would be destroyed if a more conciliatory approach was taken by Federation. (95) Lancaster's view prevailed.

On 20 August the Public Service Board invited Federation to submit 'detailed views or claims in relation to matters of concern to members of the Federation'. (96) Once again the union listed the government's failures: to provide adequate staffing, to reduce class sizes, to provide adequate relief staff, to provide sufficient teachers' scholarships, to introduce a three year minimum of teacher training, to plan for any new teachers' colleges to be opened in 1969 and to establish an Education

---

(95) These comments are based on numerous informal discussions with participants in the events of 1968, and in particular on interviews with Ivor Lancaster, Bill Leslie, Barry Manefield and Tim Hornibrook.

(96) Executive, Minutes, 20 August 1968, p.342.
Commission. To this list it added the matters of inadequate student allowances, inadequate provision of inservice courses, the lack of sufficient school accommodation, poor amenities in schools and inadequate provision of ancillary staff. The unrest within the teaching service, it noted, did not arise from 'one or two particular matters which had arisen recently' but from 'an accumulation of matters over a lengthy period of time which had produced acute frustration.'(97) The Board's apparent lack of awareness of the causes of the growing discontent among teachers was hardly conducive to Council adopting a more moderate position on the whole question. Indeed when Council met on 23 August there was widespread discussion among teachers and in the public arena about the possibility of strike action.

Elizabeth Mattick and John Frederick reported on recent events.(98) Frederick then moved the Executive recommendation for mass meetings to be called on 26 September.(99) Council rejected a proposition that Federation seek a further deputation with Cutler and the results be conveyed to the meetings.(100) It also rejected a proposition that stop work meetings be called by Council itself on 20 September.(1)

The original recommendation was adopted.(2)

(98) Council, Minutes, 23 August 1968, pp.142-143.
(99) ibid., pp.148-149.
(100) ibid., p.149.
(1) ibid., pp.149-150.
(2) ibid., p.150.
This was not the first time that mass meetings had considered the holding of stop work meetings. In the past such a proposal had been used as a tactic to force some movement from either the Public Service Board or the government. In this case, the range of issues was extensive, whereas in the past the threat of strike action had usually involved a single issue such as salaries. It remained to be seen whether this was just another tactic to force some movement from the authorities or the prelude to a spectacular one-day stoppage of the membership.

The Board brought the Council's decision before the Industrial Commission on 19 September. The Commission noted that the matters raised by Federation in its letter to the Board of 27 August were within the province of the Board and the government and, therefore, beyond the power of the Commission to make a determination upon them. It recommended, however, that Federation determine its 'priorities' and 'specify its proposed solutions'. The Board, for its part, should not 'adopt a passive role' in negotiations with Federation, but rather respond with its own 'priorities and solutions'. It, however, warned the Federation against recommending to its members participation in an illegal strike 'which would violate a law passed by the legislature'.

In a letter to the Board on 19 September, Federation responded to the Commission's recommendation by identifying four basic priorities: staffing, relief staff, teacher education,

salaries and allowances (including those of students). Other matters specified in its letter to the Board of 22 August would be the subject of subsequent discussion. (4)

The Board replied on 25 September. On staffing it offered to recruit mature age graduates. It expected an increase of 1000 to the number of teacher trainees in 1969. On the question of relief staff it proposed to authorise Principals and Infants' Mistresses to employ relief staff after three days' absence. It also proposed to permit superannuated teachers to undertake some relief teaching. (5) The questions of teacher training and student allowances, it noted, were matters for the government. On salaries, it invited Federation to make any new representations it cared to make or to apply for a new award from the Industrial Commission. It nevertheless said it would oppose a new award 'whilst present circumstances remained unchanged'.

The only area where the Board had made some concessions was on the question of relief staff. The provision of an extra 1000 trainees also promised some long-term relief in staffing. There was, however, no indication of improvement in this area in 1969. On salaries, the Board remained obdurate. On student allowances and teacher training, it could offer nothing, not even an assurance that it would press the government to give these matters some priority. (6)

---

(4) Public Service Board's reply - 25 September, ibid., p.53.
(5) ibid., p.54. See also Council, Minutes, 28 September 1968, pp.179-182.
(6) ibid.
The state budget was brought down on 25 September. It provided an increase in the number of trainee teachers from 9031 in 1968 to 10,220 in 1969.\(^{(7)}\) Student allowances were increased by 10 per cent. The only other educational 'betterments' largely went to students in non-government schools.\(^{(8)}\) The government had not acted to head off the strike by making significant, or even tactical concessions, to the Federation.

On 17 September, Federation Executive endorsed a detailed statement, 'Some Needs of N.S.W. Public Education'. It was circulated to every Federation member before the mass meetings on 26 September. It was designed to provide for members 'a comprehensive background to the present serious position of working conditions and salaries of teachers...'.\(^{(9)}\) What is interesting to note, however, is that little reference is made to salaries in the document. This is not to suggest that much of the membership was not as interested in salaries as in working conditions, but that the emphasis of the document designed for

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|}
\hline
\text{Year} & \text{Total Number of Teachers in Training} \\
\hline
1964 & 7303 \\
1965 & 7968 \\
1966 & 8413 \\
1967 & 8017 \\
1968 & 9031 \\
1969 & 10220 \text{ (estimate)} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

In 1969 there were, in fact, 10,165 students in colleges and universities. This included 172 'private' students. Annual Report of the Minister for Education for 1969, p.36.

N.S.W.T.F., Annual Report 1968, p.53

\(^{(7)}\) ibid., appendix 10, pp.54-55.

\(^{(8)}\) ibid., appendix 15, pp.56-57.
wide distribution among the membership was not on the salaries matter. It seems that Federation leadership, by this time, was trying to underplay the importance of salaries as a source of teacher discontent.

Immediately after the Council took the decision to call mass meetings, the school vacation took place. While this provided a respite for the membership, the leadership was engaged in discussions with the Commission and the Board. The negotiations between the Federation and the Board, held at the behest of the Commission, together with the deficiencies of the state budget, if anything, strengthened the determination of the leadership to have a strike.

In the weeks before the 26 September meetings, Federation embarked upon a major publicity offensive. Special printed material was despatched to schools on 5 and 6 September. Federation officers and Association executive members organised deputations to local politicians. Radio and television commercials were broadcast throughout the state. Each advertisement ended with the words: 'This Teachers' Federation announcement is made in the interests of better education for your child.' There was extensive print advertising in the Sydney and country press. (10) The intensity of the campaign was designed to maximise attendance at the mass meetings, as well as bring the issues to public attention.

Mass Meetings: 26 September

The mass meetings in Sydney, Orange, Wollongong, Newcastle and Canberra were linked by landline. Other meetings, which were not on landline, took place in a number of country centres. The meetings had before them a formidable array of documentation including the Industrial Commission's recommendations and Federation correspondence with the Board. The meetings opened with 'God Save the Queen'. Jack Whalan reported on recent events. At 4.30pm he moved the principal resolution recommending that Council call on teachers 'to refrain from duty for one day and to attend protest rallies in Sydney and other appropriate centres throughout the state'.

Whalan was an effective speaker, although he lacked some of the rhetorical flair of his predecessor, Sam Lewis. Nevertheless, on this day he more than rose to the drama and history of the occasion. He asked the 2000 teachers in the Tivoli Theatre whether they were satisfied with class loads, the relief

Meetings of trainee teachers took place at Federation House and in Wollongong.

The 'Internationale', 'Solidarity Forever' or the 'Red Flag' were, it seems, inappropriate for the occasion.

S.M.H., 27 September 1968; Education, 9 October 1968, p.152. This account of the meeting is based on reports in the S.M.H. and D.T., 27 September 1968. Almost any Federation member who participated in these meetings has a cherished anecdote on the proceedings. The author himself was present at Federation House for the trainee teachers' meeting which was linked by landline to the main meeting. See also Bruce Mitchell 'In the Public Interest: the New South Wales Teachers' Strike of 1968', in John Iremonger, John Merritt and Graeme Osborne, Strikes: Studies in Twentieth Century Australian Social History, the Australian Society for the Study of Labour History and Angus and Robertson, 1973, pp.249-265. Mitchell wrote as a participant and an historian of the strike.
staff provision, ancillary staffing, the Board's handling of the salaries negotiations. To each question, they roared a resounding 'No'. He then asked whether any good purpose could be served by delaying the proposed action. The negative response was overwhelming. He then asked whether the meeting was sufficiently dissatisfied to endorse the proposed direct action. He was greeted with a loud 'Yes', then 'No' from a group opposed, which was followed by an 'earsplitting Yes' from the supporters.\(^{(14)}\)

During the debate the various notions of 'professionalism' were invoked. One speaker said that teachers 'as a body of professional men and women' had to be careful in their demands.\(^{(15)}\) Another speaker said that strike action would demonstrate that teachers could 'behave like professional people' who considered, 'the children they were teaching' and were less concerned about their own 'conditions and chances of promotion'.\(^{(16)}\) At the Wollongong meeting one speaker said that if teachers 'refrained from duty they would have lost something which they never will get back'. A voice from the audience replied: 'What have we got to lose?'\(^{(17)}\)

The Crookwell meeting, which was not on landline, voted 29 to 9 against the strike. A spokesman for the meeting told the local newspaper that the prevailing feeling was that a strike 'was not in keeping with the moral and professional precepts for which

\(^{(14)}\) S.M.H., 27 September 1968.


\(^{(17)}\) Illawarra Mercury, 27 September 1968.
a teacher stands'. (18) Even at the Wollongong meeting where the proposal was carried overwhelmingly, the chairman, Jim Dombroski, asked members to 'adopt a professional attitude' in debating the issue. (19)

The prime purpose of the meetings was to gauge whether the feeling of the members was such that they would attend in great numbers. (20) That question was firmly answered in the affirmative. They were the biggest teachers' meetings held in Australia to that time. In Sydney, 6685 teachers attended the meetings, 859 in Newcastle, 561 in Canberra, 287 in Orange and 902 in Wollongong. (21) The voting figures for the landline meetings were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tivoli Theatre</td>
<td>1472</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmore Park</td>
<td>3659</td>
<td>1014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6908</td>
<td>2386</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The statewide positive vote at the landline linked meetings was 74 per cent. (22) Of the meetings not on landline, 48 supported the proposal and 48 were in opposition. The strike was supported by

---

(19) Illawarra Mercury, 27 September 1968.
(20) Mitchell, op.cit., p.258.
(21) N.S.W.T.F., Annual Report 1968, p.8. There were 400 student teachers at the Sydney meeting and 92 in Wollongong.
(22) Education, 9 October 1968, p.152. Orange was in the heart of the Minister's electorate. Even so the chairman of the meeting gave an assurance that teachers would be guided by the state-wide decision. Western Daily, 27 September 1968. In Wollongong the affirmative vote was 81 per cent, in Sydney, 77 per cent.
1635 teachers and 1652 teachers opposed it.\(^{(23)}\) This vote reflected the remoteness of some country members from central Federation activity and illustrated the importance of the landline link in gaining such a positive overall response to the proposal.

History had been made! It was fifty years to the day since the union had been formed on 26 September 1918. A huge banner above the stage at the Tivoli Theatre proclaimed: 'Fifty Years of United Action'. A new chapter in the saga of 'united action' had begun on 26 September 1968. Teachers poured out of the meetings to local clubs and hotels. The celebration at the Teachers' Club went on beyond midnight.\(^{(24)}\) At one less public, but more ideologically-conscious gathering, a Federation officer declared: 'Today we have moved the bourgeoisie one half of one inch'.\(^{(25)}\)

The tone of the editorials next morning was, however, rather more sober. The *Daily Telegraph* said that teachers had given children 'a blackboard demonstration of irresponsibility...'.\(^{(26)}\) The *Herald* said that a teachers' strike 'would disturb others who regard teaching as a profession'. It conceded that the Board had 'been less than responsive' to the real grievances of teachers.\(^{(27)}\) The Industrial Commission, nevertheless, rejected Federation's submission that the Board had 'been negative and uncooperative'.

---

\(^{(23)}\) Special Council Meeting, 28 September 1968, Transcript, p.19.


\(^{(25)}\) J.S. Hagan is the source of this anecdote.


\(^{(27)}\) *S.M.H.*, 27 September 1968.
It directed Federation Council to desist from calling upon teachers 'to refrain from duty'. Cutler called the teachers' decision 'deplorable and pointless': it would 'achieve nothing but harm the children and teachers involved'.

The next day, Saturday 28 September, Federation Council considered the recommendations of the meetings. Whalan gave a lengthy report on Federation's negotiations with the Board. Reports were given by Councillors about the atmosphere at and decisions of various mass meetings. When Whalan moved the motion, he produced all the familiar arguments in favour of 'refraining from duty'. He added one more argument that had not been hitherto aired publicly. He warned that if Council did not call the strike, there would be stoppages by individual schools. That would be 'a worse proposition' than the one before Council. Only a one day stoppage would ensure the leadership 'maintained control of the situation with its members'.

Whalan had made a fascinating admission. He was clearly discomforted by the actions and threats of action that had taken place throughout the year. While they provided new opportunities, they also challenged the traditional understanding of 'united action' of the membership, controlled by the leadership. While the actions had contributed to the development of the concept of


(29) D.T., 29 September 1968.


(31) ibid., p.22. Similar comments were made by Joyce Clarke and Laurie Constantine.
'united action', they also created the potential for the destruction of the concept itself. It was, therefore, necessary for the whole membership to 'refrain from duty' to make it more difficult for more militant elements within the Federation to challenge the control of action exercised by the central decision making bodies of the Federation.

During the debate on Whalan's motion all the familiar arguments for and against the strike were canvassed. Speakers from the country doubted the strike would be widely supported in their areas.(32) Other country Councillors reported strong support in their usually 'conservative' areas.(33) Another speaker argued that it was more difficult for primary teachers to strike than for secondary teachers who taught older and more independent children.(34) A Councillor who was an infants teacher retorted that teachers were more than 'child-minders,' they were 'educators'.(35)

'Professionalism' was invoked to support the motion. The Minister was endeavouring to 'degrade' teachers' professional status.(36) The strike was to defend it.(37) Indeed teachers

(32) Len Childs (Canberra), Mrs C. McLean (Griffith), George Stanton (Newcastle), ibid., pp.4, 12 and 15. (Change of pagination in typescript).

(33) Douglas Whitton (Coffs Harbour), A. Jones (Camden-Campbelltown), ibid., pp.10-12.

(34) G.A. Dodd (Kurri Kurri, Morisset), ibid., p.7.

(35) Shirley Bains (Women Teachers) ibid., p.9.

(36) Eric Earley (Hawkesbury), ibid., p.10.

(37) Frank Harvison, (Nambucca), ibid., p.9.
were exercising their 'professional duty' in striking for the progress of education. Other Councillors argued that Federation would lose its industrial 'credibility' if Council backed away from a one day strike.

Whalan reflected on these sentiments in his reply to the debate.

To my mind you've passed the point of no return. This Council went to its members through these mass meetings asking for their opinions. To my mind, you've got them, overwhelmingly, and if you refuse to accept the opinion expressed by your membership, you negate the whole principle of unionism.

Council easily defeated two alternative propositions: a half day strike and a postal ballot of members on the proposed strike action. A division was called. Whalan's recommendation was carried; 114 Councillors recorded their names in favour; 24 against.

Many teachers, however, made their decisions about whether to support the strike far removed from the rarified atmosphere of Council debates and the vigour and the thrust of mass meetings. There were more influences on teachers than the publicity material distributed by the Federation to its members. They were also influenced by statements of politicians, expressions of opinion leaders such as local newspapers, publicity generated by the Federation Reform Committee, as well as a whole

(38) George Smith (Teachers' College Lecturers), ibid., p.34.
(39) Barry Manefield (Principals) and Richard Walsham (Men Teachers), ibid., pp.28 and 31.
(40) ibid., p.36.
(41) Council, Minutes, 28 September 1968, p.190.
range of informal and undocumented sources. Country teachers, in particular, were subject to close community scrutiny and thus were more susceptible to local influences than teachers living in Sydney, Newcastle and Wollongong.

The Crookwell Gazette declared that the community was used to 'strikes by watersiders and others of that ilk, but teachers as a body were representative of all that is moderate in thought and action'. Teachers have the right to bargain collectively, but to strike; 'never', it concluded. The Dubbo Liberal called on 'responsible' teachers, to abandon the proposed 'illegal action'. Other country newspapers were prepared to concede the legitimacy of teachers' grievances, but few were willing to support the strike itself.

The Federation Reform Committee re-emerged as the strike approached. Secretary Marceline O'Riordan, said the strike was illegal under rule seven of the Federation's constitution. Publicity officer, F.S. Salter predicted that 75 per cent of the teachers would ignore the strike call. Federation took


(43) Dubbo Liberal, 29 September 1968.

(44) Of the comprehensive collection of newspaper cuttings held on the strike by the Federation, only three newspapers gave any support for the action. Broken Hill Truth, 1 October 1968, Canberra Times, 1 October 1968 and Yass Tribune, 3 October 1968.

(45) Singleton Argus, 30 September 1968. See also D.T. and S.M.H., 1 October 1968 (Advertisements). Rule 7 stated in part, that 'Neither the Federation nor any part of its members shall take part in any illegal strike...'. Such a rule is a condition of registration as an industrial organisation in N.S.W.

(46) Singleton Argus, 30 September 1968.
steps to counter such publicity. Whalan appeared on television. Commercials were shown on 12 television stations and broadcast over 28 radio stations and advertisements were inserted in the press.

On the eve of the strike, Director-General Wyndham issued a direction that all schools were to remain open. Mrs B.S. Backhouse, the President of the Federation of Parents and Citizens' Associations, said parents would be available to assist Principals with supervision. She denounced the strike, as did Cutler, who also appealed to teachers to ignore the union's directive.

On the other hand, many school staffs met to have a final discussion about the strike. At Federation House telephones rang constantly as schools reported the results of their meetings: most in favour; some against. By the afternoon of 30 September, Federation officers were confident that 80 per cent of members would support the strike.

---

(47) Executive, Minutes, 8 October 1968, p.448.

(48) ibid., See also Australian, D.T., S.M.H., 30 September 1968. Interview with Bill Leslie, 1 July 1968.

(49) Mirror, Sun, 30 September 1968.

(50) S.M.H., 1 October 1968.

(51) Sunday Telegraph, 29 September 1968.

(52) Mitchell op.cit., p.260. See also 'High Schools in Support of Stop Work Meeting', in '1968 printed material file, N.S.W.T.F. archives.
As teachers made their way to mass meetings the next morning they received final advice from the press. The Telegraph asked how children could be expected 'to respect the law' if teachers 'break it themselves'. The Bega News commended non-striking teachers for preferring 'more intellectual and dignified means of achieving' their objectives than taking strike action. The Armidale Express believed that the stoppage threatened 'the very foundation of society'. The Herald was however, less critical. The strike was a 'serious mistake' but it conceded that 'something must be radically wrong' when teachers 'with a long tradition of duty and service are moved to strike'.

Most teachers were, however, loyal to their union. The main mass meeting at Wentworth Park was attended by 12,400 teachers. This number represented nearly 40 per cent of the total membership and was probably the largest single union meeting held in Australia to that time. Teachers sat in school groups. A band of Sydney Teachers' College students paraded around the ground carrying banners, amidst the applause of the assembled teachers. Whalan, Mattick and Lancaster addressed the meeting. Resolutions

(53) D.T., 30 September 1968.
(54) Bega News, 1 October 1968.
(55) Armidale Express, 30 September 1968. See also Grafton Examiner, Inverell Times and Temora Independent, 30 September 1968.
(56) S.M.H. 1 October 1968.
were passed. One condemned the Public Service Board and the government for their numerous failures, another called for Cutler's resignation. The meeting asked Council to direct teachers not to take classes with more than 37 students in 1969.\(^{(57)}\)

The Wollongong meeting was also well attended. It was, in part, a celebration of the vanguard role taken by Illawarra teachers in the relief campaign.\(^{(58)}\) At the Bathurst meeting, one speaker predicted that the state government would use the strike to exert leverage on the federal government for more funds for education.\(^{(59)}\) In Broken Hill, there had been a tied vote at the pre-strike mass meeting. On 1 October, however, 70 per cent of all teachers supported the action.\(^{(60)}\) In Goulburn there was almost 100 per cent support for the strike.\(^{(61)}\) At the Albury meeting the Association president argued that the strike was not about wages.\(^{(62)}\) The Gundagai meeting, where 88 per cent of the members attended, was reported with the headline 'Teachers followed like sheep'.\(^{(63)}\) In Tumut 70 per cent attended the meeting, but the local newspaper gave prominence to six secondary teachers who believed Federation should have held a


\(^{(58)}\) Illawarra Mercury, 2 October 1968.

\(^{(59)}\) Western Advocate, 2 October 1968.

\(^{(60)}\) Education, 6 November 1968, p.165.

\(^{(61)}\) Goulburn Evening Post, 1 October 1968.

\(^{(62)}\) Border Morning Mail, 2 October 1968.

\(^{(63)}\) Gundagai Independent, 3 October 1968.
'referendum' on the issue.\(^{(64)}\) But whatever the tone of the reportage, the strike had made a dramatic impact throughout the state. Federation claimed 80 per cent of teachers supported the action.\(^{(65)}\)

In the afternoon in Sydney, teachers gathered in Macquarie Street in front of Parliament House. Federation claimed 5,000 were present, the Herald, only 2,000.\(^{(66)}\) Inside the Legislative Assembly, Labor members harried the Minister during question time.\(^{(67)}\) The crowd outside shouted, chanted, sang and waved placards. The crowd chorused 'We want Cutler' and 'Cutler must resign'. Opposition Leader, Pat Hills, was cheered, as was Jack Whalan.\(^{(68)}\)

It was not only the leaders who attracted attention. The Herald interviewed three rank and file women teachers. The first said that the strike was an act of 'desperation'. Teachers 'had protested and petitioned' without success. The second teacher insisted that teachers were not 'worried about money'. The third teacher said she was 'not glad' to be on strike, 'but it was the

\(^{(64)}\) Tumut Times, 4 October 1968.

\(^{(65)}\) D.T., 2 October 1982. This was not challenged at the time. Some time later, however, Cutler told the Legislative Assembly that 62 per cent of teachers had supported the strike, N.S.W.P.D., Legislative Assembly, 13 March 1969, p.4510.

\(^{(66)}\) S.M.H., 2 October, 1968.

\(^{(67)}\) N.S.W.P.D., Legislative Assembly, 1 October 1968, pp.1404-1411.

only thing to do'. She was 'acting as a responsible member' of her 'profession' by taking strike action. The feature writer commented:

These three teachers love their job, and want to do it well. They believe, the strike was necessary to show how deprived the education system is. They believe they would be shirking their duty if they did not protest as much as possible. (69)

The Aftermath

The strike had been essentially a protest action. Nothing, except perhaps the re-opening of salaries negotiations, was expected to flow immediately from the action. On the day of the strike, however, the state government announced that it would ask the Commonwealth for an additional $5 million for school buildings. (70) A few days later, the government added $1 million for education to the Budget estimates. (71) This was followed by an announcement that three-year training for teachers would be introduced. New teachers' colleges were to be erected at Lismore and Westmead. (72) The government insisted that these decisions had 'been in the pipeline' for some time. While this was probably the case it could not be suggested that the decisions were unrelated to the activities of teachers leading to the strike. The Sydney Morning Herald seemed to have little doubt on the question:

(69) S.M.H., 2 October 1968.
(70) Mirror, 2 October 1968.
(71) Education, 6 November 1968, p.166.
(72) ibid.
'Who can blame the teachers for going on strike? Their one-day stoppage was worth every penny of the $250,000 they lost in wages.'(73)

The significance of these gains was not lost on the Federation leadership. Whalan wrote of a 'new dynamism' in the union. The tradition of 'united action' had taken a new direction. But unity that was 'passive, lethargic or inactive' was 'not enough'. The union was 'unified and active as never before'. He denied teachers had lost community respect. In fact the union movement held the Federation 'in higher regard than ever before'. The task for the union was to maintain 'this new unity, dynamism and respect'.(74) This was Whalan's celebratory tone for the membership. Whalan, however, had argued for the strike, in part because it would head off schools taking matters into their own hands. The 'new dynamism' was to be celebrated, but it also had to be watched very carefully.

Eric Earley however, saw the strike in a different light. It 'should not be seen as a departure from traditional tactics, but rather as a logical outcome of the failure of traditional methods' of campaigning. The stoppage should not be seen as 'an end in itself'. It merely marks the beginning of a greater involvement of Federation members in pursuit of 'ideal educational conditions'.(75)

(73) S.M.H., 16 October 1968.

(74) Education, 6 November 1968, p.166. See also Elizabeth Mattick's comments in Education, 4 December 1968, Jubilee Supplement, p.iii.

(75) Ibid., p.175.
Earley saw sections of the membership as the dynamic force; the members were no longer to be followers of the union leadership. These two conceptions of the union would contend for hegemony, during the rest of Whalan's presidency and beyond.

Why 1968?

Why had the strike taken place in 1968 and not before? This chapter has largely been an analysis of the events leading to the strike. Some more general factors, however, require discussion.

There can be little doubt that the Minister has to bear some responsibility for the strike. Federation had reasonably amicable relations with post-war Education Ministers. Even when relations with the Labor government soured in the early 1960s, Wetherell was never the bete noire Cutler had so soon become with the Federation. His reluctance to meet with, and his suspicion of the leadership, was not conducive to productive exchange. The failure of the government to establish the Education Commission further soured relations between Cutler and the union. The sense of betrayal among the membership ran deep.

Like all Ministers for Education, however, Cutler was subject to the financial restrictions placed on state governments by the Commonwealth. Federation was not unconscious of this and, indeed, gave Askin and Cutler support in their efforts to extract more money from the federal government. (76)

In September 1968, Executive considered a report on the financial problems of the states. It concluded that the formula for the allocation of general purpose grants to the states did not provide them 'with sufficient funds necessary to maintain the important and essential community services they provide'. General purpose grants to the states had fallen from 38 per cent of income tax revenue in 1959-1960 to 30 per cent in 1968-1969, an effective cut of $500 million for the period. The general tax reimbursement increased by $136 million between 1959-1960 and 1968-9. In the same period the states had increased expenditure on education alone by $152 million. (77)

Was then the Federation misdirecting its fire? Campaigns for improved funding at both state and federal levels were regarded, by Federation, as indivisible. Campaigns directed at the state government were, in part, directed at pressuring the state to put pressure on the Commonwealth. On the other hand, the federal funding campaigns had brought State Aid, but very little benefit to public education. Indeed between 1964-1965 and 1967-1968 the percentage of specific purpose grants for education from the Commonwealth fell from 1.74 to 1.35 per cent of the total N.S.W. expenditure on education. (78) These fiscal difficulties were hardly the product of the political complexion of the N.S.W. government.

(77) ibid., attachment, p.1.

In the latter half of the 1960s, it became good politics to concentrate on the state government. The state government still had the prime responsibility for education funding. The N.S.W. government and its agencies, the Board and the Department, were closer and more visible targets than the federal government. For teachers, their decisions clearly affected their working conditions. The federal government may have had the money, but it was not perceived as exercising power over the immediate working lives of teachers.

The new generation of teachers were likely to be more adventurous in the tactics they adopted to fight the state government than their older colleagues. They were more likely to be less patient about their working conditions amidst post-war prosperity and rising community expectations about the provision of education.

1968 itself was a year of revolt in Europe and North America. There were major student-led revolts in France and West Germany as well as the 'Prague Spring' in Czechoslovakia. It was not a good year for properly constituted authority in Australia. The age of Menzies had passed; there was a growing movement against conscription and the war in Vietnam. The action of teachers in N.S.W. in 1968 was a faint echo of these global and national upheavals.

These fundamental political and industrial changes provided new opportunities for the leadership of the union. People such as Lewis, Mattick and their supporters had no ideological objection to the use of the strike weapon. Their long-standing caution about it was merely tactical. As the mood
of teachers appeared to be changing in 1967 and 1968, it took no great ideological adjustment for these people to direct the discontent of the membership towards large protest industrial action. Even Whalan, despite his private reservations, was caught up in the momentum of the events, the 'new dynamism'.

The strike, however, unleashed forces which were not entirely welcome to the leadership of the union. What constituted 'united action of the membership' was to be the subject of the constant dispute during the rest of Whalan's presidency. The question for Whalan and many others was whether there was to be responsible, co-ordinated 'united action' controlled by the leadership, or whether the priorities of the union were to be determined by vanguard minorities within the membership. For these elements the caution of those, who were seen as the 'old guard' had become dated. Their caution, it was argued, obstructed progress. A new era of internal discord was to rack the union in the ensuing years. The challenge however did not come from the Right, who had invoked a particular conception of 'professionalism' to preach responsibility and compliance with constituted authority. Rather the challenge came from people who saw themselves as a 'New Left', unlike the 'old guard' whose political and industrial arteries, they believed, had begun to harden. The 'old guard', it was thought, threatened the 'new dynamism' which had been produced by the great act of united action - redefined - of 1968.
CHAPTER NINE

'UNITED ACTION' OR 'INDUSTRIAL ANARCHY'
This chapter examines the impact of the 'new dynamism' within the Federation in the period 1968 to 1972. It considers the continuing argument between those advocating greater local initiative in tactical matters, and those who desired to maintain the maximum control of action by the leadership and the central decision making bodies of the union. In particular, it examines the conflict between Jack Whalan and his associates and a motley group of dissidents who regarded the tactics employed by the leadership as outdated in a changing political and industrial climate.

This period presents the observer with some difficulties in devising nomenclature for the contending tendencies within the union. The 'old guard' leadership contained Communist Party members and their non-party associates, whose methods of industrial and political work had developed within the 'united front' tradition. It also included elements who saw themselves as being located in the centre of the political spectrum. It received support from conservative elements who did not subscribe to overtly anti-Communist methods, but were nevertheless cautious about the political and industrial tactics that ought be employed by Federation following the 1968 strike.

Ranged against the 'old guard' were a motley group of activists and idealists, and younger Communists. Some were idealists, who were active in the struggle for educational improvement, but who were not primarily motivated by a broader vision of social progress. Others were activists of the 'New Left', swept along by the resistance and confrontationist politics of the anti-conscription and anti-Vietnam War movements of the period. Others were younger Communists who saw an opportunity to
forge a new alliance of the Left, which would also provide some counter balance against the less thoughtful adventurism of some of the activists. For the purpose of this exercise this group will be referred to as the 'dissidents' or the 'opposition'. The 'old guard' elements will be referred to as the 'united front' or 'leadership group'.(1)

The period from the 1968 Annual Conference to mid-1969 was characterised by a series of skirmishes between the leadership group and the dissidents. Both Whalan and Mattick had warned the 1968 Annual Conference that it was imperative that the 'control of action' remain in the 'hands of Council' during 1969.(2) The Conference resolution on working conditions asked schools and associations to forward proposals for action for consideration by March Council. Until that time, any action taken had to be with the 'agreement of the three Senior Officers and General Secretary'. This retreated from the formulation of the previous Annual Conference. After a lengthy debate and a complicated series of procedural manoeuvres, the leadership's formulation was adopted.(3) The leadership had won the first tactical battle, but it was clear that there was an active group which dissented

(1) Harvey Rose, himself a 'dissident' uses the terms 'united front' and 'activists'. This implies that the 'united front' group were opposed to activism, per se. Rather their critique was of certain kinds of action. H.J. Rose, "The New Era" or Some Tendencies, within the New South Wales Teachers' Federation, 1968-1971'. M.Ed. thesis, University of Sydney, 1973.


(3) ibid.
from the leadership's conception about the nature and control of action. In his first 'President Writes' column for 1969, Whalan hailed the decision as a victory for 'united action'.(4)

The Department of Education, however, was concerned that some teachers would refuse to carry out 'properly assigned duties'.(5) Principals were directed to report such teachers to the Department. The Federation Executive described the instruction as 'provocative and intimidatory' and decided to give appropriate publicity to the memorandum.(6) Whalan, nevertheless, warned members against taking 'unorganised action' which could 'result only in industrial anarchy'.(7)

An industrial campaign, against the Departmental instruction and in pursuit of improvements in working conditions generally, was complicated by the fact that negotiations had resumed on salaries. Education, indeed, had declared 1969 to be 'Salaries Year'.(8) If schools took industrial action on working conditions then the Public Service Board would be given an excuse to suspend negotiations with the Federation about salaries. The Executive, therefore, recommended to March Council that the campaign on working conditions should be a traditional,

(4) ibid., p.2. In this statement he invoked Don Taylor and Sam Lewis as the apostles of 'united action'. The same issue carried Don Taylor's account of fifty years of Federation history (p.3) and a message from Sam Lewis on the need to maintain unity (p.14).


(6) ibid., p.18.

(7) ibid.

(8) ibid., p.21.
non-industrial one of publicity, letters, telegrams and deputations to politicians.\(^9\) John Frederick admitted that some Councillors would be disappointed with the recommendation.\(^{10}\) After a fierce debate and a passionate plea for unity from Whalan, the Executive's plan was adopted.\(^{11}\) Whalan told members in the next issue of *Education* that Council had decided to 'retain command of the responsibility for all action', and thus had deliberately revised the 1967 decision to authorise 'individual staffs or individual teachers to take independent action.'\(^{12}\) He subsequently assured members, however, that the Council decision did not prevent teachers from refusing extras within Federation policy.\(^{13}\)

Nevertheless there was evidence of unrest among sections of the membership. A meeting of teachers at Bankstown resolved to support teachers who refused to carry out 'non-professional' tasks.\(^{14}\) Teachers at Lurnea High School who refused extras were reported to the Department of Education.\(^{15}\) Staff at Broken Hill High School complained about 631 'extras' issued at the school by 14 March.\(^{16}\) Teachers at Condell Park High School threatened to reduce class sizes by creating additional classes and then leaving them unattended, in order to force the

\(^{(10)}\) *Education*, 19 March 1969, p.33.  
\(^{(11)}\) *ibid.*  
\(^{(12)}\) *ibid.*  
\(^{(13)}\) *ibid.*, 16 April 1969, p.54.  
\(^{(14)}\) *ibid.*, 2 April 1969, p.42.  
\(^{(15)}\) *ibid.*, p.47.  
\(^{(16)}\) *ibid.*, 16 April 1969, p.61.
appointment of additional staff.\textsuperscript{(17)} The Executive decided to call a Special Association and School Delegates conference to discuss the situation.\textsuperscript{(18)}

Meanwhile Federation found itself before the Industrial Commission. Federation's barrister J.B. Sweeney assured the Commission that the Executive and Council had endeavoured to restrain direct action, but warned that there was a great deal of unrest throughout the teaching service.\textsuperscript{(19)} Federation and the Department accepted a recommendation from the Commission that a departmental liaison officer be appointed to deal with staffing difficulties as they arose. Federation agreed that no industrial action would be taken on staffing until the union had drawn the liaison officer's attention to any particular staffing problems.\textsuperscript{(20)} Federation Council in April, however, authorised school staffs to take action to alleviate 'adverse working conditions...after consultation with the Senior Officers and the General Secretary'.\textsuperscript{(21)} It was implied however, that action should not be of a direct variety. Nevertheless the leadership was endeavoursing to walk a tightrope between jeopardising the salaries negotiations and permitting members a considerable amount of autonomy to pursue improvements in their working conditions.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{(17)} N.S.W.T.F., \textit{Annual Report 1969}, p.6.
\item \textsuperscript{(18)} Executive, \textit{Minutes}, 18 March 1969, p.78.
\item \textsuperscript{(19)} \textit{Education}, 16 April 1969, p.61.
\item \textsuperscript{(20)} \textit{ibid.}, 30 April 1969, p.74.
\item \textsuperscript{(21)} \textit{ibid.}, p.67.
\end{itemize}
Association and School Delegates' Conference

Association and School Delegates' Conferences, unlike Annual or Special Conferences, were not policy making bodies. Nevertheless the conference which assembled on 31 May was a large and representative gathering of 1,600 delegates. It was therefore expected that its deliberations would have a significant influence upon the tactics to be adopted by the union during 1969. It became a testing ground for the contending tactical perspectives of the leadership and its critics.

The Conference considered four matters: salaries, ancillary staffing, the Education Commission and the campaign on working conditions. Without a great deal of debate it rejected the Board's latest salary offer and the recommendation of the Rydge enquiry to establish a largely powerless Education Advisory Commission rather than an Education Commission. On the question of ancillary staff, it accepted a recommendation from

---

(22) ibid., 18 June 1969, p.101. The Conference consisted of delegates from

105 metropolitan high schools
106 country high schools
106 metropolitan primary schools
134 country primary schools
64 metropolitan infants schools
27 country infants schools
119 councillors
102 country associations
22 metropolitan associations

Annual or Special Conferences usually had less than 500 delegates.

(23) ibid.
the leadership that members refuse to perform certain categories of 'non-professional' duties after 1 July.\(^\text{(24)}\) On the question of class sizes and relief staff, however, the leadership did not prevail. 'Full Federation support' was to be given to school and college staffs that took action on these matters after 1 July.\(^\text{(25)}\) The leadership's proposal to meet growing discontent by conducting an industrial campaign on 'non-professional' duties had been deemed insufficient by the delegates.

The matter was considered by Council on 7 June. After a fierce debate, Council, by 69 votes to 67, substituted the Conference's formulation with the statement that full Federation support for any proposed industrial action would be forthcoming when schools and colleges had obtained 'prior approval' from Executive.\(^\text{(26)}\) This was an even more restrictive formulation than merely seeking approval of the senior officers of the union. Executive met less frequently than the senior officers. Such a formulation, therefore, was hardly calculated to encourage members to take action on class sizes and relief staff. Whalan proclaimed the Council decision as an 'endorsement' of the policy the leadership had enunciated since the 1968 Annual Conference.\(^\text{(27)}\)

\(^{24}\) *ibid.*. Such tasks included clerical work such as typing and duplicating, handling money and other tasks, including gardening and maintenance and the handling and storage of stock supplies.

\(^{25}\) *ibid.*

\(^{26}\) *ibid.*

\(^{27}\) *ibid.*, 'President Writes' column.
The Delegates' Conference had also requested Council to consider calling mass meetings to vote on a one-day strike, and to mount a major publicity campaign on conditions in schools and colleges. Council, however, decided to call mass meetings to consider two propositions: first a one day strike and second a ten dollars voluntary levy for a major publicity campaign. In 1968 there had been only two options, to support a strike or vote against it. In 1969, the levy proposal provided an 'out' for those who were wavering on the strike question.

**Mass Meetings - 10 July**

In urging members to attend the mass meetings, Whalan argued that the view that teachers should not strike 'in any circumstances', was outmoded. He, however, warned that 'industrial anarchy' would prevail if those who would use 'any excuse' for a strike had their way. He neither endorsed nor opposed the strike, but argued forcefully that there was a demonstrable need for a large publicity fund. The members followed the President's advice. The strike proposal was defeated 8,090 to 9,098 in a state wide vote on 10 July. The second proposal, however, was carried 11,253 to 6,558. What had changed since September 1968?

In 1968, it was clear little progress had been made on a wide range of issues, except on the relief question. In June 1969, however, a government appointed committee recommended a maximum class size of 30 students in the first four years of

(28) ibid.
secondary school. Moreover, a similar committee was due to report on ancillary staffing in July 1969. Although initiatives had not produced any concrete results, they were at least signs of some progress.

A climate of rising expectations, however, is often a propitious time for concerted action to be taken. Successful action depends to a considerable degree on leadership. In 1968, there was a growing rank and file movement taking action on the relief question. It had encouraged Lancaster, Mattick and Frederick to push for a one day strike, particularly during Whalan's crucial absence overseas. When Whalan had returned in 1968, he had given all the public appearances of being strongly in favour of the strike. In 1969, in different circumstances, the leadership had tried to contain rank and file activity and Whalan himself had railed continuously against those who wished to take action without reference to the central bodies of the union. The levy proposal had, moreover, provided an option to the membership that had not been available in 1968. Finally salaries had become a more pressing matter in 1969. The fear that a comprehensive industrial campaign on working conditions would compromise salaries and other negotiations was a fear which was not confined to the leadership.

There seemed to be justification for this caution. Before the mass meetings, Council had decided to proceed with the bans on non-professional duties. The Board then broke off

negotiations with the Federation regarding the provision of ancillary staff. The Executive had a difficult choice. Bans could be suspended in the hope the Board would offer something concrete on ancillary staff. Conversely, the bans could be maintained in order to force the Board to resume negotiations. A minority element in the Executive argued that lifting the bans would undermine the industrial strength of the union.\(^{(31)}\) This view did not prevail; the bans were suspended.\(^{(32)}\)

The Federation met the Board on 1 August. The Board promised a significant increase in clerical and other ancillary staff over a five year period. This represented some progress on the matter and could be interpreted in different ways, according to whether one was an advocate of united action or local initiative. It could be represented as a victory for the tactics of the Executive in both 'turning on' and 'turning off' action at appropriate times. Acceptance of the Executive decision to lift the bans, however, had not been achieved without difficulty. The Illawarra associations had, indeed, voted to continue the bans after Executive had suspended them.\(^{(33)}\) Only after some pressure from the leadership did the Illawarra teachers comply with the Council decision.\(^{(34)}\) The Illawarra associations had played a vanguard role in 1968 and 1969. In 1969 they came close

---

\(^{(31)}\) *Education*, 13 August 1969, p.141. The divisions within the Executive were actually reported in *Education*: a rare occurrence.


to defying the central decision making bodies of the union. The leadership, on the other hand, had to balance what vanguard sections were prepared to do, against what they calculated the rest of the membership was prepared to do. The tactical decisions of the union would continue to be a search for a compromise between vanguard activism and general membership passivity. After the skirmish with the Illawarra associations, the leadership was to face a different kind of challenge to its right to decide what, in any given circumstances, constituted 'full Federation support'.

The Freney Case

During the September vacation prominent Federation activist, Denis Freney was transferred from Pittwater High School to Mosman High School. Margaret Stephens from Mosman replaced him at Pittwater. Freney claimed he was being victimised for his Federation activities. Federation sought the cancellation of the transfers. The Department established a 'fact finding' enquiry into the 'affair' at Pittwater High School. Federation demanded that a teacher's friend or representative of the Federation be present at the enquiry. This was declined by the Department. On Federation advice, most teachers at the school refused to speak to the departmental officer sent to conduct the enquiry on 10 September. Federation decided to call a press conference on 14 September and a meeting of teachers in the Manly-Warringah area on 15 September. (35)

At the press conference Whalan emphasised the rights of individual teachers in disciplinary enquiries.\(^{(36)}\) Much less emphasis, however, was given to the rights of activists to conduct union business within their schools. The focus was juridical, rather than industrial. 228 Manly-Warringah teachers, meeting on 15 September, directed Federation representatives in local secondary schools to ask their members to vote on a proposal for a stopwork meeting between 9 a.m. and 10 a.m. on 19 September. Within two days, and not without a degree of local organisation,\(^{(37)}\) there was an 80 per cent affirmative voted for stop work action.\(^{(38)}\) The matter was now firmly an industrial dispute.

The Federation Executive, however, decided to call off the stop work action, to refer the matter to the Industrial Commission and request it to arrange for an enquiry into 'the administration of the school which has caused the inharmonious relationships at the school'. While the enquiry proceeded the transfers of Freney and Stephens should be cancelled.\(^{(39)}\)

Counsel for the Public Service Board assured the Commission that Freney's transfer arose from a 'clash of personalities' between the Principal and some members of staff. He told the Commission that Freney was not being disciplined for


\(^{(37)}\) Rose, op.cit., p.34; Interview with Ray Cavenagh, 4 August 1983.

\(^{(38)}\) Rose, ibid., S.M.H., 18 September 1969

any offence. The Commission suggested the parties confer. Out of the conference came the agreement that the Board would conduct an enquiry under Section 9 of the Public Service Act. After further negotiation, the parties agreed that the enquiry would consider the 'conduct' and 'transfer of Freney' and 'such other matters as may be found relevant' to Freney's transfer.\(^{(40)}\)

Federation's tactics were to find the maximum room to manoeuvre within the rules of the game largely determined by the various instrumentalities of the State. Freney and his supporters in the Manly-Warringah area thought the Federation should employ less law and more industrial action. To that end the Manly-Warringah Association called a meeting for 22 September. It was decided to hold a stop work meeting from 2.30 p.m. on 25 September with or without the support of the Federation.\(^{(41)}\) Freney himself decided to boycott the Board enquiry.

Federation Executive met on 23 September and heard a report on the first day of the enquiry at which Freney did not appear.\(^{(42)}\) Freney was urged, 'in the interests of all teachers' to appear before the enquiry.\(^{(43)}\) Assistant General Secretary Bill Leslie was despatched to the Manly-Warringah schools to dissuade teachers from supporting the stop work action.\(^{(44)}\) His efforts, it seems, met with some success. Only 15 teachers eventually supported the unauthorised stop work

\(^{(40)}\) ibid.

\(^{(41)}\) Rose, op.cit., p.37.


\(^{(43)}\) Executive, Minutes, 23 September 1969, p.530.

\(^{(44)}\) Rose, op.cit., p.38. Interview with Bill Leslie, 1 July 1983.
action. Nevertheless, the striking teachers issued a press release condemning the Department, the Board and the Federation for their various actions. 'Teachers', they said, should not be the subject of 'elaborate games between Bridge St., Sussex St., and lawyers'. It was not good enough for the union to become 'just another bureaucracy'. The Federation's over-dependence on 'legalism' could result in a 'corresponding loss of human values'.

The matter had been complicated by the intervention of Liberal parliamentarian Peter Coleman. On 23 September he told the Legislative Assembly that Freney was a part of a group of teachers 'committed to revolution' who would use their positions to advance their 'cause'.

Coleman's intervention probably strengthened the resolve of the Federation leadership to concentrate on defending Freney's employment rights within the quasi-legal avenues open to it, rather than developing a broad industrial response as desired by Freney and some of the Manly-Warringah teachers. Freney's activities in the anti-conscription and anti-Vietnam war movements as well as his alleged Trotskyist political orientation, were a matter of notoriety. These activities probably made him that much more difficult to defend.

---


The matter dragged on for some months. Freney reluctantly agreed to appear before the enquiry. Counsel assisting the enquiry argued that Freney's transfer was a 'minor administrative procedure', not victimisation. The enquiry eventually found that Freney's transfer had indeed been justified.

The Freney case raised the question of the individual's rights to determine tactics in an industrial dispute. Some of his supporters in the Manly-Warringah area actually defied a direction not to stop work. Previously the Illawarra associations had defied the Federation's suspension of the bans on 'non-professional' duties. While the defiance was significant, it was short-lived. To carry it through would have brought the associations into possibly irreparable conflict with the leadership of the union. In the last instance, the Illawarra leadership had to accept the decisions of the central organs of the union. Rank and file democratic initiative had given way to democratic centralism.

The political orientations of the Manly-Warringah dissidents were, however, different from that of the Illawarra leadership. Doris Jobling, the Federation organiser in the area, was one of the younger generation of Communists who challenged the cautious 'united front' tactics of an older generation of Communist teachers. Leading Manly-Warringah dissidents Ray Cavenagh, Clare Cavenagh, Graham Ashton and Harvey Rose were committed to improvements in educational provision. They were

(48) S.M.H., 16 October 1969. Inquiry Under Section 9 of the Public Service Act, Transcript, p.104.

(49) S.M.H., 1 November 1969. Inquiry under Section 9 of the Public Service Act, Findings, 29 October 1969, p.7.
Influenced by the 'New Left' tendencies of the late 1960s, without being necessarily committed to, or motivated by, a broader analysis of capitalist society. Their tactics tended to be individualistic, idealist, perhaps even adventurist, rather than cautious and collectivist. The Manly-Warringah activists were a microcosm of a heterogeneous group of dissidents within the union challenging the 'united front' tactics of the leadership.\(^{(50)}\)

The Freney case was a symptom of a growing disaffection with the 'old guard' leadership and with Whalan in particular. This disaffection was manifested in the elections for the senior officers of the union and again at Annual Conference.

1969 Senior Officers Election

Whalan was challenged for the Presidency by Executive member Eric Earley. Earley was of the Left, but not closely associated with the style of politics represented by the 'old guard'. He attracted wide support from a rather heterogeneous group of dissidents in the union.\(^{(51)}\) Whalan, on the other hand could boast support from sixteen out of the seventeen Executive members of the union.\(^{(52)}\) Earley argued that there had been a 'lack of positive leadership and vacillation on major issues'.\(^{(53)}\) Whalan said the return of the existing senior

\(^{(50)}\) This analysis is based to a considerable extent on an interview with Ray Cavenagh, 4 August 1983, and less formal discussion with other participants in the events.

\(^{(51)}\) Eric Earley election leaflet, Miscellaneous elections material folder, Sam Lewis papers, N.S.W.T.F. archives.

\(^{(52)}\) Education, 22 October 1969, p.181. Whalan's election statement. Earley himself was the other Executive member.

\(^{(53)}\) ibid., Earley's election statement.
officers would consolidate the 'unity' of the Federation. (54) This unity however, would be achieved through a representative model of democracy. The concept of unity promoted by the 'super militants' was badly 'warped'. If it prevailed Federation could become a 'disorganised ineffectual rabble'. The decisions of the majority must prevail, and militant 'minorities' must be bound by the decisions of Conference, Executive and Council. The 'super militants' were indeed a greater threat to the stability of the union than the Federation Reform Committee. (55) Earley was not identified as a 'super militant', but Whalan's intention was clear.

Despite the vehemence of Whalan's attacks Earley polled well against Whalan. (56) The 'super militants', it seemed, were not without significant support within the membership.

1969 Annual Conference

The 1969 Annual Conference was overshadowed by the salaries issue. Negotiations with the Board had continued during

(54) ibid.
(55) ibid., 'President Writes' column.
(56) ibid., 4 February 1970

Senior Officers Election - 1969 (55)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Preferences</th>
<th>President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.G. Earley</td>
<td>6,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.J. Whalan</td>
<td>8,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.P. Stanton</td>
<td>2,814</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After distribution of Stanton's preferences

| E.G. Earley       | 7,944     |
| W.J. Whalan       | 9,434     |

Mattick and Frederick were not challenged by Earley's supporters.
1969 without a satisfactory result being achieved. The matter went before the Industrial Commission. On 22 October it granted the Federation's interim claim of 12 per cent, and set dates in October and November to hear a full 'work value' case on the balance of the Federation's claim. (57)

On 20 November, a meeting of 1,200 examination markers expressed dissatisfaction with the rates for marking School Certificate and Higher School Certificate papers. (58) The Public Service Board declined to vary the rates. (59) On 22 November, Council directed the teachers to cease marking from 4 p.m. on 24 November, despite Whalan's warning that this action might jeopardise the salaries case. (60) The Industrial Commission suspended the hearing after application by the Board. Federation Executive called off the action by the markers. This decision was endorsed by a meeting of markers on 25 November, although only after a stormy debate, and with no great enthusiasm. (61) Once again the interests of the whole of the membership had come into conflict with the more immediate interests of one section of the members. The issue of the interests of the usually passive majority, as opposed to the vanguard activists, dominated the Conference.

(57) ibid., 5 November 1969, p. 190. Technical teachers were subsequently awarded a similar increase.


(59) ibid.

(60) ibid., p. 209.

Whalan told the Conference that the Federation had made a conscious decision to refer the salaries matter to the Industrial Commission. The union had 'to accept the rules' of that body. (62) Federation, therefore, could not afford the 'luxury of strikes during 1970.' Amidst sustained heckling from the Conference he told delegates, 'if you want salaries you have to behave yourself'. (63) Despite the uproar, however, Whalan's admonitions swayed a majority of the Conference. During 1970 industrial action on working conditions by schools and associations could only proceed with 'express approval of the three Senior Officers and the General Secretary'. (64) The leadership view prevailed. The dissidents' much reiterated demand for local initiative in taking industrial action had failed to achieve majority support at the Conference.

Another Illawarra Initiative

The Conference resolution on working conditions did not, however, preclude all direct action. Schools were to be permitted to take a limited and specific form of action on class sizes. Teachers could choose one day when classes would be supervised and not actively taught. Intensive publicity was to be given to the action in any given school. It was the Illawarra associations that took up the challenge. With Federation endorsement,


(63) ibid. The transcript notes that this statement was greeted with uproar.

(64) Education, 4 February 1970, p.4.
secondary schools in the Illawarra area were to undertake the action on Friday 13 March. It became known as the 'Black Friday' action.\(^{65}\)

On 11 March the Board drew the matter to the attention of the Industrial Commission, which declined to give 'any specific directions' on the matter. It nevertheless reminded the Federation of its obligations under the Industrial Arbitration Act.\(^{66}\) Whalan, the officer conducting the case Des Brady, and the Federation's barrister J.B. Sweeney, were nevertheless concerned about the case.\(^{67}\) On 12 March Whalan addressed a meeting of over 200 Illawarra teachers about his fears. After some debate, however, the meeting voted 200 to 13 to proceed with the action.\(^{68}\)

The action was remarkably successful. It attracted considerable publicity.\(^{69}\) It was taken with the approval, if not enthusiasm, of Federation. It was not a Manly-like wildcat action, whatever Whalan might have thought of it. It looked as though other areas might take it up.

\(^{65}\) 'Illawarra, North Illawarra and Kiama Teachers' Association: Information for Members - Confidential 13 February 1971'. Illawarra Teachers' Association files, University of Wollongong archives. This document outlines the dispute from an Illawarra perspective.

\(^{66}\) ibid.

\(^{67}\) Education, 1 April 1970, p.46. (Whalan). Interview with Des Brady, 22 May 1984.

\(^{68}\) ibid.

\(^{69}\) D.T., 12, 14 March 1970. Illawarra Mercury, 13, 16, 18, 19 March. S.M.H., 13, 14 March.
On Monday 17 March a number of telegrams arrived at Federation urging Executive not to authorise similar action elsewhere. Sweeney advised Federation that the Commission might require assurances that no further action would be taken. A meeting of Illawarra primary and infants teachers declared that direct action at that time would jeopardise the salaries case. Executive resolved to suspend further action on working conditions. The broader interests of the members had prevailed against the desire for vanguard action of an industrially militant section of the union. The Illawarra incident, however, revealed considerable disaffection with the tactics of the leadership.

Special Conference

This disaffection was apparent at a Special Conference of the union held on 9 May called to review the progress of the campaign on working conditions. Some gains had been made. The Board had established a teacher training scheme for mature age graduates. It had also agreed to investigate the acceleration of the provision of ancillary staff and to review procedures covering the employment of superannuated teachers. It was also

(70) Statement by D.J. Brady to Executive, attachment to D.J. Brady to M. Graham in Illawarra Teachers' Association Bulletin n.d. (but 1971), Illawarra Teachers' Association files, N.S.W.T.F. archives. Interview with Des Brady, 22 May 1984. It was widely believed Brady 'inspired' the telegrams.

(71) ibid.

(72) Education, 1 April 1970, p.45. At this meeting to congratulate secondary teachers for their action was only carried 117 to 101.

agreed that teachers would no longer be required to sign 'on' and 'off' each day, but would only be required to initial the attendance book. *Education* proclaimed: 'Campaign pays off - substantial gain in Working Conditions'.(74)

Conference seemed less enthusiastic about the the degree of progress than *Education*. Douglas Whitton, himself far from being a militant, moved that Federation withdraw its assurances to the Commission that no direct action would be authorised. His motion was defeated by 231 votes to 237. Des Tye of the Illawarra Association moved that Federation 'resume forms of action to recover' the gains that had been surrendered by the leadership. It was lost 202 to 262.(75) The editor of *Education*, however, conceded that the closeness of the voting revealed the 'growing strength of teacher dissatisfaction throughout the state'.(76)

Whalan, however, was not so charitable. He said that the Conference had been influenced by a group of self-styled 'Federation Activists' who set themselves up as 'industrial experts'. But they were really a 'disruptive, divisive and anarchistic organisation', whose activities would inevitably end in 'complete industrial anarchy'.(77) Whalan's outburst provoked a letter to *Education* from Executive members Colette Tucker, Richard Walsham, Neil Pollock and Eric Earley. They deplored his 'unwarranted' attack on a large number of 'sincere, 

(74) *Education*, 15 April 1970, p.53. The signing on and off procedures were regarded as a particularly trivial, but irksome, assault upon teachers' 'professional status'.


(76) ibid.

(77) ibid., p.74. See also *S.M.H.*, 28 May 1970.
active and devoted members of the Federation'. (78) It seemed that there would not only be lack of action, but also a lack of unity within the Federation. The instrumentalities of the State could not but have failed to note the state of the union.

Continuing Controversy

For the time being there was no controversy about the right of local units of Federation to take action. The internal struggle, however, continued unabated in areas where the question of industrial action did not arise. Three episodes in this continuing conflict will be discussed: the 'common scale' controversy, the 'pupil place vacant' controversy and the activities of the Teachers' Moratorium group.

(i) The 'Common Scale' Controversy

The decision to introduce three year teacher training in 1969 highlighted the plight of two year trained teachers relative to their three, four and five year trained colleagues. Two year trained teachers were subject to the imposition of barriers as they moved up the incremental salaries scale. Federation desired to overcome this problem by proposing that these barriers be removed, and that all two and three year trained teachers would move up a common incremental scale. Negotiations took place between the Board and the union on this matter in mid-1970. The Board's final offer was that two-year trained teachers with fifteen years' service could proceed to the maximum point of normal progression for such teachers. Teachers with less than eleven years of service would be required to complete three 'units

(78) ibid., 3 June 1970, p.94. See also S.M.H., 6 June 1970.
of study' in order to proceed beyond that point.\(^{(79)}\) This proposal was unacceptable to the Metropolitan Teachers' Association which represented primary and infants teachers in the Sydney metropolitan area.\(^{(80)}\) J.B. Sweeney, however, advised Federation to accept the Board's offer, arguing that the Industrial Commission would maintain the even less satisfactory situation of separate salary scales if agreement was not reached.\(^{(81)}\)

Whalan proposed acceptance of the Board's offer at June Council. Eric Earley moved that mass meetings be called in order to mobilise the members on the issue.\(^{(82)}\) Lancaster, however, supported acceptance of the offer, arguing that improvements could be negotiated in the future. After a lively debate a division was called on Earley's amendment. It was lost 41 - 98. The original proposition was carried 88 to 42 with three abstentions. In a Council of about 150 members, the dissidents were well short of the 'numbers'. Nevertheless, the heat generated by the issue provoked Whalan, Mattick, Frederick and Lancaster to make a strong appeal for unity in the journal.\(^{(83)}\)

---


\(^{(80)}\) Metropolitan Teachers' Association, Bulletin June 1970, p.3. This Association was the result of an amalgamation of the Men Teachers' and Women Teachers' Associations, which had taken place in 1969.


\(^{(82)}\) Council, Minutes, 6 June 1970, p.117.

The issue, however, became the subject of a bitter controversy within the Metropolitan Teachers' Association. When the matter came before the Council, the M.T.A. Councillors had not voted as a bloc against acceptance of the proposal. Individual Councillors defended the positions they had taken at a subsequent meeting of the Association. After a bitter debate the Association accepted the Council's decision 'with regret'.

The matter spilled over into the elections for Councillors from the Association for the 1971-1972 period. Richard Walsham and Col Rennie circulated a ticket which excluded three of the existing Councillors. The Association President Enid Hokin accused Walsham and Rennie of misrepresentation. Walsham and Rennie countered by accusing the Federation leadership and its supporters within the Association of advocating 'outmoded formulas and concepts' of action. The gains of 1968 and 1969, they said, had been undermined by the 'relative inaction' of 1970. The balance of forces was such, however, that a mixed group of 'old guard' supporters and their critics was elected as Councillors for the Association.

(85) ibid.
(86) Election material, Metropolitan Teachers' Association files, N.S.W.T.F. archives.
(87) Enid Hokin to M.T.A. members, 7 October 1970, in ibid.
(ii) 'Pupil Place Vacant' Controversy

Early in 1970 the Director of Secondary Education advised Principals of procedures to be followed in response to 'disruptive behaviour' by students beyond the compulsory school leaving age of fifteen years. The ultimate sanction of expulsion from school remained with the Minister, but Principals were empowered to declare 'vacant' the place of students who were 'wasting educational resources'.

The matter was the subject of fierce controversy within the Secondary Teachers' Association in February and March 1970. The leading critics of the proposal, such as Colette Tucker, Jenny Nisbet, Joe Rankin and Eric Earley, were also opponents of the Federation leadership. For the most part, defenders of the proposal, such as Frank Doyle and Bessie Mitchell, both Principals themselves, were generally supporters of the leadership. The critics argued that the 'problem of difficult' older students would be solved by smaller classes, improved counselling provision and more 'appropriate' senior curriculum. Supporters of the proposal tended to argue that the authority of Principals should not be undermined. After two meetings and a rescission motion, a record S.T.A. Council of 230 members representing 80 schools, supported the memorandum.

(92) ibid.
(93) ibid., 9 September 1970, p.160.
The matter came before Federation Council on 21 August 1970. The senior officers recommended general support for the memorandum, but also proposed that aspects of the document which were 'objectionable' to teachers should be raised with the Director of Secondary Education.\footnote{ibid., 9 September 1970, p.160.} Neil Pollock, a Primary Principal, said that the document took a 'purely punitive approach' and 'was at variance with current educational thought'.\footnote{ibid.} Frank Doyle said that Council could not ignore 'the fact that teachers were being continually subject to humiliation by some senior pupils'.\footnote{ibid.} After a lengthy debate Council carried the original recommendation with the provision that Principals should only exercise their powers in consultation with the teachers of the students concerned.\footnote{ibid.}

The underlying issues were, however, much more profound than the question of the 'Pupil Place Vacant' document. Many of the arguments of the opponents of the proposal reflected the increasingly anti-authoritarian tendencies characteristic of the late 1960s. Just as the dissidents were reluctant to accept the exclusive right of the Federation leadership to determine tactics, so too were they reluctant to accept what they regarded as authoritarian and punitive disciplinary powers over students.
The confrontationist and anti-authoritarian politics of the dissidents, and the more cautious politics of the 'old guard' were fought out in the elections for S.T.A. representatives on Federation Council. Frank Doyle accused some S.T.A. Councillors of failing to support Association policy on the pupil place vacant issue. Jenny Nisbet argued that democracy was 'best served' when representatives were not committed 'to a decision before a final debate' on any given issue. The dissidents issued a policy statement which argued that teachers 'must be allowed to take action at the local level with the full support of their union'. Both sides issued tickets consisting of both supporters of the leadership as well as the dissidents, but the 'old guard' insisted their ticket represented a 'wide range of teacher opinion' and thus would enhance 'maximum unity in action of all members'. These differences in approach can also be illustrated by examining how the union dealt with the question of the Vietnam war during 1969 and 1970.

(iii) The Teachers' Moratorium Group

There is no doubt that the 'Old Left' section of the leadership were united with the dissidents in their opposition to

(98) ibid., 23 September 1970, p.66.
(99) ibid., 21 October 1970, p.188.
(1) 'Elect your Representatives', signatories included John Frederick, Elizabeth Mattick, Bessie Mitchell and Helen Palmer. Secondary Teachers' Association files, N.S.W.T.F. archives.
the Vietnam war. Nevertheless the experience of the union over the question of affiliation with the A.I.C.D. in 1965 had revealed the problems associated with involving the union too overtly in questions of war and peace. In 1969 a group of younger Federation activists, with support of some of the older Left stalwarts, such as Joyce Clarke, formed the Teachers' Moratorium Group. One of its principal activities was to educate students and teachers about the Vietnam war and the question of conscription.\(^{(2)}\) The group, however, had no formal status within the union.

The potential for division within the union over wider political questions was revealed at the 1969 Annual Conference. A motion was moved supporting the right of teachers and teacher trainees to refuse 'in conscience' conscription for overseas service.\(^{(3)}\) This provoked the predictable response from conservative elements that such pronouncements were beyond the competence of an organisation primarily interested in education.\(^{(4)}\) Peter Woods from Camden Campbelltown Teachers' Association, furthermore, moved that the Conference call on 'national servicemen in Vietnam to lay down their arms'.\(^{(5)}\) This amendment provoked a stormy debate with one delegate declaring that 'a soldier without a gun...is a dead soldier'.\(^{(6)}\)

\(^{(2)}\) Foundation members included Colette Tucker, Ernie Tucker and Harvey Rose, see Rose, op. cit., p.52.

\(^{(3)}\) 1969 Annual Conference, Transcript, p.181.


\(^{(5)}\) 1969 Annual Conference, Transcript, p.144; S.M.H., 18 December 1969.

\(^{(6)}\) ibid.
Although Woods' amendment was defeated and the original proposition adopted, 180 of the 550 delegates signed a petition expressing views similar to those expressed in the amendment. (7)

In June 1970 a group of Federation activists including Eric Earley and Federation officers Nance Cooper, Doris Jobling, Brian O'Loughlin and Tim Hornibrook demonstrated outside Ibrox Park Boys High School. They were protesting against the suspension by the Principal of Robert Colley, the vice-captain of the school for wearing a Vietnam Moratorium badge. (8) This incident provoked a lively exchange of letters in Education. A Primary Principal accused the Federation officers of publicly undermining the Principal and the staff at Ibrox Park, by supporting Colley's defiance of school authority. (9) Colette Tucker replied that the demonstrators were simply defending the rights of students and teachers to wear badges and discuss political issues within the schools. (10) Frank Harvison, by no means a conservative himself, demanded that Federation not 'protect' union officers who 'disrupt the work' of their 'fellow Federation members' at Ibrox Park High School. (11)

Federation both defended the right of students to wear badges (12) and the rights of officers to carry out political activities in their own time. (13) The tactics of the dissidents,

(7) Rose, op.cit., p.52.
(8) Rose, op.cit., p.54; S.M.H., 6 June 1970.
(11) ibid., p.131.
however, were embarrassing to the more cautious members of the Federation leadership. There was no great difference about objectives, but there were growing differences between the confrontationist political style of the dissidents and the caution of the 'Old Left' leadership and its allies.

The Vietnam Moratorium Committee was also instrumental in persuading some 250 teachers and about 800 students to leave their schools before the end of classes and join the Vietnam Moratorium March on 5 May 1970. They were joined by more teachers and students after school when 2,000 people demonstrated outside the Department of Education before joining the main Moratorium procession.

The activities of the group did not have the official sanction of the union. In a formal sense the union could not be held responsible for its members taking action on various 'political' issues. Nevertheless, the independent activities of the group gave a certain amount of legitimacy to tactical initiatives that could be applied to more orthodox union activities. The Teachers' Moratorium Committee, as well as assisting in mobilising teachers on the war, and on conscription, assisted in legitimising tactics which would have been quite unthinkable within the union before that time.

**Secondary Staffing**

It was the broader question of secondary staffing, however, which was to occupy the Federation's attention in the latter part of 1970. Early in second term the Department of Education directed that secondary schools, where student numbers had fallen, should re-organise their timetables so that teachers
would be available for transfer. It was unusual for such staffing adjustments in secondary schools to take place in the middle of the year. Staffs at Strathfield South, Bega, Arthur Phillip and Willoughby Girls High Schools refused to work to the revised timetables. Such action, however, might have threatened the salaries case in its final stage of hearing. Federation asked the staffs not to proceed with the action and the matter was referred to the Industrial Commission. The Commission, directed the parties to confer on the matter. Before such a conference could take place, the Public Service Board announced that all secondary teachers would be asked to teach an additional period in 1971, for which an allowance of one hour's pay would be paid. This compounded Federation's problems.

Some school staffs were already restless about staffing reductions in 1970. If their proposed action proceeded, the salaries case could be jeopardised. On the other hand, the working conditions of all secondary teachers in 1971 were likely to deteriorate. Which struggle was to have priority? Moreover, the proposal to pay teachers for the extra work might have had some attraction to some members. The tactical response of the Federation was to continue discussions with the Board, but also to call meetings of Federation representatives to consider the situation.

On 9 July a meeting of 300 Sydney metropolitan representatives endorsed this approach. The meeting, however, threatened that stop work meetings, commencing at 2.30 p.m., would

(15) ibid., p.8. See also p.63 for the full statement by the Board.
be called if satisfactory progress was not made on the staffing problems. Schools proposing to take action on staff reductions during 1970 would, moreover, have 'full support' of Federation after gaining approval of the senior officers of the union.\(^{(16)}\)

Meanwhile negotiations were proceeding on the proposed staffing reductions for 1970. They proved fruitless. The Industrial Commission proposed a compromise. It recommended that the reductions proposed for Bega, Willoughby and Arthur Phillip not take place, but said that this was not to be regarded as a precedent by the Federation, and upheld the right of management to make such reductions.\(^{(17)}\)

In early August the Department of Education instructed secondary Principals to reduce the provision for mathematics and science teaching in first form by one period per class for 1971. In schools where enrolments had fallen, Principals were also directed to nominate teachers for transfer whether they had sought it or not. By late October it was clear that the Department's teacher recruiting program overseas had only been partly successful. Of 607 offers made by the Department, only 274 people had accepted.\(^{(18)}\) Whalan warned of the seriousness of the situation, but cautioned against 'snap decisions on direct action' being taken on the issue. There were simply not enough teachers to meet anticipated demand.\(^{(19)}\)

\(^{(16)}\) Education, 29 July 1970, p.133. This was endorsed by Council on 11 July.


\(^{(19)}\) ibid., p.194.
On 29 October, the Minister, however, announced that all secondary teachers would be required to teach an extra period in 1971 with appropriate money allowance. On 3 November the Secondary Teachers' Association demanded that a stop work meeting of secondary teachers be held to protest the decision. On this occasion the Federation Executive did not hesitate, but called a one day stoppage. The Minister's announcement had been the final provocation. If a strike was not called then it was likely that there would be stoppages in individual schools. In that situation 'united action' of secondary teachers was preferable to 'wildcat' actions. It was fortuitous that the salaries case had concluded a few weeks before. It was no longer an obstacle for the Federation.

The strike was a significant success. Even the Department conceded that 75 per cent of secondary teachers supported the action. The Sydney strike meeting carried a resolution, moved by Lancaster on behalf of the leadership, calling for a second strike if negotiations proved fruitless. The meeting defeated a proposal from Eric Earley that a campaign of rolling strikes be undertaken instead. During the meeting, however, there was much heckling of speakers supporting Lancaster's proposal and cheers for those supporting the more militant approach of Earley. It was united action, but not universal accord.

(20) S.M.H., 30 October 1970.
(22) D.T., 11 November 1970.
(24) ibid.
After further negotiations the Board dropped its proposal for the extra period in 1971. In return Federation agreed to some reduction in the provision of face to face teaching periods for students in 1971, which would be made up in the following years. This agreement was endorsed by Council only after a very fiery debate. It was, however, endorsed by 112 to 30 with 11 abstentions after a division was called. The leadership had won the day, but the omens were not good for a tranquil Annual Conference.

1970 Annual Conference

The great restraining factor of the salaries case no longer existed by the end of 1970. Whalan, however, was not prepared to permit 'small groups' of members to usurp control of action from the 'properly constituted bodies' of the union. John Frederick expressed concern that 'factionalism' within the union would lead to 'a loss of unity and a loss of purpose for the Federation'. The principal resolution on working conditions moved by Elizabeth Mattick, made a distinction between conditions that had application to the majority of the membership and those which referred to 'a local situation'. The leadership, she argued, must retain control in both cases. Col Rennie, however, moved an amendment to the section referring to action on working conditions with general application. Schools and associations would be authorised to take action on these matters 'with the full

(26) ibid. See also Australian, 26 November 1970.
(28) ibid.
support of the Federation after the General Secretary has been notified'. (29) No longer would it be necessary for schools to seek endorsement of the leadership for action. Rennie's proposition was carried by 227 to 218 votes. The balance of power had been shifted away from the centre to the individual units of the union. Graham Ashton, however, failed in his attempt to have the same formulation apply to local situations not covered by Federation policy. Endorsement from the centre was still required. (30)

This was largely a return to the formulation of the 1967 Annual Conference. The dissidents' two year campaign to wrest control of action away from the leadership, had met with a considerable measure of success. Without the salaries case the leadership lacked the crucial sanction necessary to maintain tight control over the vanguard sections of the Federation. Indeed during 1971 there was considerable action, at school level, on working conditions, particularly over extras. (31)

Inspections

The other great debate at Annual Conference concerned the question of inspections. The Illawarra Association proposed that once a teacher had been found to be 'a fit and proper person to

(31) N.S.W.T.F., Annual Report 1971, pp.4-5.
practise the profession', no further inspections for promotion purposes would take place. (32) Seniority would be the sole determinant for further promotion.

Such a proposal struck at the central means used by various authorities to exercise control over teachers. The authorities would not give up such a control mechanism without a struggle. The Federation's inspection committee took a more moderate line. It was proposed that inspections for promotion would continue but they would be undertaken by panels consisting of a nominee of the Department, a Principal or Infants Mistress and a practising teacher nominated by the Federation. A similar process would apply for teachers seeking certification. (33)

This was predominately peer assessment, although the peers would be more likely than not, persons who had been successful in the promotion process. The Conference adopted this latter proposal. Neil Pollock was probably correct when he said teachers were not opposed to the promotion system as such. They were more concerned to ease the burdens of inspection, not abolish it altogether. (34) This became the policy to be pursued by John Frederick on a working party which the Department had established in 1970 to examine the question of inspections.

---

(32) Annual Conference, Transcript, p.43. This was also the policy of the inspections committee of the Secondary Teachers' Association.

(33) Education, 17 February 1971, p.20. The teacher would nominate a representative on the panel.

The policy on inspections became critical following the actions of an inspector in the Illawarra area early in 1971. The inspector, Bill Booth, made the error of questioning the secretary of the Illawarra Association, Max Graham, about his Federation activities.\(^{(35)}\) His blunder was a gift to the well drilled and politically astute Illawarra Association. A mass meeting of Illawarra teachers condemned Booth's action and called on the Federation to authorise stop work meetings if there was a repetition of such action.\(^{(36)}\) Federation Council, however, contented itself with requesting schools to forward protests to the Department about Booth's activities.\(^{(37)}\)

On 6 April Executive asked schools to comment on the possibility of Federation authorising the refusal of inspection, except where a teacher had specifically requested an inspection. Thirty schools supported the proposal, nine expressed opposition.\(^{(38)}\) On 31 July Federation Council demanded that all school inspections, advisory or supervisory visits and other forms of inspection, cease for the rest of 1971. Stop work meetings in schools were authorised if inspections were forced upon schools or individual teachers.\(^{(39)}\)

\(^{(35)}\) Illawarra Mercury, 1 March 1971.

\(^{(36)}\) Resolutions of mass meeting of Illawarra teachers, 18 March 1971, in Illawarra Teachers' Association files, N.S.W.T.F. archives.

\(^{(37)}\) W.J. Whalan and I.G. Lancaster, circular to Federation Representatives, 16 March 1971, N.S.W.T.F. archives.


That such a recommendation should be made marked a new direction for the union. Action had been taken on salaries and on extras. Now the Federation was challenging a central power structure within the education system. The assertion of professional autonomy was to be given an industrial dimension. The Board immediately referred the matter to the Industrial Commission.\(^{(40)}\) The Inspectors' Institute let it be known that its members would refuse to carry out any inspections requested by teachers which were not subject to the Federation ban.\(^{(41)}\) Federation was also informed that the Report of the Deparmental working party on inspections would be available in September.\(^{(42)}\)

A special meeting of Council was called on 14 September. It lifted the bans until 9 October, when it would consider the Department's working party report.\(^{(43)}\) Three teachers at Manly High School, Graham Ashton, Bob Howes and Jenny Clark decided to defy the Council decision and 'in conscience' refuse to be inspected. They cited Annual Conference policy as justification for their action. The Department of Education brought charges against them under Section 37 of the Teaching Service Act for 'wilful disobedience or disregard of a legal order' made under the Act.\(^{(44)}\)

---

\(^{(40)}\) N.S.W.T.F., Annual Report 1971, p.11.
\(^{(41)}\) ibid. See letters of President to Inspectors' Institute, J.N. Yabsley, S.M.H., 3 August and 18 September, 1971.
\(^{(42)}\) Executive, Minutes, 24 August 1971, p.169.
\(^{(44)}\) ibid.
Although the teachers had defied a specific instruction of the Council, they could not remain unsupported by the union. The use of Section 37 of the Teaching Service Act created a new problem for the union. It could also be used against teachers taking properly authorised direct action. The Manly-Warringah Teachers' Association threatened industrial action. The Federation Executive, rather, offered the teachers legal support in their disciplinary hearings. There was really no question of developing a public campaign culminating in some direct action in support of the teachers. The teachers were found 'guilty' and were fined. Executive offered legal assistance to the teachers in their appeal to the Crown Employees Appeal Board 'in spite of the fact the original action' was taken against a 'Council resolution'. The support was offered 'because of wider implications of the imposition of fines' and particularly in view of the fact that Council had directed secondary teachers to refuse to organise timetables which incorporated increased period loadings in 1972.

It was no longer a question of a few 'wildcat' activists in Manly. The Department had 'informed Federation that all secondary teachers would be required to teach two extra periods'. Sport was to be made voluntary for students, with teachers taking sport being paid an allowance. A one period stoppage took


(47) ibid.

(48) N.S.W.T.F., Annual Report 1971, pp.7 and 55.
place on the afternoon of 17 August against the proposal.\(^{(49)}\)
The Public Service Board sought a variation of the Teachers' Award to permit the allocation of additional periods in 1972.\(^{(50)}\) In retaliation Federation directed secondary teachers to refuse to work the additional periods and refuse all extras classes within their existing teaching loads.\(^{(51)}\) This latter directive was only withdrawn when the Board agreed to withdraw its application for a variation in the Teachers' Award.\(^{(52)}\) On 16 December the Industrial Commission formally directed teachers to work the additional periods in 1972.\(^{(53)}\) Annual Conference defied the Commission and reaffirmed the direction to refuse the periods.\(^{(54)}\) So the guerilla warfare continued until the Department withdrew its proposal on 17 January 1972.

Thus ended a dramatic year of Federation history in which the presidency of Jack Whalan also came to an end. For four years he had defended the right of the central decision-making bodies of the union against the unfettered initiative of various sections of the membership. His tactics were bruising and often inflammatory. But they represented a tradition of united action and centralised control which had brought the union through the divisions of the 1950s and the struggles of the 1960s. He had viewed the dissidents as often misguided, sometimes mischievous, even anarchistic. They tended to see him as a dated temporiser,

\(^{(49)}\) ibid., pp.8-9
\(^{(50)}\) ibid.
\(^{(51)}\) ibid.
\(^{(52)}\) Education, 8 December 1971, p.229.
\(^{(53)}\) ibid., 2 February 1972, p.6.
\(^{(54)}\) ibid., p.7.
and on occasions as a wily manipulator of what he saw as the ingrained conservatism of many teachers. But the union had changed profoundly in four years. The great 'united action' of 1968 had given way to the guerilla warfare of 1971. The politics of confrontation penetrated the union as older traditions of action seemed no answer to the problems of the 1970s.

The dissidents had not, however, gained ascendancy within the union membership. The dissidents' candidate Eric Earley was defeated in the 1971 senior officers' elections as was the 'united front' candidate Elizabeth Mattick.\(^{55}\) Elected instead was a conservative Canberra Deputy Principal, Len Childs, who offered 'strong professional leadership' independent from 'all factions within Federation'.\(^{56}\) The membership, it seemed, had not chosen either of the courses offered by the 'united front' leadership or by the dissidents. It was clear that the union was now openly divided and even, in some senses, polarised. The state government saw its opportunity to capitalise on those divisions. Much of the internal politics of the union in the following years would be about the best methods to be adopted in preventing the government from maximising its opportunities.

\(^{55}\) *Education*, 2 February, 1972, p.6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L.H. Childs</td>
<td>7,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.G. Earley</td>
<td>4,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.W. Mattick</td>
<td>6,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.T.P. Stanton</td>
<td>1,160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After distribution of Earley and Stanton's preferences:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Childs</td>
<td>10,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattick</td>
<td>9,092</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mattick's running mates Neil Pollock and John Frederick were, however, elected Deputy President and Senior Vice-President.

\(^{56}\) Len Childs, Election Poster, Senior Officers Election files, N.S.W.T.F. archives.
CHAPTER TEN

DISSIDENTS AND DEREGISTRATION

1972 – 1973
The election of Len Childs over Elizabeth Mattick and Eric Earley indicated that there was significant support among the membership for caution and moderation. About 56 per cent of the membership had voted in the election, a somewhat greater proportion than usual. One observer writing in Education, said there was a widespread expectation of a return to the 'harmonious relationships of an earlier period' between Federation and the various state authorities. Childs' presidency, however, was characterised by intensified conflict between the union and the authorities and by even greater conflict within the Federation itself.

In 1972 the union was largely occupied with countering the use of Section 37 against individual teachers. In 1973 the union faced deregistration as an industrial organisation. These attacks from the state authorities upon the union, in turn, occasioned considerable conflict within the union itself about the best tactics to counter these assaults upon the organisation. This chapter will discuss these events within the broader context of the themes of unity, local initiative and central control which have been pursued in earlier chapters.

---

(1) Childs told the 1971 Annual Conference of the need for 'moderation' and 'negotiation'. Education, 16 February 1972, p.4.

(2) Since rank and file ballots began in 1952, the average turnout has been 53.5 per cent of eligible voters. See Anne Junor, 'Senior Officers election - fact and fiction', unpublished memorandum, 23 January 1984. Research Department, N.S.W.T.F.

(3) Education, 12 February 1975, p.44. In this issue an article entitled 'Conservative Prognosis' appeared. This article reflected upon the events in the union from 1970 to 1975. The writer was not named but was described by the editor as a 'right of centre moderate.'
The debates at the 1971 Annual Conference did not generate the heat of 1968, 1969 and 1970. John Frederick moved the resolution authorising secondary teachers to refuse to teach additional periods in 1972\(^4\). Elizabeth Mattick argued that Federation should concentrate on a limited number of issues in 1972, in order to maintain unity. She did not, however, question the notion of schools and associations taking action on issues specified by Conference\(^5\). Ivor Lancaster moved that Council be empowered to consider the establishment of a 'Fighting Fund' to assist members who might suffer financial disadvantage resulting from adhering to union policy.\(^6\) Whalan made it clear that he opposed these propositions and expressed the fear that the government might seek to deregister the union.\(^7\) It was clear, however, that the continuing leadership had distanced themselves from the retiring Whalan. Events had led them to occupy ground previously held by the dissident elements in the union.

The government's decision not to proceed with the proposal that secondary teachers take two additional periods in 1972 meant that an immediate confrontation with the union was averted. Even if the proposed confrontation had taken place, resistance to the imposition of additional periods would have been an essentially defensive exercise. Teachers were authorised to take action to improve working conditions as well as action to

---

\(^{(4)}\) Annual Conference 1971, Transcript, p.52.

\(^{(5)}\) ibid., p.92-93.

\(^{(6)}\) ibid., pp.122-123.

\(^{(7)}\) ibid., p.52.
defend existing conditions. The Director-General of Education however possessed power under Section 37 of the Teaching Service Act to discipline teachers if they refused to carry out their assigned duties. In 1972 this power was used to an unprecedented degree.

Section 37 Charges

On 29 February the infants staff at Kingswood South Public School adopted the tactic of minimal supervision of classes. A remedial class had been disbanded and the size of other classes had increased following the transfer of a teacher. The Department offered a 'support' teacher for the remedial class. This was rejected by the teachers. The infants mistress and six staff members were charged under Section 37 with a 'breach of discipline'.(8)

The prime consideration for the union was how to have the charges withdrawn. The question of the class sizes became a less pressing consideration. After representations to the Department, Director-General Buggie agreed to drop the charges if the teachers resumed teaching their classes. He promised an additional teacher if enrolments at the school increased.(9) The use of Section 37 diverted the union from pressing for improvements in working conditions, to adopting a defensive campaign against disciplinary measures. As a result the status quo continued to apply at the school.

---


(9) ibid.
Meanwhile a number of secondary teachers had refused to take 'extras'. By March, teachers at Wollongong, Whitebridge, Swansea and Orange High Schools had been charged under Section 37. March Council authorised schools to hold stopwork meetings if further charges were laid against teachers carrying out union policy. The Illawarra Associations called a strike for 24 March, the day the charges against teachers at Wollongong were to be heard.

The matter came before the Industrial Commission. Justice Sheldon directed that the Illawarra strike not take place. He recommended that Federation withdraw its authorisation of members to refuse duty. In exchange he was prepared to recommend that the Department drop the charges. Buggie told Federation that he would adjourn the hearing of the charges while Sheldon's proposals were considered by the union. If the Federation had agreed to these proposals, however, it would have denied its members the use of the industrial weapon of refusing duty.

The situation was inflamed by a circular sent to Illawarra schools by Department of Education Area Director, Brian Gillett. Federation policy, he said, could not override 'properly


instituted Departmental policies.'(14) Gillett had also brought charges against Illawarra Association secretary Max Graham for alleged intimidatory behaviour in his role of Federation Representative at Smiths Hill High School.(15) Lancaster warned Buggie that Gillett's action had created serious difficulties for the Federation leadership and 'exacerbated' an already tense situation in the Illawarra area.(16) Buggie responded by arranging for the withdrawal of Gillett's memorandum.

All four senior officers attended an after school mass meeting of Illawarra teachers. Childs reported on Sheldon's and Buggie's proposals. The meeting agreed not to proceed with the proposed strike until Council had met on 10 April. It demanded that a statewide stoppage be held if, however, the charges were not dropped by 7 April.(17)

This latter proposition was discussed at mass meetings in Sydney, Newcastle, Canberra, Parramatta and Penrith on 29 March. Only about 1,000 members attended the Sydney meeting, but they endorsed the proposal for a one day strike.(18) The Parramatta meeting, however, carried the proposition by only 248 to 201 votes.(19) Only in Newcastle, where charged teachers addressed the meeting, was there a good attendance and solid support for a

(14) Circular to Principals from B.S. Gillett, 22 March 1972, Illawarra Teachers Association files, N.S.W.T.F. archives.

(15) Illawarra Mercury, 14 March 1972.

(16) Urgent telegram, Lancaster to Buggie, 24 March 1972, in Section 37 Cases file, N.S.W.T.F. archives.

(17) Education, 12 April 1972, p.66.

(18) ibid.

(19) ibid.
strike. (20) On 7 April Council decided that a Special Conference would consider the whole question on 22 April. (21) In the meantime the general industrial situation had been complicated further by the action of two prominent dissidents Doris Jobling and Graham Ashton.

The Doris Jobling Case

In December 1971 Federation organiser Doris Jobling had been arrested under the provisions of the Summary Offences Act for failing to comply with a direction of the Principal of Killarney Heights High School, that she leave the premises forthwith. (22) Hitherto the right of access of union officers to workplaces, under the Industrial Arbitration Act, had not been challenged. If Jobling was found guilty, a serious precedent would have been created and the operations of other union officers may have been jeopardised.

Jobling was given legal support by the Federation and members were urged by Executive to attend a rally on the morning of the hearing on 27 April. (23) This fell somewhat short of a general mobilisation of members in support of a fundamental right of access by union officers to their members. Prominent

(20) ibid.
(21) Council, Minutes, 7 April, 1972, p.90.
(22) Education, 2 February 1972, p.7.
(23) ibid., 29 March 1972, p.50. Statement by all administrative officers of the Federation, including Lancaster. The presidential officers did not sign the statement.
dissidents also urged teachers to attend the rally.\footnote{ibid., 12 April 1972, p.64. Signatories included Eric Earley, Jenny Nisbet, Graham Ashton, Ray Cavenagh, Jennie George, Mary Boland, Barry Cooper and Rosemary Babbage.} No names of the 'old guard' were to be found among the enthusiastic supporters of the demonstration. It was yet further evidence of tactical differences between the 'old guard' elements and their critics. As it was, the Magistrate dismissed the charges on a technicality. Jobling's stand and that of her supporters seemed vindicated. The reservations of the 'old guard' seemed, in the circumstances, to be evidence of weakness in the face of provocation by the authorities. The disagreements about the Jobling case were muted compared with those that were revealed during the Graham Ashton affair.

The Graham Ashton Case

Early in 1972 the English Master at Manly Boys' High School was to undergo an inspection for promotion to Deputy Principal. He requested his staff to complete lesson registers and have class books available for inspection. Graham Ashton declined the request. He refused to comply with a formal direction to that effect on 17 March. On 30 March he was charged under Section 37, and suspended from duty.\footnote{Council, Minutes, 8 April 1972, p.71.} He regarded the action as victimisation of a well known Federationist. He agreed, however, with the senior officers that his action was not authorised by any specific section of the working conditions resolution.\footnote{Ibid. This was taken from Len Childs' report to Council. It was not contested by Ashton when he spoke after Childs.} Representations were made to the Department.
Buggie said he would suspend the charges if Ashton agreed to sign a statement that he would comply with all 'reasonable and lawful' directions.(27) He refused to do so.

The next day Ashton returned to school in defiance of the suspension. Lancaster, Childs, Pollock and Jobling also attended the school. Ashton was adamant he would not agree to Buggie's conditions. The senior officers, however, advised him to comply with the original directive and sign the lesson register.(28)

Ashton was determined to teach his classes. The Principal said that he would call the police to have him removed if he attempted to take his classes. The senior officers advised that he would be in a stronger tactical position if he did not take his classes. The advice was not accepted. The police were called. He was arrested and appeared in court later that day. He was released on bail on condition that he did not return to school without the Principal's prior agreement.(29) On the same day the Manly staff met and supported Ashton's action in taking classes, by 42 votes to 3.(30) The staff, however, requested Ashton to comply with the Director-General's conditions on the grounds that there were many problems facing members throughout the state which required attention.(31)

(27) ibid., p.72.
(28) ibid.
(29) ibid. See also D.T., Sun, 6 April 1972.
(30) Council, Minutes, 8 April 1972, p.76.
(31) ibid., p.75.
The leadership faced some difficult problems. Were the actions of an individual, acting outside union policy, to have priority over defending the forty members charged under Section 37 for implementing union policy? Yet the union had to give some support to such a prominent Federationist. To do otherwise was to appear to display weakness in the face of the provocation of Section 37. A middle course was chosen by Executive: Ashton would be supported, but only if he agreed to supply the notebooks and sign the register. Council debated this approach to the problem on 8 April.

Various alternatives to the Executive recommendation were proposed. Ray Cavenagh moved that Ashton be asked to comply with all reasonable requirements for the inspectorial visit at Manly High School, if the charges were dropped. Ken Johnson proposed that Federation give Ashton full legal support. In exchange, Ashton would comply 'under protest' with the requirements of the English Master. Bert Hilling proposed a statewide strike be called if Ashton's suspension was not lifted if he agreed to comply with the original directions.

Compliance with union policy, however, was not a necessary criterion for the union to provide legal assistance to members. Legal support was often given to members who breached regulations not covered by specific union policies. These matters were, for the most part, of a private nature. They did not

---

(32) Education, 6 April 1972, p.73.
(33) ibid.
(34) ibid.
(35) ibid.
intrude into areas of industrial disputation, nor into the arenas of factional or tactical conflict within the union. The charges against Ashton had been laid at the same time as similar charges were laid against teachers for carrying out union policy. Would the decision not to support Ashton be regarded as a weakening of the union's resolve to resist the use of Section 37 as a penal provision in industrial disputes?

Ashton's argument was a compelling one. He had merely done what hundreds of secondary teachers were doing without any penalty being applied to them. Was it not, therefore, reasonable to conclude that Ashton was being victimised because he was a prominent Federationist? Ashton was not without support within the union.

A letter to Education signed by 94 members argued that the lesson register system was 'hypocritical and unprofessional'. Furthermore, Ashton was correct in not giving an undertaking to comply with all 'reasonable and lawful' instructions. Such an undertaking could force Ashton to break Federation policy on extras and period loadings. (36) Doris Jobling produced a letter from Lancaster dated 22 January 1971 which informed the Department that Federation Executive had endorsed a regional conference declaration that the 'maintenance of central subject registers' was 'time wasting' and 'unprofessional'. (37) Rosemary Babbage argued that 'no wrong headed direction' given by the senior officers could change the fact that Ashton had acted within union

(36) ibid., 22 April 1972, p.77. Signatories included Eric Earley, Doris Jobling, Michael Hourihan, Jenny Nisbet, Rosemary Babbage, Jennie George, and Cathy McDonald.

(37) ibid.
policy. It was unlikely, however, that Ashton was aware of the policy when he took the action. The leadership's handling of the affair had given the dissidents another opportunity to expose what they saw as a temporising approach to most issues.

The charges against Ashton were heard on 21 April. They were found proven and he was directed to resign within fourteen days. He appealed to the Crown Employees Appeal Board. He requested legal assistance from Federation. He refused to accept the Federation's condition for support that he merely appeal against the severity of the penalty. On 6 July, however, he was reinstated without penalty on giving an undertaking that he would in future provide a record of his work in a form acceptable to his Subject Master and Principal. Childs wrote that the whole case may have been unnecessary if Ashton had agreed to Federation's request three months before.

Despite the impeccable logic of Childs' comment, the leadership had been discredited in the view of many active Federation members. It had appeared equivocal when many thought an uncompromising stance was appropriate. Ashton's stand, however, had helped undermine the legitimacy of the use of Section 37 in an industrial dispute. The resolution of the Ashton case had vindicated the logic of the leadership's position, but the affair had hardly enhanced its political credibility.

(38) ibid.
(40) ibid., p.153.
The Ashton case mobilised radical dissident elements against the leadership. At the Special Conference of 22 April it was, however, the conservative dissenters who took on the leadership.

The prime purpose of the Special Conference was to consider a fee increase in order to establish a 'fighting fund' to assist members financially disadvantaged by supporting union policy. A lengthy debate took place on the Executive's proposition that the membership fee be increased from $32.76 to $49.92 p.a. Various amendments were moved for lower amounts than $49.92 p.a. Frank Doyle, a Federation trustee, proposed a fee of $42.38. He said that the membership would not tolerate a fee increase of nearly 50 per cent. His calculation proved to have substance when his proposition was only defeated 275 votes to 290. The original proposition was carried by 314 votes to 197. Even this vote was a clear sign of considerable division within the union. Subsequently the Conference voted to allocate $14.00 per member to a 'fighting fund'. In supporting the proposition, Joyce Clarke, appealed to all good Federationists to support the decisions actively, to ensure that there was 'no loss of membership.' Another delegate warned that the fund would give license to certain 'wildcat' elements in the union to

---

(41) Special Conference, 22 April 1972, Transcript, p.6.
(42) ibid., p.7.
(43) ibid., p.16.
(44) ibid., p.21.
do as they pleased.\(^{(45)}\) The possibility of this happening, however, was limited when the Conference carried a resolution requiring school staffs, groups of teachers or individuals to seek approval of the Executive or Council for action on local problems not covered by the Federation's working conditions resolution.\(^{(46)}\)

It was not however, wildcat elements which led the revolt against the Conference's decisions. The conservative Principals' Association circularised other associations with a proposition of a fee level of $39.96 p.a. \(^{(47)}\) Letters critical of the Conference decision appeared in \textit{Education}.\(^{(48)}\) 8,000 members signed a petition opposing the increase.\(^{(49)}\) This represented 20 per cent of the membership.\(^{(50)}\)

Such open division within the Federation made it easier for the state government to strike an effective blow against the union. It announced that it would cease deducting union fees from members' salary cheques.\(^{(51)}\) Federation sought a legal opinion

\(^{(45)}\) \textit{ibid.}, p.28.
\(^{(46)}\) \textit{Education}, 17 May 1972, p.87. Prior approval, however, did not have to be sought for action on matters such as extras and class sizes.
\(^{(47)}\) B. Manefield to I.G. Lancaster, 3 May and 12 May 1972 in Principals Association files, N.S.W.T.F. archives.
\(^{(48)}\) \textit{Education}, 17 May 1972, p.89.
\(^{(49)}\) \textit{ibid.}, 28 June 1972, p.125.
\(^{(50)}\) For membership figures 1968-1962 see \textit{Annual Report 1981}, p.43.
from Neville Wran Q.C. He argued that Federation's rules prevented its trustees signing cheques for members taking part in 'illegal strikes'.(52) The mobilisation of the membership, together with Wran's opinion, made it almost inevitable that another Conference would be called to consider the decisions of the April Conference.(53) The Special Conference on 17 June abolished the fighting fund and replaced it with a voluntary fund. The fee was reduced from $49.76 to $42.00 p.a. It carried a resolution calling for unity within the membership, a call as much directed at the 'wildcat' dissident elements as against the conservative elements who had mobilised against the fee increase.(54) Childs hailed the turn of events. Usually passive teachers had been aroused to take an active role in union affairs 'instead of leaving decisions to the minority'. He hoped the trend would continue.(55) In this he was appealing to the very constituency that had been influential in his election. He perceived that the tactics of both the old guard and of the dissidents were unacceptable to an important, but usually passive section of the membership. The continuing activity of the passive members would, perhaps, strengthen his position within the union.

(52) Council, Minutes, 3 June 1972, attachment.
(54) ibid., 28 June 1972, pp.125 and 136.
(55) ibid., p.126.
The Campaign Against Section 37

Meanwhile the campaign against Section 37 had been proceeding. The first hearing of a charge under Section 37 involved David Barber from Orange High School. The Department Officer hearing the matter denied Barber the opportunity of calling witnesses in his defence, and refused to guarantee that a transcript of the hearing would be made available to Barber or to the Federation. The conduct of the hearing gave Federation the opportunity to further question the legitimacy of the use of Section 37 in industrial disputes. Much was made of the fact that the departmental officer was not required to conduct enquiries with 'regard to legal forms'. It was indeed a 'travesty of justice.'

The Illawarra Associations were able to make great use of this slogan in their campaign in support of the Wollongong teachers charged under Section 37. The Illawarra teachers' links with the broader trade union movement proved to be most useful in this campaign. On 28 April, 2,000 teachers and other unionists marched through the streets of Wollongong in support of the charged teachers. When the charges against the Illawarra secretary Max Graham were heard on 31 May and 2 June,

(56) Department of Education, Before Mr McLaren - Prescribed Officer, 17th March, 1970. Inquiry under Section 37 of the Teaching Service Act, 1970. Re Barber. Unpaginated transcript (but pp.4 and 27). The transcript was eventually made available to Federation.

(57) 'Section 37 - travesty of justice.' A statement from the combined Executives of Illawarra, North Illawarra and South Illawarra Teachers' Associations. See also Education, 29 March 1972, p.51.

the secretary of the South Coast Labor Council, Merv Nixon, attended the hearing. He suggested that Port Kembla would probably be closed by maritime unions if Graham was dealt with harshly. (59) Subsequently Graham was found guilty of intimidating fellow teachers at Smiths Hill High School. His penalty was merely the minimum of a reprimand and a warning. As other teachers had received fines of varying amounts Graham had, indeed, done well. (60) It also suited the authorities. There was no appeal against a reprimand so Federation was denied a further opportunity to capitalise on the incident. It also ensured that Port Kembla was not shut down. On the other hand, the publicity given to the Graham incident had effectively discredited the use of the Section 37 strategy against union members. The Sydney based leadership could not take all the credit for the Illawarra campaign. Another incident in Sydney, however, seemed to reflect well on the industrial acumen of the leadership.

On 2 May, eight teachers at Balgowlah Boys' High School were charged under Section 37. This followed an incident two months before when they had refused to teach in certain rooms until the electricity supply was restored to them. It hardly seemed a major matter. On 10 May the Executive decided to call a mass meeting of teachers in the area, where a proposal for a one

(59) This story was told when Nixon was made an honorary life member of the Federation at the 1980 Annual Conference.

(60) See Bob Sharkey's account of the incident, Education, 9 August 1972, p.171. Sharkey was organiser for the area.
day strike would be put to them. Two hours before the mass meeting, the charges were dropped by the Department, following negotiations with the Federation.\(^\text{(61)}\)

In reporting the matter to Council, Deputy President Neil Pollock placed great emphasis on the level of co-operation by the teachers with the senior officers during the course of the dispute. He read a letter from the teachers thanking Federation for its 'unqualified support'.\(^\text{(62)}\) The implied criticism of certain elements who were not so co-operative in disputes would not have been lost on Council.

The initiative in industrial disputes was, however, no longer the exclusive province of the Sydney-based leadership. The Wollongong strike and the limited, but public action, in support of Doris Jobling, illustrated that actions taken by activists and dissidents forced situations whereby the leadership had little option but support those initiatives. When Newcastle secondary teachers held a one day strike on 15 June, they called for sustained union wide action against Section 37.\(^\text{(63)}\) The leadership's support for one day strikes provided a safety valve for those demanding stronger action. If the leadership had tried to suppress local initiatives entirely, it may have been faced with the kind of wildcat action at the local level which might have been much more difficult to contain than the protest gestures

\(^{\text{(61)}}\) Council, Minutes, 3 June 1972, p.216. See also Education, 31 May 1972, pp.90 and 98.

\(^{\text{(62)}}\) ibid., p.128.

\(^{\text{(63)}}\) Newcastle Morning Herald, S.M.H., 16 June 1972.
of one day strikes. On the other hand, the leadership was well aware that conservative elements had effectively mobilised against the fee increase. Treading a middle path at this time was a tenuous process.

**Deregistration**

Given these internal divisions it is not surprising that the State authorities began to apply additional pressure on the union. On 22 June the Public Service Board told the Industrial Commission that it would seek the deregistration of the Federation if it did not desist from taking industrial action.\(^{(64)}\) The Commission suggested the parties confer.

During the negotiations, Federation proposed an agreement with the Board on the following matters:

1. That the provision of immediate relief was desirable.
2. That Principals and staffs would be able to make necessary arrangements regarding 'extras' and other matters in schools.
3. That Section 37 charges be suspended.

The Board was prepared to agree if Federation suspended action on extras for fourteen days. Federation agreed to this condition. On 26 June, however, the Board told the Commission that it would proceed with its application for deregistration of the Federation. Executive decided to call a special meeting of Council to discuss the suspension of the action. The Commission requested the Board

\(^{(64)}\) *Education*, 12 July 1972, p.137.
to consider not proceeding with its application.\textsuperscript{(65)} Nevertheless the threat of deregistration was now a matter for active debate within the union.

Childs told the members that if it was deregistered, the Federation would cease to be the strong, united organisation that it had been throughout its history.\textsuperscript{(66)} Education editor Michael Hourihan argued that once used, the power of deregistration would lose its deterrent effect. Given Federation's industrial record, moreover, it was far from inevitable that the union would indeed be deregistered.\textsuperscript{(67)}

Nevertheless Council on 1 July, without a great deal of argument, agreed to suspend action for fourteen days. After some argument it also authorised the Executive to extend the suspension if necessary. Childs was concerned, however, that some members would regard this as a backdown. He denied that it was, and urged adherence to the Council decision. Twenty-two secondary teachers from Canberra wrote to Education and said they were appalled at the 'weak-kneed' attitude displayed by Executive and Council.\textsuperscript{(68)}

During July, mass meetings were held to discuss the resumption of action if no substantial progress was made by 29 July. Only 3,000 members attended the meetings. Although the resumption of action was strongly endorsed by the meetings, the senior officers thought that the decision was not an adequate

\textsuperscript{(65)} For outline of these events see Council, \textit{Minutes}, 1 July 1972, pp.145-152 and Annual Report 1972, p.6.


\textsuperscript{(67)} \textit{ibid}.

\textsuperscript{(68)} \textit{ibid.}, 26 July 1972, p.156.
indication of the feeling of the 35,000 members of the union. At
the Council meeting on 29 July, Childs moved that the suspension
of action continue until 25 August. He conceded, however, that no
great progress had been made in negotiations. (69)

Lancaster supported Childs' proposal, but other members
of the leadership put forward different propositions. Executive
members Joyce Clarke and Alan Cross, called for the lifting of the
suspension of action on 31 July. (70) Neil Pollock proposed that
a school based vote be held on 14 August on the lifting of the
bans on action. (71) The original proposition, however, was
adopted.

What is significant about this is the public display of
division among the united front group about tactics. It was
argued that if the ban was lifted, then the union would be in a
stronger bargaining position with the authorities. A hard line
may have forced concessions from the Board. On the other hand, to
lift the suspension may have resulted in a complete breakdown in
negotiations. The fact remained, however, that the Board had not
given up its main negotiating weapon, the threat of
deregistration, whereas Federation had forsaken its principal
weapon, the threat of industrial action. Hourihan expressed the
hope that the Federation's 'conciliatory attitude' would not be
seen as a 'sign of weakness' by the Board. (72)

(69) Council, Minutes, 29 July 1972, p.179.
(70) ibid., p.180.
(71) ibid.
The Council decision received a mixed response in the subsequent Education. Thirty six teachers from Gateshead High School deplored Council's disregard of the decisions of the mass meetings. (73) Thirty two teachers at J.J. Cahill High School said the leadership was afraid of engaging in struggle over a vital principle. It was not 'safe for teachers to follow that leadership anywhere.' (74) On the other hand, the President of the Barraba Association warned that many country teachers were becoming alienated from the Federation by the militancy of certain sections within the union. (75) The leadership therefore had to pursue a tactical course which would pacify the militants without, at the same time, alienating the more passive members of the union. It was not an easy task.

**Salaries or Working Conditions**

The following Council meeting on 11 September had an additional problem. It had to consider the progress of negotiations between the Federation and the Board on salaries, as well as the Board's staffing proposals for 1973. Would the union be, once again, forced to choose giving priority to salaries over the pursuit of improvements in working conditions?

In the working conditions area the Board offered to reduce the 'waiting time' for relief staff from three to two days. No improvements in class sizes or in the provision of

(73) ibid., 13 September 1972, p.188.
(74) ibid.
(75) ibid.
ancillary staff were offered. This was considered most inadequate, particularly in the light of the decision of the Federation to maintain its suspension of action. Council had little option but authorise the resumption of direct action. (76)

The Board's salaries offer was also rejected. The Federation claimed that the Board had not maintained the wage standard set by the 1970 salaries award for teachers. (77) More seriously, however, the Board argued that a salaries agreement was contingent upon the union's acceptance of the duties of each teacher as defined by the Board and Director-General of Education. (78) The implication of this, was that the Federation might be precluded from seeking improvements in working conditions during the currency of the agreement. In practice, however, the Federation's acceptance of certain statements of teachers' duties in the 1970 salaries case had not precluded the union from seeking improvements in conditions in 1971 and 1972. Nevertheless, the Board's attempt to link salaries with acceptance of certain statements of teachers' duties in the industrial climate in 1972, was perceived as another variation of the practice of attempting to drive a wedge between Federation members primarily interested in salaries, and those who were concerned to make progress on conditions. Council, therefore, had little choice but to reject the salaries offer.


(78) ibid., pp.22 and 24.
Given that Council had also resumed action on working conditions, the Board immediately broke off salaries negotiations. It was made clear there would be no agreement unless 'the parties are agreed as to the working conditions of employment at the time of signing the agreement.' This would not preclude Federation from seeking improvements in working conditions during the currency of the agreement, but it would be improper to take industrial action in pursuit of these improvements. (79)

The State Budget was brought down in October. The additional 812 teachers it provided hardly covered increases in enrolments. There was little prospect of improvements in class sizes. Moreover, there was little additional provision for relief or ancillary staff. The provision for increases in teachers' salaries was 6.5 per cent. The recent salaries offer of the Board had averaged the same percentage. (80)

On 17 October Executive decided to call mass meetings to discuss the salaries and staffing situation. It was proposed that if significant progress was not made on these matters by 4 November, a 24 hour strike would be called. (81) In moving the motion for the strike at the Sydney Town Hall meeting Childs confessed that matters had reached an impasse. He said that although he had always maintained that the strike weapon should only be used as a last resort, a strike seemed the only method of resolution. (82) There was not, however, overwhelming enthusiasm

(80) Council, Minutes, 7 October 1972, pp.262-265.
(81) Executive, Minutes, 17 October 1972, p.712.
(82) Education, 8 November 1972, p.254.
for the strike. There was only a 55 per cent affirmative vote for the action to be taken.\(^{(83)}\)

At a subsequent Council on 4 November, Childs reported that the Chairman of the Public Service Board had given him the impression that a salaries agreement was not contingent upon acceptance of certain working conditions. Some Councillors contested Childs' recollection of his conversation with the Chairman of the Board.\(^{(84)}\) Barry Manefield, however, was satisfied that the Board was prepared to resume salaries negotiations. He moved that Council suspend all industrial action on working conditions for the rest of 1972. Childs and Lancaster, however, proposed that a 24 hour strike take place on 9 November. Divisions were called at the end of a fiery debate. Manefield's proposition was defeated 61 to 101. The strike proposal was then carried 107 to 53.\(^{(85)}\)

On 7 November, the Board made application for the deregistration of the Federation. It also announced that it would make a salaries determination on 9 November. The Executive had to decide whether the strike would proceed, although it did not know what the Board proposed in the way of a salary increase. The strike was called off. On 8 November the Industrial Commission stood over the matter of deregistration.\(^{(86)}\)

\(^{(83)}\) Voting figures were 6,279 to 4,825 at meetings linked by landline and 814 for to 963 against at other meetings. N.S.W.T.F. Annual Report 1972, p.8. Total membership of 36,000 members in 1972.

\(^{(84)}\) Council, Minutes, 4 November 1972, p.276.

\(^{(85)}\) On the debate see Education, 22 November 1972, p.280.

The Board's determination was, however, disappointing. The minimum increase was 6 per cent; the maximum 12 per cent. This represented a minor change for classroom teachers, but no change for promotions positions and allowances. The risk taken by the Executive in calling off the strike had hardly seemed justified.

Strong criticism was expressed of the decision to call off the strike at the Council meeting on 18 November. The Executive's action was, however, endorsed by 113 to 32. This was followed by a fierce debate about the tactics to be adopted by Federation from that time. Childs moved that all action be suspended on working conditions and that priority be given to salaries. Pollock made it clear that the other senior officers did not support this proposal. The Council subsequently carried, by 96 to 46, an amendment to Child's motion, which had the effect of lifting the suspension of industrial action on working conditions. The President was clearly and publicly repudiated by Council, an unusual event in Federation politics.

Council's deliberations were once again the subject of sharp debate in Education. T.M. Bamborough accused the Council of reckless 'brinksmanship' in resuming action on working conditions. Clare Cavenagh, on the other hand, said that

(88) ibid., p.295.
(89) ibid., p.301.
(90) ibid.
the Executive had, in recent times, shown 'as much industrial acumen as a choko!'

Michael Hourhian said some of the 'expert pessimists' were too easily frightened by the 'deregistration bogey'. If teachers had to choose between 'deregistration and a further deterioration in conditions', they would hardly prefer the latter.

Childs hit back at his critics in the final issue of Education for the year. Annual Conference would need to think very carefully about the role of direct action in Federation affairs. He invoked Whalan when he said that it was essential that 'all members act together'. He could not see that 'unilateral direct action' by some sections of the union had ever been of 'benefit' to Federation.

The spectre of deregistration hung over Annual Conference. John Frederick outlined the difficulties raised by the threat of deregistration. He argued, nevertheless, that if the union gave up the right to take direct action in order to avoid deregistration, then the authorities would have achieved their objective in any case.

Pollock successfully proposed that schools, associations and areas seek 'authorisation' by Council and Executive, before carrying out 'forms of action' decided by Conference.

---

(92) ibid.
(93) ibid. (Editorial).
(94) ibid., 6 December 1972, p.286.
(95) Annual Conference 1972, Transcript, pp.28-29.
(96) Annual Conference 1972, Minutes, p.16.
the union was strengthened even further when Conference gave them
the exclusive right to initiate action on working conditions...as
deeded appropriate in the light of 'circumstances.'(97) The
power of the centre had not been so strongly asserted since the
1966 Annual Conference.

A 'New Look' Executive

A number of strong advocates of local initiative were,
however, elected to the Federation Executive by February Council
in 1973. These included Peter Woods, Geoff Turnbull, Eric
Pearson, Des Tye, Ian Lunnion and Elin Snape. Generally associated
with united front tradition were Pollock, Mattick, Jack Shield,
Joyce Clarke, Enid Hokin, Laurie Constantine and Frank Doyle. The
other members of the Executive were Childs himself, and Alan
Murphy and Don Robertson, the latter pair tending to side with the
dissidents and Childs usually associated with the old guard
elements on the Executive.(98) While it is not suggested that
the Executive divided strictly along these lines on all occasions,
it is clear that the dissident elements were in a stronger
position than had ever been the case since the united front group
had begun to decline in influence. The composition of the 1973
Executive reflected the gains made by the dissident elements in
the Council elections of 1972. This shift in the balance of power
was reflected in the election for Senior Vice-President. John
Frederick stood down from that position and an election was

(97) ibid., p.20.

(98) This assessment is based on discussions with various
members of the 1973 Executive.
conducted within the Council for his replacement. Col Rennie was elected over Elizabeth Mattick by 85 votes to 80. Both were able candidates, although Mattick had clearly more to offer in experience. Both had been leading members of the Communist Party education fraction during the 1950s and 1960s. Her second defeat was a sign that an era was ending, both within the Federation and the Communist Party.

The division within the Executive was never clearer than when it split over continued support of Peter Woods in his refusal to accept his salary cheque as a protest against the state government's ending deduction of union fees. He argued that under the Truck Act of 1932 he was entitled to receive his salary in cash. During 1972 Federation had advanced money to Woods on condition that he repay when the matter was resolved. This was overwhelmingly endorsed at the 1972 Annual Conference. Early in 1973, however, trustee Frank Doyle refused to sign any more cheques advancing money to Woods.

The matter was discussed by Executive on 13 March. At 9 p.m. Childs adjourned the meeting. Childs, Pollock, Mattick, Shield, Doyle, Clarke, Hokin and Constantine left the meeting. Rennie was elected chairperson by the remaining Executive members. They then voted to continue legal and financial support to Woods, provided he undertook to return all funds when he received salary owing to him. Childs sought legal advice

(99)  Council, Minutes, 10 March 1979, p.33.
(1)  Executive, Minutes, 13 March 1973, pp.103-106. Woods did not take part in this decision.
about the validity of the decisions taken by the 'rump' Executive. They were held to be valid. This incident reveals the degree of factional division and personal bitterness which characterised the work of the 1973 Executive.

**Teacher Unemployment**

The Executive, however, had to face a problem that had not existed since the 1930s; teacher unemployment. During January 1973 hundreds of teachers returning from overseas as well as students who were not bonded to the Education Department were informed that there were no teaching positions for them. Education Minister Eric Willis called on the federal Labor government to provide funds to employ these teachers.

An Unemployed Teachers Committee was established by Federation. Demonstrations were organised outside the Department of Education and Parliament House in Canberra. A public meeting was held on 7 February where a statement by Education Minister Willis that teachers had no 'God given right to employment' was greeted with considerable hostility by the 600 people present. On 10 February, Council authorised teachers to refuse class sizes in excess of Federation policy. The question was raised in the by-elections for the state electorates

---


(5) Council, Minutes, 10 February 1973, p.15.
of Byron, Hawkesbury and Armidale. The state Labor Opposition promised to employ all teachers when it returned to office.\(^6\) On 13 February, Executive asked schools to consider whether a 24 hour strike should be called if all unemployed teachers were not employed by 10 March.\(^7\)

The notion of unemployed teachers was a foreign one for most teachers who had begun their careers amidst the post-war baby boom with its attendant teacher shortages. A much longer campaign would have been necessary for many teachers to grasp the gravity of the situation. Moreover, the state government maintained that many teachers seeking employment were restrictive about the areas where they preferred to teach.\(^8\) This perhaps created some doubt in teachers' minds about the issue. It is not surprising, therefore, that indications of support for a 24 hour strike were not strong. On 10 March Council recommended that extended lunchtime stopwork meetings 'be held in schools on 22 March if all qualified teachers were not employed by 20 March.'\(^9\)

The state government announced that it would use a special unemployment relief grant from the federal government to employ some teachers. As this would absorb only 230 of 1,360 teachers registered for employment, the Executive decided the lunchtime strikes should be held. The response was not good. A Federation survey of 214 schools revealed that 152 schools had held meetings, of which 56 had extended their meetings for periods


\(^8\) S.M.H., 17 February 1973.

\(^9\) Council, Minutes, 10 March 1973, p.58.
ranging from 10 minutes to all afternoon. It was hardly spectacular, nor indeed particularly united action. In the first half of 1973, however, the question of class sizes became a priority issue within the Federation.

Class Sizes

At the beginning of the 1973 school year Pat Lee, the Principal of Minerva Street School for handicapped children, refused to enrol children in excess of 16 students per class, as specified by the 1972 Annual Conference decision. The departmental maximum was 24 pupils. His action was endorsed by Federation. On 16 February he was directed to accept additional students; he refused and was charged under Section 37 on 26 February. The staff went on minimal supervision of classes in his support, as did teachers at two other special schools. Support was also received from a parent committee established at the school. On 1 March, 562 teachers attended a mass meeting called by the Sutherland Teachers' Association. In response to a recommendation from that meeting, many teachers on 5 March took minimal supervision action in support of Lee and the teachers at the special schools. The episode involving industrial action in schools with handicapped children received considerable attention in the media.

---

(10) ibid.
The matter came before Justice Sheldon in the Industrial Commission on 5 and 9 March. He said he would recommend that the charges against Lee be dropped if Federation agreed to talks with the Department on class sizes for handicapped children. On 10 March Council accepted the offer, but 'without prejudice' to its class size policy. On 25 July the Department announced that it would reduce special classes to a maximum of 18 and a minimum of 15. This compromise was accepted by Federation.

The action taken by Pat Lee and the special school teachers had the support of the Federation leadership. Like Max Graham, Pat Lee was a prominent Federationist who was backed by a well organised and influential Sutherland Teachers' Association. Lee's actions could not be dismissed as 'individualist' or 'adventurist'. It had been undertaken with the full support of the central decision making bodies of the Federation. Another more general action on class sizes in the Canterbury Bankstown area was not so well received in some sections of the Federation leadership.

In February 1973 the newly formed Canterbury Bankstown Association carried out a survey of class sizes in the fifteen secondary schools covered by the Association. Of a total of 325 first to fourth form English classes in these schools, 147 had more than 35 students, and 178 classes had fewer than 35 students. In response to these findings, the Association asked schools to discuss the holding of a one day strike.

(18) Ibid.
The proposition was carried by 319 to 245 with 40 abstentions. Six of the fifteen schools voted against the strike. (19) Executive endorsed the strike, although Childs had reservations about it in the light of the threat of deregistration. (20) Indeed he attacked the strike in Education, saying that while 'regional activity had its place', fragmented action could do 'more harm than good'. Such a statement was hardly calculated to maximise support for the strike. It, however, took place on 12 April with about 59 per cent of secondary teachers in the area striking. It had been hoped that 75 per cent would support the action. (21) Nevertheless it was the first strike on an area basis in the Sydney metropolitan area and received good coverage in the local and state media. (22) Childs, nevertheless, warned members that the strike demonstrated that Federation was 'gradually being taken over by [an] active minority.' (23)

Deregistration

The strike had taken place amidst further legal moves about deregistration. On 8 February, the Board had requested the Industrial Commission to stand over its application for the deregistration of the Federation because of the improved

(19) ibid., 11 April 1973, p.81. See also Richard Walsham, 'Submission to Federation Executive, 3 April 1973 re: Staffing of Canterbury Bankstown secondary schools', in Canterbury Bankstown Teachers Association files, N.S.W.T.F. archives. Walsham was the organiser for the area.

(20) Executive, Minutes, 3 April 1973, pp.157-158.


(22) ibid., The strike meeting was covered by Channels 7 and 10. See also Bankstown Torch, 11 April 1973 and the Mirror, 13 April 1973.

'industrial atmosphere.'(24) The Commission met the request, but the Board did not withdraw the application. On 8 April the Board notified Federation that it would seek to have the matter relisted for mention in the light of the industrial action that had taken place during 1973.(25) The Industrial Commission, in the meantime, suspended hearings of the Technical Teachers salaries case until the deregistration matter was settled. Once again the Federation had been placed on the defensive.(26)

At Council on 7 April, Childs moved that Executive not authorise any proposals for industrial action for one month because of the 'gravity of the present situation.'(27) This would have withdrawn authorisation of the Canterbury Bankstown strike. Col Rennie responded by moving an amendment which declared that the 'threat of deregistration' would not deter the Federation 'from pursuing its legitimate right as a trade union to take action.'(28) After a sharp debate and a 'most telling speech'(29) by the officer responsible for the Technical Teachers' case, Max Taylor, Rennie's amendment was carried 93 votes to 63.(30) The confrontationist tactics of the dissidents, it seemed, now had wide support within the Federation structure.

(25) ibid.
(26) ibid.
(28) ibid.
(29) ibid., Education's words in reporting the debate.
(30) ibid.
Federation had thrown down the gauntlet to the authorities. The deregistration hearing reopened on 9 July and continued until 30 July. The Commission rejected the submission of Federation's barrister, Neville Wran, that it lacked jurisdiction to determine the matter. Childs was Federation's only witness. The Board and the Department presented three witnesses. (31) The Commission reserved its decision.

Concerned about the turn of events, Executive recommended to Council on 5 May that a Special Conference be called to discuss the matter. Peter Woods, however, led the opposition to the proposal. It was lost 67 votes to 86. (32) Education declared: 'Government intimidation: Federation fights back.' (33) Childs said Council had rejected a return to 'unity and sanity'. Federation was, he said, heading for self-destruction. (34)

On 23 May the Commission declared that a case had been made for the deregistration of the Federation. An organisation which 'deliberately chooses to have direct action as a mainspring of its industrial policy' could not expect otherwise. (35) The Commission declined to make a 'final order' on the matter and suggested that Federation could have the matter reopened if it took steps to alter its policies. In the meantime it would not proceed with the Technical Teachers' salaries case. (36) Childs

(34) ibid., p.114.
(36) ibid., p.57.
said Federation had to decide between a policy of confrontation, or a policy whereby its actions would be in accord with its constitution.\(^{(37)}\) Education however, said that deregistration would probably 'make teachers close ranks and fight back.'\(^{(38)}\)

Council met on 26 May. It made a number of demands on the state government concerning class sizes, relief staff, deduction of union fees, salaries, and access to arbitration on working conditions. Mass meetings were called, to consider the Commission's judgement. A Special Conference was to be held on 7 July to consider further action. Council rejected an amendment for a suspension of all action on working conditions.\(^{(39)}\)

The mass meetings overwhelmingly carried resolutions denying that 'direct action' was the 'mainspring' of Federation policy, but reaffirming Federation's right to take such action if necessary.\(^{(40)}\) The first part of this declaration was the subject of considerable debate at Council on 22 June. Speakers in opposition argued that it placed Federation on the defensive with the authorities. It was only carried after a division of Council by 95 votes to 79.\(^{(41)}\)

In the weeks preceding the Special Conference, differing tactical perspectives were the subject of sharp debate in Education. One statement entitled 'Deregistration: a positive

\(^{(37)}\) Education, 16 June 1973, p.132. He was referring to the rule which precluded the Federation from taking part in an illegal strike.

\(^{(38)}\) ibid.


\(^{(40)}\) ibid., 20 June 1973, p.149.

approach' was signed by Executive members, Pearson, Rennie, Woods, Tye, Turnbull, Lunnun and Robertson. (42) Deregistration was merely the latest of a series of attacks upon the union. A section of the Federation leadership, they suggested, wished to meet the threat by giving up the right to take direct action when necessary. Federation should rather emphasise the legitimacy of its demands for better working conditions for teachers and better educational conditions for children. Proposals to back down 'must be rejected'. 'Defeatist talk' must be resisted. (43)

Pollock replied to this declaration. He argued that Federation had to decide whether or not it wished to opt out of arbitration system. It was in the best interests of all members to retain registration. It was therefore necessary to assure the Commission that the union would negotiate with the employer, 'prior to taking direct action'. Moreover, when disputes arose, the Commission should be assured that Executive and Council would make every effort to minimise direct action by members. (44)

A lot of this was shadow boxing. While there were genuine tactical differences, it was really only Childs among the leadership who wanted to see the virtual abandonment of direct action. Pollock and his supporters wanted to give the appearance that the Federation was not an organisation that took action willy nilly, without being seen to take steps to avoid it in the first place. The signatories of the declaration wished to project an

---

(42) ibid., 20 June 1973, p.151. Other signatories were David Bell, Van Davy, Eric Earley, Ken Johnson, David Koffel and John Overall.

(43) ibid.

image to the authorities of a strong forthright union. If that was not done, they feared it would be difficult to advance the working conditions of teachers, even if deregistration itself was avoided. These public expressions of difference were not unrelated to factional manoeuvrings within the union. The dissidents were strongly represented on Executive. They had some tactical victories on Council. Their supporters were playing an increasingly influential role in the Associations. The vacillations of the old guard were a perfect weapon for the dissidents to use against them.

On the eve of the Special Conference the Minister for Education Eric Willis indicated that there was a real possibility of improvements in schools in 1974, because of the money expected to flow from the federal government following the Report of the Karmel Committee. (45) The question before the Executive was whether its policy on direct action should be amended to satisfy the Industrial Commission and so avoid deregistration, or whether to maintain the absolute right to take direct action when appropriate. A middle course was chosen. Conference authorised Council to amend the section of the working conditions policy authorising industrial action, only if 'major reforms' were guaranteed for implementation in 1974. In supporting this proposition Max Taylor argued that the union needed to 'stand fast' on deregistration in order to strengthen its hand in negotiations with the authorities. (46)

On 20 July the Public Service Board told Federation that it had approved, in principle, the provision of immediate relief for infants and primary teachers and relief for secondary teachers after one day's absence. This hardly constituted a 'major reform', but it was the culmination of a sustained campaign waged since 1967. (47) It was not clear, however, that 700 additional infants and primary teachers and 1,400 secondary teachers to be employed in 1974 would make a significant impact on class sizes.

At the Council meeting on 21 July, Elizabeth Mattick moved and Max Taylor seconded, a motion that Federation not approve any further action on relief or class sizes in 1974. This was conditional upon the Board withdrawing its application for deregistration. Taylor warned that if the Board's offer was rejected, the Federation would surely be deregistered. Once that question was out of the way the Technical Teachers' salaries case could proceed and the 'flow on' from that would be of benefit to all teachers. His speech was greeted with cries of 'sell-out'. He retorted that there was no point in the union being deregistered when progress had been made on working conditions. (48)

Pearson moved an amendment that action be suspended only when the Board gave 'unconditional' guarantees that all qualified teachers would be employed and a plan for the reduction of class sizes would be formulated. (49) His seconder, Van Davy, said

(48) Education, 1 August 1973, p.197.
(49) ibid.
that the Board's proposals were neither 'major reforms' nor 'guarantees'. Pearson's amendment was defeated narrowly by 71 votes to 78. The original proposition was carried 89 to 60. The fragile consensus of the Special Conference had shattered within two weeks.

The Council decision was attacked in the next issue of Education. P. Cameron, a Federation Councillor, said Council's decision had left the membership 'lying prostrate and bleeding from stab wounds in the back'. Davy attacked the 80 councillors who had 'sold out'. It was yet another example of the 'stop-go...vacillations' which had characterised the leadership during 1972 and 1973.

The case recommenced on 1 November. Two days later the Commission by majority decision (Beattie and Sheldon, with McKeon dissenting) dismissed the Board's application. In their joint decision, Beattie and Sheldon referred to the October Council's threat to call mass meetings on 9 November to consider strike action over salaries. Such a decision would have been sufficient for the Commission to deregister the union or to adjourn the hearing once more. This did not occur, nor did it lead to the interruption of the Technical Teachers' salaries case which concluded before the Commission on 31 October. This change of

(50) ibid.
(51) ibid.
(52) ibid., 15 August 1973, p.214.
(53) ibid. By this time Davy was openly a candidate for the position of Senior Vice-President of the union.
behaviour by the Commission lent credence to the argument that the threat of deregistration was, just that, a threat. It had worked in the first half of 1973, by restraining the industrial activity of Federation. The suspension of action, in the latter part of the year, nevertheless, probably made it easier to dismiss the application for deregistration.

On Tuesday 27 November the first state wide strike, exclusively on the salaries issue, took place. On that day six thousand teachers gathered at a rainy Wentworth Park to reject the Board's 12 to 14 per cent salary offer. Nevertheless, that afternoon the Board agreed to meet with the Federation. It was agreed that an expedited hearing would be held before the Industrial Commission and the bases of the determination would be the decision of the Technical Teachers' case which had provided for increases ranging from 12 to 20 per cent.

By the end of 1973, significant gains had been made on the extras issue, deregistration had been defeated, and the salaries debacle of 1972 had been redressed to some extent. The leadership did not reap any political benefit from the successes of the year. A new senior officers team of leading dissidents, Eric Pearson, Col Rennie and Van Davy was elected to office, defeating an old guard team of Neil Pollock, Jack Shield and Joyce Clarke and a 'centre-right' team of Barry Manefield, Frank Doyle and Les Gapps. Len Childs himself had been beaten into third place for the Presidency by Pearson and Manefield. Pollock came a

---


distant fourth place. It seemed that the grip of the 'united front' group on the leadership had been broken. Whether the methods of action associated with that group would be entirely abandoned was yet to be determined. The dissidents and their supporters now had hegemony within the decision making bodies of the union. It remained to be seen whether it would be the beginning of a 'new era' in Federation history.

(56) Senior Officers Elections file, N.S.W.T.F. archives.

President

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L.H. Childs</td>
<td>2,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Manefield</td>
<td>3,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.J. Pearson</td>
<td>5,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Pollock</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Pollock</td>
<td>2,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.P. Stanton</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After distribution of preferences of Stanton, J. Pollock, N. Pollock and Childs:

- B. Manefield 6,536
- E.J. Pearson 9,037

Deputy President

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L. Gapps</td>
<td>4,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.A. Rennie</td>
<td>7,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.J. Shield</td>
<td>4,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After Gapps' preferences were distributed:

- C.A. Rennie 8,603
- H.J. Shield 7,015

Senior Vice-President

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J. Clarke</td>
<td>4,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Davy</td>
<td>5,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Doyle</td>
<td>5,156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After Clarke's preferences were distributed:

- V. Davy 8,596
- F. Doyle 7,022
CHAPTER ELEVEN

1974-1975: A 'NEW ERA'?
The election of Pearson, Rennie and Davy as the presidential officers for 1974-1975 was the most dramatic change of leadership since the early 1950s. It represented a victory for the dissident and opposition elements over the old guard bearers of the united front tradition within the union. Did this change of leadership bring about fundamental changes in the way the union operated? Was the new leadership better able to overcome the forces of the State arrayed against the union? How did it contend with the diverse forces within the union structure? How far did the period 1974-1975 constitute a 'new era' for the Federation?

The three members of the team were an interesting contrast in styles. Dr. Eric Pearson, college academic, wearer of three piece pin stripe suits, was a Rugby selector, who wrote warmly as an ex-serviceman about the significance of Anzac Day. (1) This all appealed to more conservative teachers. His often demagogic oratory and his association with the dissident elements nevertheless attracted support from younger and less conservative teachers. Rennie combined a rather dour toughness, a hint of larrikinism and a longstanding record of concern with basic industrial issues of wages and working conditions. Davy's style was different again. Young, aged twenty nine at the time of his election, full of ideas and enthusiasm, he lacked leadership experience, but was well versed in union and Left politics generally. He could claim to represent the post war generation that had entered teaching in the 1960s and early 1970s. (2)

(1) Education, 23 April 1975, p.144.
(2) These are largely the impressions of the author tested against the views of activists of the period.
During their election campaign they had promised that they would emphasise 'professional issues', and the close relationship of these, with issues usually regarded as 'industrial'. When they took office Pearson said that there should be 'initial and major emphasis' on 'professional' issues such as the Education Commission and community involvement in education. Davy said that members expected the union not only to take a lead on salaries and working conditions but also in the realm of 'educational philosophy ... and debate'. He could not conceive of one 'industrial' issue which was not also a 'professional' matter.\(^3\)

**Community Involvement in Schools**

The team soon had to face what this objective meant in practice. In May 1973 an unnamed group of educationists released a paper entitled *The Community and its Schools*.\(^4\) It argued that educational benefits would flow from decentralisation and community involvement in the administration of the public school system. It picked up some of rhetoric of the 'New Left' in the late 1960s about 'bureaucracy', the 'system', alienation of the individual and the need for 'participation' of people in decisions

\(^{3}\) 'Election of three Senior Officers...Preliminary Policy Statements...' and 'Unite around Education Issues'. Election policy statements of Pearson, Rennie and Davy. 'Win! A Dynamic Education Oriented Federation', Poster, (in possession of the author). See also *Education*, 24 October 1973, pp.291-293.

that affect them. The paper proposed the establishment of school boards on which teachers and members of the 'community' would exercise some control of the 'housekeeping' arrangements of each school and play some role in the selection of principals and staff of schools.

The reaction within the Federation to these proposals were largely negative. It supported the concept of community involvement but expressed strong opposition to the imposition of structures such as boards or councils which would play a role in the governance of schools. Federation sent Pollock and Davy to New Zealand to report on the operations of school councils in that country. They argued that the predominantly middle class membership of the boards was not representative of the 'community' nor did they enhance real involvement of members of the community in the education of their children. Detailed critiques were written of the proposals and Council established a committee.


to develop an alternative to the paper. Davy became the
driving force of this committee.

The Principals' Association was particularly concerned at
the proposals. It was not convinced that parents wanted to accept
responsibility for the governance of schools. No imposed structure
should have the power to advise on the 'educational progress of
the school or the appointment of principals or staff'.

While Principals perhaps felt themselves most under threat, these
sentiments largely reflected the views of schools and associations
that commented on the paper. A seminar, conducted by the
Federation on the matter, moreover, expressed concern that
unfavourable areas would have difficulty in attracting staff if
boards were to have responsibility for the appointment of
teachers. It was no surprise, then, that Council on
24 August 1973, condemned the proposals. The question
remained, however, what methods would be used to resist their
implementation.

In the 1973 Annual Conference debate on the Education
Commission, Davy moved an amendment rejecting the Minister's
statement that the establishment of a Commission was inconsistent
with 'fostering teacher and community involvement in educational

(10) ibid., 12 September 1973, p.246.
(11) 'Resolutions from School Staffs supporting Federation
opposition to the introduction of the booklet: The
Community and its Schools' and 'Resolutions from
Teachers' Associations supporting Federation opposition
to the introduction of the booklet: The Community and its Schools'. Community Involvement files, N.S.W.T.F.
archives.
(13) ibid. p.248.
decision making'. Federation was to organise an extensive program of discussions among the membership in 1974 with the objective of developing an alternative to the proposals, consistent with the establishment of a Commission. If the government continued to resist the establishment of a Commission, then the union should take direct action on the issue. This tactic occasioned considerable debate, but it was carried by 272 votes to 224.\(^{(14)}\)

A widespread program of parent and teacher meetings took place in 1974 but no strike action took place on that issue. In the meantime, the union had become involved in a series of disputes about class sizes, as well as in the 1974 federal election. Nevertheless, the meetings largely confirmed opposition to the proposals.

There was, however, considerable disagreement about how the Federation should respond to the proposals. The North Illawarra Association, for instance, expressed outright opposition, seeing the proposals as 'an attempt to destroy teachers' working conditions and weaken the Federation'.\(^{(15)}\) Davy, on the other hand, suggested that Federation might need to examine some kind of school based structure which would facilitate community involvement and have some role in the life of the school. He proposed the formation of school committees consisting of teachers and members of the community who would exercise 'power' over all areas of the schools' activity except 'teaching methodology'.\(^{(16)}\)

\(^{(14)}\) Annual Conference 1973, Minutes, p.9 and Transcript, 18 December 1973, pp.28-29

\(^{(15)}\) 'Resolutions from Teachers' Associations...'

\(^{(16)}\) Education, 27 February 1974, p.50.
In June 1974 Council supported the concept of citizen's councils proposed by the Federation's Educational and Professional Committee. These councils would act as regional coordination bodies over matters such as finance, staffing and resource allocation at the regional level. Council however, resolutely opposed the imposition of 'formal decision making structures' at the school level 'unless they arose' out of a general agreement as to how local school community needs might best be met.

Pearson commented on this decision in Education. He warned that school boards would be dominated by those seeking to further their business and political interests. They would seek reward for their services by intruding into the 'management of professional education programs' within schools. Hourihan said local politicians would stifle 'teacher action with the dead hand of ignorance and conformism'. The hard-line approach was more favoured by Council than Davy's alternative of seeking to use the proposals to facilitate community involvement in the governance of schools.


(19) Education, 10 July 1974, p.207.

(20) ibid.
Education Minister Willis established a panel to review the generally unfavourable responses to the proposals. (21) In July it recommended the establishment of school boards with Principals, and at least one other teacher, as members. Community representatives, were nevertheless, to outnumber teachers. (22) Boards were to manage school finance, and to employ non-teaching staff and casual staff for out of school activities, as well as exercising advisory functions in respect of the educational functions of the school. (23)

By 15 July the three Federations had rejected the proposals. (24) Davy told Council on 20 July that the differences between the organisations were minimal in the 'short term' and 'absolutely absent' in the 'long term'. (25) The Parents' and Citizens' Federation was particularly annoyed that P. and C. affiliated branches were specifically excluded from having any formal role in the school boards. (26) Tottie Cohen,

(21) The Community and its Schools. Report of the Review Panel appointed by the Minister of Education, N.S.W. Department of Education, 1974, p.2. The members of the panel were Gerry Gleeson (chairman), W.F. Connell, Professor of Education at The University of Sydney, Mrs B.S. Backhouse of the Parents and Citizens' Federation and Len Childs. The latter two were acting in their 'personal capacities'.

(22) ibid., pp.26-27.

(23) ibid., pp.27-29.


President of the P. and C. Federation, called the proposals a 'damp squib', but she also said that parents 'had been pushed aside for long enough...because we are not professionally trained'. (27) The terms of this objection were rather at odds with teachers' fears about losing their monopoly over 'professional expertise'. Nevertheless, the three organisations rejected the new proposals. There was a danger, however, that the Minister might pacify the parents' organisations' opposition and successfully isolate the Teachers' Federation.

Council endorsed a proposal that the three Federations conduct a joint campaign against the proposals, culminating in a protest outside Parliament House. It also established a committee to consider the powers to be exercised by the regional citizens' councils. This resolution came closer to the Davy strategy of developing alternative proposals. Nevertheless, Council also instructed the Executive to develop 'a stronger plan of action to defeat the Willis-Buggie Report'. (28)

The leadership was walking a tightrope. There were demands from sections of the membership for stronger action against the proposals. Such action, however, might have jeopardised the alliance with the parents' organisations and perhaps, thwarted the desire of some for a Federation-developed alternative structure of school governance.

As it was, the issue was incorporated by more immediate concerns about salaries and class sizes. The boards' proposal was one of the issues on which a statewide strike was held on

(27) Parent and Citizen, August 1974, p.3.
18 September 1974, together with salaries, class sizes, the Education Commission and student allowances. To strike on five issues maximised support for the action. The Principals' Association, however, called for the union to take a stronger line on the boards' issue and not link it 'continually with ... class sizes and the Education Commission'.

After the strike, Federation still faced the problem of deciding whether it would support a school based structure which would include members of the community in its membership. It was the central issue faced by the Council committee on community involvement which met for most of the latter part of 1974. How could the parents' organisations be satisfied without compromising the industrial and professional interests of teachers? This was the principal problem faced by the committee.

Davy proposed the establishment of school committees consisting of 30 per cent of teachers, 30 per cent students, 30 per cent community members and 10 per cent ancillary staff representatives. These committees would 'modify curricula to meet community needs', develop and run after school community leisure, sport and educative activities and advise the staff on the expenditure of school finances and administration. Such committees would assist to break the control of 'the tyrannical agents of the Department', including many Principals and 'place it

(29) B. Manefield to J.R. Williams, 11 October 1974. See also resolution of meeting of primary teachers' promotion positions, 16 October 1974, Principals' Association files, N.S.W.T.F. archives.

in the hands of the practitioners and the consumers'. In the committee he also argued that there was an immediate political necessity for an alternative structure, lest Federation be accused of being merely negative in its rejection of the board proposals.\(^{(31)}\) Others on the committee, however, argued that the imposition of any structure would inhibit experimentation and lead to a uniformity that would not reflect the particular needs of any given community.\(^{(32)}\) There was also division within the committee over whether school committees should exercise advisory or 'real' powers over school curriculum.\(^{(33)}\)

The committee recommended that 'open and unrestricted meetings of teachers and other staff...parents, students and interested citizens' should take place regularly. This would constitute the School Council. It would have an executive consisting of representatives of the union branch, the parents' organisations and students in the school. The Council's powers over curriculum, however, would be advisory. It would 'co-ordinate use of school buildings and facilities for extra curricular activities...after school hours'. It would not


\(^{(32)}\) ibid.

\(^{(33)}\) John O'Brien, 'Report prepared for the St. George Teachers' Association on the activities of the ad hoc committee on Community Involvement', n.d. (but 1974). Copy in possession of author, who was himself a member of the committee.
exercise financial management of the school, but 10 per cent of the school's budget would be set aside for the Council to 'spend on educational projects and improvements within the school'. (34)

This represented a compromise between the 'no structure at any cost' position and a view that structures should be established. The Illawarra Teachers' Association, however, proposed that no school structure should be established. Its Association Secretary, Arthur Osborne, argued that there was no substantial evidence that parents desired to be responsible for curriculum, staffing, finance and equipment in schools. These decisions were best left to teachers as the people most qualified to make them. Regional committees with parent representation should be established to identify 'needs'. At the school level existing parents' organisations should be 'upgraded' but there would be no school level structure. (35)

On the eve of Annual Conference it became known that the government would establish school councils with representatives of parents' and teachers' organisations 'in the majority'. The councils would have no control over 'professional education matters, staffing or matters relating to individual teachers'. (36) Davy proclaimed this as the 'death' of school boards. (37)

(34) ibid.
Arthur Osborne was not so sanguine. He said that only minor concessions had been made. He moved a motion which largely incorporated the Illawarra approach to the issue. There were to be no structures at school level, but parents were to have representation on regional needs committees and a State Education Council which would make decisions about curriculum matters.

This policy, however, marked an important concession by Federation. Parent participation in educational bodies at the regional level was accepted by the union, although Federation remained resolutely opposed to it at the school level. For the most part, however, Federation policy reflected the hard line promoted by the Illawarra and Principals' Associations rather than the position taken by Davy. Why then had the hard line triumphed at this point?

The original proposal emanated from the very authorities that had endeavoured to deregister the Federation and charge individual members under Section 37. Buggie and Gleeson, two particular enemies of the union, were behind the school boards' initiative. It was not unreasonable to assume that the proposal was more likely to weaken rather than strengthen the Federation. In an interview some years later, Willis admitted as much.

---

(38) ibid., p.17.

(39) Annual Conference 1974, Minutes, pp.35-36.

The Federation membership expressed almost universal opposition to the proposals. Principals saw their powers being eroded by 'interfering parents'. Teachers feared for what they saw as their professional autonomy. The concept of professionalism was mobilised to defend teachers. Even those teachers who tended to dismiss the notion of professionalism, saw real dangers to hard-won working conditions.

The alliance between the Teachers' Federation and the parents' organisations was also of crucial importance. By the time government realised its error in excluding the parents' organisations from the councils it was too late. The legitimacy of the whole proposal had been undermined. The government could do little in the face of the united front of the three organisations.

Federation also had some unusual allies. The Departmental Directors of Education expressed the fear that councils would become the 'instruments of militantly 'leftist' teachers'. (41) The Inspectors' Institute warned that the implementation of the proposals should be gradual and flexible, lest there be a 'backlash' against them. (42)

The government attempted to establish school boards in Walcha, Bathurst and Armidale. (43) Local teachers and parents were effectively mobilised against the proposals. By mid-1975 the

(41) Cited in ibid., p.54.
(42) ibid.
government strategy had petered out. It was a sound victory for
the union and its new leadership. In resisting the proposals it
had reactivated the best traditions of united action between
teachers and their allies. The issue had been a novel one, but
the tactics used to counter the threat drew upon a firmly
established tradition within the Federation. Nevertheless for the
first time the union had been forced to concede that parents had
some role to play in the administration of education.

The Class Size Campaign

The campaign against school boards was largely defensive.
The new leadership, however, had promised to make gains for
teachers and for education generally, by encouraging members to
take action to achieve those ends. Gains had been made on the
relief question since 1968; not so on class sizes.

The 1969 Scott Report\(^{(44)}\) on class sizes, the 'needs'
survey conducted by a committee chaired by Jack Buggie\(^{(45)}\) and
at the federal level, the Karmel Report of 1973\(^{(46)}\) had lent
considerable legitimacy to the unions' claims about class sizes.
The reduction of class sizes to meet the individual needs of

\(^{(44)}\) Report of the Committee appointed to Investigate and
Advise on Class Sizes and Teaching Loads in Government
Secondary Schools in New South Wales, N.S.W. Government
Printer, 1970.

\(^{(45)}\) Report of a Committee appointed to Survey Educational
Printer, 1972. Elizabeth Mattick and Fred Clarke
represented the Federation on this committee.

\(^{(46)}\) Schools in Australia. Report of the Interim Committee
for the Australian Schools Commission. Australian
students was given renewed emphasis by the new leadership. (47) The leadership was soon given an opportunity to demonstrate its commitment to a concerted campaign on class size issue.

In March 1974, a young teacher, Vincent King of Bronte Primary School was notified of a transfer to a nearby school. This meant that the remedial class he was teaching was absorbed into the remaining classes with a corresponding increase in the size of those classes. He refused the transfer. He was suspended and charged under Section 37. The staff threatened to go on minimal supervision if he was not reinstated. Parents at the school and the local district council of the Parents' and Citizens' Association supported the teachers' action. (48)

The Eastern Suburbs Teachers' Association (E.S.T.A.) called a stop work meeting of all teachers in the area for the afternoon of 21 March. (49) On 19 March the Federation Executive decided that unless a satisfactory solution to the dispute was achieved, all teachers in the Eastern Suburbs, Inner City, Western Suburbs and Canterbury-Bankstown areas would strike on 29 March and a state wide stoppage would be held on 4 April. (50) Even the old guard elements on the Executive did not question the tactical wisdom of this response. (51)

---


(48) ibid., 27 March 1974, p.37.

(49) ibid.

(50) ibid.

(51) ibid.
Two hundred teachers in the Eastern Suburbs attended the stop work meeting on 19 March. At the same time Federation was appearing before the Industrial Commission. Justice Sheldon recommended that a survey be conducted into the remedial needs of Bronte Public School. Federation agreed to abide by the results of the survey in exchange for a recommendation that King would be reinstated and charges dropped. Further industrial action on the issue was suspended.\(^{(52)}\) The survey took place but the school counsellor was not permitted to observe the operation. On 9 April the Director General upheld King's transfer and announced that he would not be replaced at the school.\(^{(53)}\)

The Federation took the matter back to the Industrial Commission, complaining that the Department had breached undertakings that it would provide the union with the results of the survey before action was taken on it. The Commission recommended that King stay at the school until 22 April. Further discussions took place with the Department on 26 April and 14 May.\(^{(54)}\) On 16 May the Director General announced that a resource teacher would be provided at the school for 2 hours each morning. King was transferred and not replaced.\(^{(55)}\)

Was it the same old story? The Commission, by focusing on the particular problem at Bronte, had circumvented Federation's desire to turn a single school dispute into a state wide


\(^{(55)}\) ibid., pp.6-7.
campaign. Furthermore, the solution offered to the school fell considerably short of the staff's original objective. The new leadership it seemed had been caught within the same institutional limitations encountered by its predecessors.

The Eastern Suburbs Teachers' Association accused Pearson of making a crucial error in accepting the Commission's proposal for a survey without insisting on adequate safeguards. Much later, Pearson admitted that his action had been 'foolish'. Federation would be wary of giving similar undertakings in the future.

The Bronte dispute highlighted the difficulties in generalising individual school action. The action of the Bronte teachers was primarily designed to meet a particular problem they faced. Federation, on the other hand, saw it as an opportunity to campaign against the staffing formula and to pressure the government to bring down a class size plan. But once the matter went to the Industrial Commission, the focus was once again directed towards the problem at the school itself. The staffing formula was not broken; no class size plan was announced. Nevertheless, the Bronte matter was the first of a series of disputes during 1974 and 1975 which focused on the class size question and related issues. During March and April 1974 there was industrial action at Stanmore Infants School on the need for lower class sizes for schools with a high proportion of migrant children. The Inner City Teachers' Association held a one day

---


strike in an attempt to generalise the matter to the wider issue
of class sizes in schools with a high proportion of migrants.\(^\text{(58)}\)

The focus of the dispute nevertheless remained on the particular
problem of the Stanmore school.

The legitimacy of action at the school level was not
contested by the leadership, but some of the problems raised by
such action were revealed. The problems of the particular school
and the wider objectives of the union appeared to be in tension
with each other. While the leadership could claim that such
disputes had the cumulative effect of forcing general improve­
ments, the settlements of the disputes seemed limited in their
gains for the particular school concerned. The relative lack of
short term success created some disaffection with the leadership
among those who had supported its election.

The class size issue, however, was kept to the forefront
of the union's concerns by other methods. During 1974 Federation
gave some publicity to the work on class sizes by Martin Olson of
the Columbia University Teachers' College.\(^\text{(59)}\) This work was
given particular attention in the 'Project Spotlight' which was
organised by Federation using $10,000 innovations grant from the
Schools Commission. Two overseas speakers, Girard Hottleman of
the Massachusetts Teachers' Association and Mike Zlotnik of the
British Columbia Teachers' Federation spoke at a series of public

\(^{(58)}\) Education, 10 April 1974, p.133, 5 June 1974,

\(^{(59)}\) N.S.W.T.F., 'Columbia University Study: New Evidence
Supports Small Class Sizes'. See also Education,
13 March 1974, p.67 (article by Mel Adams).
meetings organised by the Federation on community involvement in education and on Olson's work on class sizes.\(^{(60)}\)

These activities, together with the various disputes\(^{(61)}\) that took place in 1974 on the class size issue, seemed to have some cumulative effect. On 24 November 1974, Willis said that it was the governments' objective that no class should 'need to exceed' 30 students by 1980.\(^{(62)}\) This implied an average class size of 30 rather than concept of a maximum class size. The 1974 Annual Conference welcomed the Minister's announcement but rejected the concept of average class sizes rather than the notion of a maximum size. The Minister's plan was further criticised for making no provision for differential staffing in disadvantaged schools, and for reducing class sizes in 'practical' subjects.\(^{(63)}\) February Council directed teachers not to teach classes which exceeded the following maxima:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infants/Primary</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Disadvantaged)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forms I - III</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{(60)}\) Education, 7 August 1974, pp.258-260; N.S.W.T.F., Annual Report 1974, p.31. Meetings were held in Sydney, Canberra, Dubbo, Moree, Albury, Wagga Wagga, Armidale, Lismore, Newcastle, Parramatta and Wollongong. Zlotnik spoke on Olson's work on class sizes.

\(^{(61)}\) Disputes took place at Kendall Central, Port Kembla, Miller, Swansea, Randwick North and Taree High Schools. N.S.W.T.F., Annual Report 1974, pp.5-6.


\(^{(63)}\) Education, 29 January 1975, p.11.
Support would also be given to members taking action to reduce practical class sizes to 22. (64) The class size question was to be the union's priority in 1975.

Two schools took up the issue immediately. Randwick North High School organised a 'work-in' at the school. This involved bringing an unemployed teacher into the school in order to reduce class sizes. The teacher involved was threatened with charges under the Summary Offences Act. On Federation advice he left the school on the first day of the 'work-in'. The novelty of the tactic, however, attracted considerable attention. (65)

Another school, Randwick Boys High School took up the much harder issue of science class sizes. It decided to exclude any students in excess of 22 students, the maximum set by Federation for such classes. The action occasioned a confrontation between the leadership and the Eastern Suburbs Teachers' Association at March Council. Rennie moved that the action be suspended for one week so that the union could ascertain whether the Department would establish a committee to investigate 'practical' class sizes.

Rosemary Babbage of the E.S.T.A. said that this proposition was 'tantamount to Council failing to support the legitimate action of the school staff carrying out Federation policy'. (66) Council rejected Rennie's proposition and directed Executive to plan state wide action in support of the Randwick

(64) ibid., 26 February 1975, p.47; N.S.W.T.F., Annual Report 1975, section 2 (no pagination).


teachers.\(^{67}\) The action proceeded but was suspended when the union as a whole became embroiled in a dispute about preference in employment for unionists. The Federation representative at the school, however, made it clear that the teachers were disappointed with what they saw as a lack of support from the leadership.\(^{68}\)

Much greater enthusiasm was shown for the action taken by teachers at Balmain primary school. When a remedial teacher was transferred, a section of the staff began an indefinite strike on 10 April, which eventually lasted for 13 ½ days.\(^{69}\) The matter went to the Industrial Commission and eventually the Department agreed to provide a remedial teacher for three days a week.\(^{70}\) One teacher praised the support given to the action by Federation officers, but questioned the wisdom of the Executive's recommendation to the teachers to return to work when the Department had not given firm assurances that the remedial needs of the school would be met.\(^{71}\)

The Bronte and Balmain disputes were the most protracted school disputes faced by Federation in 1974 and 1975. In both cases the emphasis was on the schools' specific needs. The disputes at Randwick Boys and Randwick North were of a more generalised nature, designed to 'break' the staffing formula and achieve class size reductions for all. By emphasising the needs

\(^{67}\) ibid.

\(^{68}\) ibid., 23 April, 1975, p.132.

\(^{69}\) ibid., p.144 and 21 May 1975, p.168.

\(^{70}\) ibid., 18 June 1975, p.197.

\(^{71}\) ibid., 21 May 1975, p.168.
of individual schools, Federation was able to mobilise teacher and community support for the teachers at the schools. Such an emphasis, however, provided opportunities for the authorities to go some way towards meeting a school's particular problem, but also for diffusing a general campaign growing out of the single school action.

Having said that, it should be noted that each action had a cumulative effect. With Commonwealth involvement in the funding of public schools, it was more likely that the states would be in a better position to meet the demands placed upon it. The struggle between the Federation and the authorities was therefore, primarily over when the state's education requirements would be met. There can be little doubt that the various school actions assisted in pressuring the state government to make some concrete moves on the class size issue.

While there was criticism of the way some disputes were handled, there was no suggestion that the new leadership questioned the right of schools to take industrial action. While there may have been private reservations within the leadership about the efficacy of school based action, there was no public criticism of the concept itself in the way Whalan and Childs had questioned it. 'United action' of the whole membership, however, had not out-lived its usefulness.

Salaries

Salaries campaigns had generally involved the whole membership, and as such acted as great unifying force. In their election campaign Pearson, Rennie and Davy had argued that the wages of the lowest paid teachers had to be given priority in any
salary claim. Such a proposal was likely to cause division within the union. After lengthy canvassing of the membership in the early months of 1974, the Executive proposed a draft of a 25 per cent increase for all teachers based on economic and comparative wage adjustment arguments. When the matter came before Council, Rennie and Davy moved that the claim be 15 per cent plus a flat increase of $1,000. After a sharp debate, the original proposition was carried by only 73 votes to 70. In the next issue of Education, Rennie and Davy argued the case for their proposal saying that it was a 'positive step' towards a 'career salary' for classroom teachers.

The Secondary Teachers' Association, whose leadership was dominated by teachers in promotion positions, argued that the Rennie and Davy proposition ignored the greater taxation and superannuation commitments of higher paid teachers. The Canterbury Bankstown Teachers' Association, however, supported the proposition. Indeed it suggested that Federation should move towards a single base salary for all teachers, with allowances for those holding promotion positions.

---

(72) 'Unite Around Education Issues', election statement of Pearson, Rennie and Davy, p.4.

(73) Council, Minutes, 25 May 1974, p.75.

(74) Ibid.

(75) Education, 5 June 1971, p.171. See also Davy's letter.

(76) Education, 5 June 1974, p.171.

(77) Ibid.

(78) A. Rosser to J.R. Williams, undated (but July 1974), Canterbury Bankstown Teachers' Association files, N.S.W.T.F. archives.
differing perspectives reflected the breadth of the division within the membership about the claim.\(^{(79)}\)

When the matter came before Council for final determination, a classic compromise was struck. The salaries committee proposed a claim of 20 per cent plus $500.\(^{(80)}\) This had a less severe effect on higher paid teachers, but met some of the criticisms of the original 25 per cent claim. Council, moreover, rejected an attempt by the Principals' Association Councillor Barry Manefield to have the claim for all promotions personnel increased to 30 per cent.\(^{(81)}\)

Salaries debates within the Federation had tended to be largely about relativities among the rates for promotions teachers, and between that group and the rates for classroom teachers. The final claim demonstrated that the balance of power had shifted towards the classroom teachers. It was a considerable, although not a total, victory for Rennie, Davy and their supporters. To achieve the claim was the next problem.


\(^{(80)}\) ibid. See also Council, Minutes, 25 May 1974, (attachment).

Teacher Opinion on Salary Claim

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flat money increase</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat money increase plus percentage</td>
<td>1348</td>
<td>1615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal percentage</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>1356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing percentage</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreasing percentage</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>2375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Scale</td>
<td>1241</td>
<td>1373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Salary - allowances for promotion</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>2773</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{(81)}\) ibid., p.106.
After negotiations, the Public Service Board made a final offer of 8.5 per cent plus $500 for classroom teachers and 9.5 per cent plus $500 for teachers in promotions positions. The offer was widely rejected within the membership.\(^{(82)}\) On 24 August, Council called a 24 hour strike for 18 September. The issues of staffing, trainee teacher allowances, school councils and the Education Commission were added to salaries, as they were said to be 'interrelated directly to the current poor rate of pay offered in teaching'.\(^{(83)}\) Even the Principals' Association took the unprecedented step of urging its members to support the strike. The salaries offer and the threat of school boards was rather too much for them in one year.\(^{(84)}\) The strike was a stunning success, with 80 per cent of the members supporting the action.\(^{(85)}\) An underlying inflation rate of 14 per cent and a resulting wave of industrial action among workers generally,\(^{(86)}\) enhanced militancy among school teachers. Eventually the matter went before the Industrial Commission which awarded increases of 20 to 30 per cent for non-graduate teachers, 19 to 22 per cent for graduates and 20 to 29 per cent for teachers in promotion positions.\(^{(87)}\) The leadership had been able to exploit skilfully

\(^{(82)}\) Education, 11 September 1974, p.279.

\(^{(83)}\) ibid., 9 October 1974, p.326.

\(^{(84)}\) Interview with Barry Manefield, 29 March 1983.


\(^{(87)}\) N.S.W.T.F., Annual Report 1975, section 10.
arguments based on the inflationary pressures of the time and to achieve a result which went some way towards lifting the salaries of lower paid teachers relative to their better paid colleagues.

Nevertheless, however skilful the leadership, and however united the response of the membership, there were external constraints upon union action which were difficult to overcome. When the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission introduced wage indexation in April 1975, the Public Service Board made it clear that it would adhere to the wage indexation guidelines laid down by the Commission in future negotiations with the Federation. The union nevertheless submitted a wage claim of 14 per cent to cover price movements as well as increases in work value. Pearson warned members that the indexation guidelines would need to be overturned if the claim was to be realised. The response from the membership was not encouraging, so Council adopted a claim of 5 per cent to cover changes in work value. The Board rejected the claim outright. It was taken to the Commission which ruled that a work value change would need to be shown for each wage classification. This would have involved the union in a case on a scale similar to that of 1970,


(91) Council, Minutes, 11 October 1975, p.231.

(92) N.S.W.T.F., Annual Report 1976, p.27.
which had taken most of that year. There was little choice but to withdraw the case and campaign amongst the membership about the effect of indexation on teachers' wages. (93)

Although Federation had prided itself as a wages pacesetter among teachers and public sector workers generally, it could not alone, break out of indexation. In 1974, it had been able to exploit the situation and make wage gains somewhat ahead of the going rate of about 15 per cent. But other unions had led the way in establishing the wages climate. In 1975 all unions were faced with the imposition of wage restraint amidst economic downturn. Although some union leaders realised the implications of indexation, there was a long way to go before a 'break out' could be contemplated.

By October 1975 the Federal Labor government was fighting for its survival in the face of the Senate blocking supply. The union movement was hardly likely to launch a major industrial campaign against it. Neither the economic, industrial nor political climate favoured a sustained campaign against indexation. Although the Federation leadership was accused of indulging in a re-election stunt in advocating a 5 per cent claim, (94) it could hardly be blamed for its inability to lead its members against the wages system itself.

Preference for Unionists

By 1975 the union was facing severe financial problems. The government's decision to end deductions of union fees from

(93) ibid., p.26.

(94) Education, 8 October 1975.
member's salary cheques had begun to have serious economic consequences for the Federation. Membership had fallen to a post-war low of 71 per cent of teachers at the beginning of 1974. After a concerted recruitment campaign and the insertion of a preference clause into the salary awards of 1974, the membership reached 84 per cent of the teaching force by early 1975. Nevertheless, the union faced a deficit of $250,000 in 1975. Economies were made, but the union looked to the preference clause to assist in building up the membership.

The clause gave Federation members preference over non-members in both employment and retrenchment. The Department initially indicated that it would have no difficulty in implementing the clause. In January 1975, however, the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>88.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>88.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Board notified Federation that the preference provision would not apply to bonded ex-students or to teachers recruited from overseas. Indeed union membership would only be the 'final consideration' in employment decisions generally. Federation took the matter to the Industrial Commission, but the problem was not resolved. 

February Council decided to link the issue to the general question of teacher unemployment. The 'work-in' at Randwick North High School was designed to highlight the matter. A public meeting on teacher unemployment addressed by Willis and Opposition Leader Neville Wran was held on 13 March. On 18 March, Willis introduced a bill to amend the Teaching Service Act in order to empower the Director-General to override preference. He said that the government was determined to meet 'educational needs'. It would not accede to the Federation's quest for 'compulsory unionism'. The measure was opposed strongly by the Labor Party. Neville Wran warned that the government was courting 'industrial anarchy'. Labor Council Secretary John Ducker said the measure threatened the whole union movement. Federation sought the Industrial

(97) N.S.W.T.F., Annual Report 1975, section 11.
(99) ibid., 23 April 1975, p.133.
(100) ibid., 26 March 1975, p.116.
(1) N.S.W.P.D., Legislative Assembly, 18 March 1975, pp.4795-4801, Willis' second reading speech. See also S.M.H., 19 March 1975.
(2) ibid., p.4811.
Commission's intervention but its President, Sir Alexander Beattie, thought that such an action was inappropriate.\(^{(4)}\) A special meeting of Council took place on 20 March. It called a one day strike for Tuesday 25 March.\(^{(5)}\)

Hitherto state wide strikes had usually followed a sustained 'build up' period. Council, however, was convinced there would be strong support for the action. It is instructive to examine the arguments used by Federation officers to convince members to support the action. Parliamentary democracy and sanctity of the law featured prominently in Eric Pearsons' statements on the question. The government, he said, had overridden 'the law and the courts with a cynical contempt unprecedented in the history of the state.' The Industrial Commission had properly granted preference; the government had taken it away.\(^{(6)}\) Such language was designed to appeal to members who tended to see the Commission as a neutral umpire in the continuing struggles between Labour and Capital and between Labour and the State. The court had enforced the rules; so the government had changed them.

\(^{(4)}\) J.R. Williams to Industrial Registrar, 19 March 1975 and Industrial Registrar to J.R. Williams, 21 March 1975. Preference for Unionists files, N.S.W.T.F. archives.

\(^{(5)}\) Council, Minutes, 22 March 1975, pp.51-52.

\(^{(6)}\) Education, 9 April 1975, p.117 (special strike issue). He used similar language in his address to members over radio 2KY on Monday 24 March. Copy of speech in Preference for Unionists files, N.S.W.T.F. archives. Pearson debated Willis on Channel 10. Davy and Hourihan were interviewed on Channels 7 and 9. Advertisements were placed in the Telegraph and Australian on 21 and 24 March (but not in the Herald as the printers were in dispute with the company).
Given that there was no time to canvass the strike proposal in any formal way with the membership, the strike was a considerable success with about 64 per cent of members responding to the call. The main meeting was addressed by such notables as A.C.T.U. President, R.J. Hawke, Labour Council Secretary John Ducker and Neville Wran. Even the Sydney Morning Herald muted its usual criticism of teachers' strikes and contented itself with blaming both the union and the government for the situation.

The strike meetings endorsed the holding of a further strike if the legislation was not repealed within three weeks. The Sydney meeting, however, rejected a proposition, moved by Peter Woods and seconded by Jennie George that the union should cease to recognise the legitimacy of the Industrial Commission. This rejection was at least consistent with the aura of sanctity with which Federation endowed the court when the government overrode its decision.

The leadership had taken a considerable risk in calling the strike and it had been vindicated. The problem was how to sustain the campaign. Willis was adamant that the government would not back down. The union, he said, would not frustrate the authorities' attempt to employ the 'most qualified staff' by its

---

(7) S.M.H., 26 March 1975.
(8) Australian, 26 March 1975.
(9) S.M.H., 4 April 1975.
(10) Education, 9 April 1975, p.121.
(11) Interview with Peter Woods, 15 February 1984. The amendment was not reported in Education.
desire for 'compulsory unionism'. Teachers from two schools wrote to Herald supporting Willis' attitude. Davy and Rennie denied that the union was demanding compulsory unionism. Pearson and Willis exchanged letters in the press about the issue.

Federation was not unsupported. The Waterside Workers and Ironworkers threatened to close Port Kembla. The Council of Parents' and Citizens'. Federation called for the repeal of the legislation. Eighteen public service unions, including the Inspectors' Institute, took out a press advertisement in support of the Federation. On the eve of the second strike Willis agreed to freeze the legislation, pending further negotiations. If these failed then the Federation could take the matter to arbitration. No guarantee was given, however, that the legislation would be repealed. Despite the reservation of some Executive members, there was little choice but to call off the second strike.

(12) S.M.H., 26 March 1975.
(13) S.M.H., 8 April (Helensburgh Primary), 17 April 1975 (Lindfield Infants).
(15) Australian, 24 March 1975; Daily Mirror, 1 April 1975.
(16) S.M.H., 11, 12 April 1975.
(17) S.M.H., 7 April 1975.
(18) S.M.H., 2 April 1975.
(19) Executive, Minutes, 14 April 1975, pp.132-133; S.M.H., 15 April 1975.
(20) Executive, Minutes, 14 April 1975, p.134. Education, 23 April 1975, p.123. The author was present at the meeting.
These reservations proved to be justified. Negotiations proceeded, but without result. On 14 May Willis announced that the legislation would be implemented. Pearson expressed his 'complete and utter' shock at the decision.\(^{(21)}\) Nevertheless, Buggie wrote to teachers assuring them that preference would be given to Federation members 'where applicants for a position' were 'equally qualified and equally suitable'.\(^{(22)}\) This seemed a concession, but it was not a guarantee of 'absolute preference' to union members.

The government had achieved a tactical victory over the union. The feeling for another strike had largely dissipated. Mass meetings, however, were called to consider strike action with other unions in third term.\(^{(23)}\) The meetings were not well attended, and although they supported strike action, the fight had clearly gone out of much of the membership.\(^{(24)}\) Federation therefore shifted its attention to a political campaign on the issue. Federal Immigration Minister, Clyde Cameron, agreed to refuse visas to teachers recruited from overseas.\(^{(25)}\) The union offered to arrange to have the bans lifted if the Department

---


\(^{(22)}\) Copy of letter in preference to Unionists files, N.S.W.T.F. archives; N.S.W.T.F., Annual Report 1975, section 10.

\(^{(23)}\) Council, Minutes, 24 May 1975, p.93.

\(^{(24)}\) Council, Minutes, 19 July 1975, p.143. Final figures were: For, 3451; Against, 1313. Total membership, 33,846.

\(^{(25)}\) Mirror, 29 April 1975.
agreed to employ all unemployed teachers who were not unduly restrictive in their choice of work location. The Department declined the offer. In the latter part of 1975 Federation sought clear undertakings from all political parties that preference would be restored. This was accompanied by a publicity campaign against the state government. When the Labor Party won government in 1976, preference was restored to teacher unionists.

In the long term the campaign was successful. In the short term, however, the union had been outmanoeuvred by a wily Minister. The leadership had taken a considerable risk in calling the first strike. This contrasted with its predecessors' failure to take immediate and dramatic action against the government on the deregistration issue. In that sense the leadership had proved its worth. To achieve its ultimate objective, however, it had to resort to well established political and publicity methods not substantially different from those which had been used by its predecessors. The capacity for sustained industrial action by the mass of teachers was still limited, despite the desires of a militant leadership and the vanguard elements within the union. There were, moreover, forces developing within the union which owed little to the activity of the new establishment within the leadership of the organisation.

Re-emergence of Women Members

Only one of the eleven candidates in the 1973 senior officers election was a woman; Joyce Clarke. The defeat of Elizabeth Mattick in 1971 had broken a forty year old tradition that one of the senior officers ought be a woman. The re-establishment of that tradition, it seems, was not a priority of candidates in 1973.

The revival of the women's movement in the late 1960s and early 1970s was beginning to have an impact within the union. Nance Cooper had written forcefully about women, girls and education in 1969. There had been a complicated dispute about maternity leave for Federation organiser, Doris Jobling Owens in 1974-1975. Education occasionally featured articles of particular interest to women readers. Cathy McDonald was appointed to a Schools Commission study group on girls and education which eventually produced the landmark report, Girls, School and Society in 1975.

---

(29) See letter to colleagues from Joyce Clarke (1973), Sam Lewis papers, N.S.W.T.F. archives. She said that at least one senior officer should be a woman, given that more than 50 per cent of the membership were women.


By International Women's Year in 1975, however, matters of particular interest to women members were largely regarded as exotic within the union. At the 1974 Annual Conference there was a move for the union to employ a person to co-ordinate activities during 1975 on the status of women, their roles in the education system and within the union itself. It was opposed on financial grounds. The debate was then adjourned until the next day.

When it resumed the next morning two speakers, Cathy McDonald and Eric Pearson, told Conference that there had been heavy lobbying overnight for and against the proposition. McDonald said that the opponents had called the proposal 'divisive'. She suggested that similar sentiments had been expressed about earlier Federation campaigns on equal pay and equal opportunity. Replying to the debate Pearson opposed the employment of a co-ordinator from union funds, but promised that Federation would seek funding from the federal government for the position. The motion was lost, but Federation subsequently obtained funds from the federal government to establish the position.

(33) Annual Conference, Transcript, 17 December 1974, p.40. Interview with Nance Cooper, 8 February 1984. She moved the original proposition.

(34) ibid., p.47.

(35) ibid., 18 December 1974, pp.2 and 4. Interview with Cathy Bloch (McDonald), 10 February 1984.

(36) ibid., p.2.

(37) ibid., p.4.

Pearson, in fact, devoted his first 'President Writes' column of 1975 to the issue of maternity leave. He confessed that he had not been aware until recent times that women returning from maternity leave were not guaranteed return\(^{(39)}\) to the school or college from which they had taken leave, nor could they return at a time they thought appropriate within the general time span for such leave. The question was taken up with some vigour with the Department during 1975, with Jennie George and Cathy McDonald as well as Pearson and General Secretary Max Taylor being involved in the negotiations. In July, the Department gave an undertaking that it would appoint teachers returning from maternity leave at the expiry date of the leave and not afterwards. Eventually women were guaranteed return to the school from whence they came.\(^{(40)}\) It seemed that issues of particular interest to women were beginning to have an impact on the mainstream activity of the union.

On 15 March Council elected Gail Shelston as co-ordinator of International Women's Year activities within the union.\(^{(41)}\) Her prime, although not exclusive concern, was to promote consciousness among members about the issue of sexism in education.\(^{(42)}\) A number of articles appeared in *Education* during 1975 covering such topics as gender differences in

\(^{(39)}\) ibid., 26 February 1975, p.46.

\(^{(40)}\) ibid., 2 July 1975, p.214.

\(^{(41)}\) ibid., 12 March 1975, p.98. Other candidates were Wendy McCarthy and Winifred Poole.

educational provision and sex stereotyping in primary school. Gail Shelston and a small group of feminist teachers, set about developing a network of women contacts in schools and colleges. Talks were given at many school and association meetings, to community organisations and on radio programmes on a range of issues. A kit on sexism on education was widely distributed. Such activity received a mixed response. One correspondent accused feminists of trying to reverse the 'natural order' of things. Another claimed that women in the primary service were already favoured in the allocation of appointment and classes. Gail Shelston was 'complimented' at one association meeting for being 'quite intelligent for a chick.'

Federation joined a deputation of women educators to the Minister to request him to establish a committee on sexism in education. He established the committee. While such

---

(43) ibid., 26 February 1975, p.61 (Pam Waugh) and 12 March 1975, p.79 (Joan Bielski).
(44) ibid., 12 February 1975, p.33 (Elaine Whiteman) and Shelston, op.cit.
(45) ibid., 21 May 1975, p.152 and 3 December 1975, p.418. See also International Women's Year files, N.S.W.T.F. archives.
(48) ibid., 29 January 1975, p.4.
(49) ibid., 25 February 1975, p.42.
initiatives are sometimes taken in order to diffuse an issue his
decision indicated that this particular issue could no longer be
ignored. Federation and a small group of feminists within the
union had assisted in making the education of girls an issue in
N.S.W. educational politics.

The question of Federation funding the continuation of
the co-ordinator's position came before the 1975 Annual
Conference. A motion from the floor that Federation fund the
position in 1976, was carried. At the same conference,
however, there were complaints that women found it difficult to
receive the call to speak, from the chair. Nevertheless,
much had been achieved in a year. It was largely women members
who had succeeded in persuading the union that issues of
particular concern to women should be a significant part of
Federation activity. The initiative had not come from the 'new
look' leadership.

Democracy in the Schools -
Corporal Punishment

In the early 1970s Van Davy and his associates as well as
members of the Communist Party had shown considerable interest in

(51) Annual Conference 1975, Minutes, pp.35-36.

(52) Conference Comment, 17 December 1975, unofficial
publication authorised by David Bell, Richard Walsham and
Nance Cooper (in possession of author).
the question of democracy in schools.\(^{53}\) A draft resolution came before the 1973 Annual Conference. The views expressed therein reflected much of the discussion of the period about the necessity for participatory democracy in schools. Much of the discussion at the conference, however, concerned an amendment to the policy which declared that students 'shall not be subjected to corporal punishment of any kind'.\(^{54}\) After a tense, and sometimes emotional debate, the amendment was lost 241 votes to 208.\(^{55}\)

In May 1974 the Canterbury Bankstown Association asked the Federation Executive to call on schools to abolish corporal punishment, 'in the interests of developing positive relationships


\(^{54}\) Annual Conference 1973, Transcript, Wednesday, a.m., p.21.

\(^{55}\) ibid., The author was present during the debate. See also Richard Walsham, 'Recent Developments in the N.S.W. Teachers' Federation', unpublished paper, C.P.A., n.d. (but 1974), p.3.
between teachers and students'. Instead the Executive asked school staffs to indicate their attitude to the question generally. In the absence of a concerted campaign on the question, it is not surprising that 97.5 per cent of staffs that responded said that corporal punishment should be retained 'as a last resort'. The Canterbury Bankstown Association expressed irritation at the way the Executive handled the issue. Its action had effectively stymied the campaign against corporal punishment. Amidst the struggle about school boards and a salaries campaign, the Executive was hardly likely to encourage a divisive brawl about corporal punishment. The democracy in schools policy could assist teachers in the attempts to gain some control over the governance of schools, but the corporal punishment issue struck at the heart of the power relationship between the teachers and the taught. Perhaps if a concerted campaign had been conducted by sections of the membership before the matter was raised in a formal way, the treatment of the issue may have been different. Women members had campaigned to bring issues of particular interest to women to the attention of the union. There had been no such concerted campaign by the opponents of corporal punishment. It is not surprising that the leadership was loath to put at risk the sometimes tenuous unity within the union.

(56) R.K. Morris to J.R. Williams, 13 May 1974, Canterbury Bankstown Association files, N.S.W.T.F. archives.

(57) Executive, Minutes, 10 September 1974, p.606.

(58) ibid., pp.605-606.
Limited Tenure of Office - Sectional Associations

The Pearson, Rennie and Davy team had associated itself with a movement within the union to end unlimited tenure of office within the union and to abolish sectional associations. (59) Davy reminded the 1973 Annual Conference that the team had a 'mandate' to move on these two issues. (60) The sectional associations had been slowly dying since 1963, when teachers were automatically allocated to a local association if one existed. The formation of the Eastern Suburbs, Inner City, Ryde Macquarie and Lower North Shore Associations in 1974 marked the virtual death knell of sectional associations. With their demise the power base of the old guard and conservative elements was destroyed. The Inner City and Eastern Suburbs Associations became the vanguard elements in the 1970s. The new leadership had initiated the process, but it had been a part of the winning side of the argument between local and sectional interests within the union.

Less success was achieved on the notion of limited tenure of office. The concept had been endorsed in principle at the 1973 Annual Conference. (61) When its implementation came before the

(59) 'United around Educational Issues...new methods of organisation and communication with members', p.4. Election Statement (in possession of author).


(61) Annual Conference 1973, Minutes, p.4.
1974 Conference, however, the delegates voted not to proceed with the matter any further.\(^{(62)}\) Federation subsequently gained the right of officers to return to their teaching positions with full employment rights. This achieved the objective of a regular turnover of officers in the latter 1970s, and thus achieved what the dissident elements of the early 1970s had sought on factional grounds.

A New Establishment and New Dissidents

By coming to office in 1974 and with a majority of its supporters on Executive and Council, the Pearson, Rennie and Davy team became the new establishment. They brought new vigour, albeit inexperience, to Federation affairs compared with the apparent vacillations of their predecessors. They had considerable success with the traditional matter of salaries. They invoked conservative feelings within the membership to mobilise a militant response to the threat of school boards and the denial of preference. These were essentially defensive issues. In the area of class size, however, some positive gains were made for teachers.

By the time the team took office considerable funds from federal sources were flowing into the schools. Progress could be made on issues like class sizes because the state government was in a better financial position to respond to such demands. In a more general sense the optimism wrought by these funds probably made it easier to mobilise members in both offensive and defensive struggles. It was a time of optimism and progress. To some extent, the team was the beneficiary of this situation.

\(^{(62)}\) Annual Conference 1974, Transcript, 16 December 1974, a.m., p.10.
This atmosphere also helps to explain why the team, despite its successes, became the object of growing criticism. Pearson, an ill man, did not recontest the Presidency. Rennie and Davy offered themselves for the Presidency and the Deputy Presidency and newcomer Barbara Murphy for the Senior Vice-Presidency. On this occasion, however, they were not supported by such a widely-based alliance of dissident forces as had worked for their election in 1973. A dissident team of Peter Woods, Jennifer Nisbet and Michael Silvester stood against them, claiming to represent the sentiments which had sustained the opposition to the old guard leadership.\footnote{N.S.W.T.F., Senior Officers Election - November 1975. Policy of Woods, Nisbet and Silvester and 'Let the Teachers Speak!' Poster (in possession of author).}

Pearson, Rennie and Davy had not provoked the sustained criticism which had been the lot of Whalan and Childs. But there were signs of disillusionment just months after the new leadership's election. There was disaffection about the handling of the Bronte dispute. In 1975 there was criticism of the leadership's attitude to the Randwick Boys High School action on science classes. More militant alternatives were being put to the senior officers' recommendations. Peter Woods proposed a concerted campaign against the legitimacy of the Industrial Commission during the preference dispute. Mary Boland proposed that secondary teachers reduce their teaching load by three periods if the government did not repeal the legislation denying preference.\footnote{Council, Minutes, 19 July 1975, p.114, Education, 2 July 1975, p.219.} Jennifer Nisbet accused the leadership of
'reinterpreting' policy in the Whalan mode. Jean Law suggested that the 5 per cent salary claim in 1975 was a re-election stunt. Most of these critics had supported Pearson, Rennie and Davy in the 1973 senior officers' election. A new group of dissidents, which included some of these critics, began to meet separately from the supporters of the leadership. A meeting of the leadership's supporters chose Barbara Murphy ahead of Peter Woods as a running mate for Rennie and Davy, following Pearson's decision not to re-contest office. This was the catalyst which finally produced the new dissident team of Woods, Nisbet and Silvester.

The new team and their supporters argued that the leadership had not encouraged sufficiently, local initiative in the taking of action. They argued that Federation had to take a more militant approach, in order to improve the working conditions of the members.

Not all the criticism of the leadership, however, came from its former supporters.

Barry Manefield had become the unofficial spokesman for those who felt discomforted by what they perceived as the unnecessary militancy of the leadership.

(66) *ibid.*, pp.374 and 379.
(67) Based on discussions with Mary Boland, Cathy Bloch, Jennie George and Peter Woods who were present at the meeting.
(68) 'New South Wales Teachers' Federation, Senior Officers Election - November 1975, Policy of Woods - Nisbet - Silvester' (in possession of author).
retiring, Manefield was able to mount a successful challenge to Rennie for the presidency of the union. Davy and Murphy, however, were elected as deputy president and senior vice president respectively. The new team of senior officers, therefore, consisted of an apparently conservative president and two leading members of the group that had captured the leadership in 1973.

This latter group, which had carried the banner of local initiative in action, had defeated the united front leadership, which had been so long sustained by the highly-disciplined and well-organised Communist Party fraction within the union. With the split in the C.P.A., the ideological and organisational impetus had been removed from the old guard, but had never been effectively re-established among the ideologically motley group of dissidents. By 1975 the dissidents themselves had split into two contending groups.

Had then the period 1974-1975 not constituted a 'new era' in Federation history? Was the leadership of Pearson, Rennie and Davy all that different from those who had gone before them?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P. Harrison Mattley</td>
<td>1,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Manefield</td>
<td>7,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.A. Rennie</td>
<td>6,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.R. Woods</td>
<td>1,483</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After distribution of preferences:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Manefield</td>
<td>8,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.A. Rennie</td>
<td>8,245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In 1983 Ivor Lancaster commented on this latter split by stating, rather sadly, that 'splitters beget splitters'.

(70) P. Harrison Mattley 1,314
B. Manefield 7,366
C.A. Rennie 6,724
P.R. Woods 1,483

(71) In 1983 Ivor Lancaster commented on this latter split by stating, rather sadly, that 'splitters beget splitters'.
Like their predecessors, Pearson, Rennie and Davy still faced the problem of reconciling a commitment to action with the maintenance of unity. In the face of attacks by the state authorities, it was necessary to mount defensive counter-action. This, they were able to do - for the most part. They were also expected to make advances for the membership. Some of their supporters were disappointed with the leadership's record in this regard. Too little action provoked criticism. On the other hand, too much action discomfited more conservative members of the union. Nevertheless Pearson, Rennie and Davy did bring vigour and determination to the leadership. Like their predecessors, however, they had to balance the enthusiasm of the vanguard elements, against the more cautious disposition of much of the membership.

At a more fundamental level, a change of leadership did not, in itself, change the nature of the teaching force. Conservative arguments about professional rights and status still needed to be used to mobilise many union members. For many teachers, industrial action was supported with reluctance and resignation, rather than with militant enthusiasm. But even that level of mobilisation would have been unthinkable in 1965. By the mid-1970s, arguments about the use of the strike weapon tended to be more about its usefulness as a tactic in any given situation, rather than its propriety as such. The problem of reconciling action with the maintenance of unity had been a problem for Pearson, Rennie and Davy, as it had been for their predecessors. It would continue to be a problem for their successors.
CONCLUSION
Employees of the State usually have a more complicated relationship with their employers than workers in the private sector. Many private sector workers can bring direct economic pressure upon their employers. The withdrawal of labour can present, at least a temporary threat, to the level of profits. For the most part the services provided by the State are not designed to produce profits. Industrial action by workers in the State sector are therefore less likely to affect the level of profits, although in areas like transport, posts and telecommunications where fees and charges are levied, sustained industrial action may affect the cash flow of certain State instrumentalities. In the administrative services of the State and in areas like the police, the provision of justice and in education, this latter consideration does not apply. Indeed it is often pointed out that sustained industrial action by public school teachers would bring considerable savings to the State authorities.

Public school teachers, therefore have traditionally sought to bring political pressure upon the State. The denial of services by public school teachers is designed to be a political embarrassment to the State. A sustained campaign directed at the State, even one which falls short of the resort to direct action, can have a considerable impact on it.

Indeed it can be argued that the sustained withdrawal of labour by school teachers could have most deleterious consequences for society as a whole. As well as their functions as educators, teachers also carry out a significant amount of State-supported child care. This function has, perhaps, taken on an increasing
importance in the post war period with women entering the paid labour force in significant numbers. A sustained withdrawal of labour of teachers, would, therefore, be most disruptive to two income or sole parent families. In Australia in general and in N.S.W. in particular, there has never been a sustained withdrawal of labour by the great mass of teachers, although there have been lengthy strikes by individual schools or groups of schools from time to time.

As well as being employees of the State, public school teachers have been usually regarded as 'professionals' rather than members of the working class. Traditionally professionals are assumed to have a level of commitment to their work, which exceeds the desire for economic rewards. Professionals are not assumed to be primarily self-interested. It is no accident that many discussions among teachers about the propriety of industrial action, often revolves on the issue of whether or not it is proper for professionals to withdraw their labour from their clients. The professional status attributed to teachers distances them from other groups or employees who do not claim, nor have attributed to them, professional status. Professionals, it is argued, should be altruistic, dignified, responsible and respectable.

Public school teachers, as both State employees and as professionals, are therefore likely to be subject to considerable constraint when it comes to the action of withdrawing their labour. For the first fifty years of its history, the N.S.W. Teachers' Federation was constrained in this manner. Nevertheless during this period the union was attacked, from time to time, for being a strident, militant organisation. At various times during
its history, there has been considerable argument within the union as to whether it should be a quiet, dignified organisation which relied on cogent argument and top level negotiation or whether it should be an active, publicly campaigning organisation which sought, where it could, to force the various State authorities to adopt policies which met Federation objectives.

This argument arose, in part, from the divisions within the structure of the teaching service itself. The union contained classroom teachers as well as those who exercise supervisory or administrative authority over them. The interests of these two groups were, at least potentially, in conflict. The teaching service, moreover, had a majority of women, while supervisory and administrative functions were generally exercised by men. Furthermore until 1962, women teachers were paid less than men doing the same work.

These divisions were reflected within the structure of the Federation. Members gained representation, either through locality or by section. Generally speaking teachers in country areas were organised in local associations which contained all members regardless of position held in the teaching service. Until the 1960s however, country teachers were not directly represented on Federation Council.

Infants and primary classroom teachers in Sydney and Newcastle were represented in associations of classroom teachers which were further differentiated by gender. Teachers fulfilling supervisory and administrative roles, were represented in associations based on position in the promotion hierarchy. Secondary teachers, with a few exceptions, were members of the Secondary Teachers' Association.
It was therefore important for the union leadership to emphasise issues which would gain support of the great range of teachers. In the 1950s and 1960s improvements in school accommodation, reduction in class sizes, greater provision for teacher training were in the interests of all members.

It was, however, only the State authorities which could provide the funds to finance these improvements. Federation correctly calculated that the federal government's monopoly of income taxing powers meant that the states could not meet their education obligations without the federal government rendering significant financial assistance. The campaign to persuade the federal government to take such a role would only be effective if it could be demonstrated that teachers had wide support for their demands. Federation, therefore, set about building a 'united front' in support of federal funding of education.

While the united front tactic dated from the 1930s, it was given considerable impetus by the launching of Sputnik in 1957 and the dissemination of the writings of the human capital theorists. While Federation had long argued that education was a fundamental necessity for the exercise of democratic citizenship, events of the late 1950s and early 1960s enabled Federation and its allies to argue that increased funding of education was necessary for scientific, technological and economic progress.

But even if the funds were made available, they would not be used most effectively if they were applied to an education system developed in an earlier period. The reconstruction of the secondary education system was, therefore, as necessary as funds, to establish an education system which could best meet the
economic, scientific, and technological demands of the 1960s. In seeking reform of secondary education Federation was able, moreover, to project itself not only as an organisation devoted to improving the working conditions of its members, but also as an organisation of professional educators, concerned to improve education generally. As such, Federation could project itself as an industrial, educational and professional organisation. In doing so it appealed to the legitimate desire of its members, as workers, to improve their conditions of employment, as well as to their self-image as altruistic professionals devoted to the good of education itself.

In 1964 Federation had achieved two major objectives. The federal government had committed itself to direct funding of schools, albeit in a very limited way. The N.S.W. government, moreover, had committed itself to implementing the Wyndham Report on secondary education. The first decision, however, had also brought a historic commitment to State Aid for non-government schools. The human capital arguments, it was clear, did not only apply to public schools. Federation therefore, was faced with the difficulty of maintaining the campaign for federal funding, but also continuing to oppose the allocation of funds to non-government schools. The implementation of the Wyndham scheme also meant that the union would need to campaign even more vigorously for the additional teachers necessary for an effective realisation of the objectives of the scheme.

While Federation looked to the federal government to provide additional funds to meet the requirements of an expanding education system, it was the N.S.W. government which exercised the
prime responsibility for the allocation of resources to, and the implementation of structural reforms within, the education system. Throughout the 1950s Federation maintained generally cordial relationships with the state Labor government. The principal source of advice to the government on the conduct of the education system was the Public Service Board. The Board, moreover, possessed considerable powers over the teaching service. Since the 1920s it had been Federation policy that these powers should be removed from the Board and placed under the control of Education Commission on which teachers would be represented directly.

Amidst the demographic crisis of the late 1950s and early 1960s, this policy was revived by Federation. It was argued that education should be run by 'experts'. As professional educators teachers were experts. The policy was promoted in such a way as to appeal to the 'professional' self-image of teachers.

It was the state Labor government that needed to be persuaded to make such a fundamental change. Long established campaigning methods did not shift the government. Federation therefore took the step of all but calling on teachers to vote for the Liberal and Country parties in the 1965 election, who unlike Labor, were prepared to establish a Commission. The new government's failure to honour that promise produced a deep sense of betrayal among Federation members.

By the mid-1960s, therefore, two of the most important tactics employed by Federation had either produced unintended consequences or had failed altogether. The intervention in the 1965 election failed; the federal funding campaign resulted in an
historic commitment to State Aid as well as direct federal assistance to public schools. Only one industrial tactic remained unused by Federation. In 1968 Federation added the strike to its array of industrial and political tactics.

In the 1960s the composition of the teaching force had undergone considerable change. Unlike their older colleagues people entering the teaching service had not lived through depression and war. Their expectations were wrought in the more prosperous and optimistic environment of the post war period. Although class sizes were lower and buildings probably better during the 1960s than they were in the late 1940s and 1950s, the younger teaching force perceived their working conditions as intolerable by the standards thought appropriate to the 1960s. Indeed by the middle of the decade, secondary class sizes began to deteriorate in comparison with the early 1960s. By that time, the children born in the ten years after the war had reached secondary school. Many of them were staying on to the fourth and subsequent years of secondary schooling. The provision of teachers barely kept abreast of the increase in enrolments. The teacher shortage had its most direct effect on the provision of relief staff. By 1967 there was growing unrest among secondary teachers about the number of extra classes they were forced to take, to cover the absences of their colleagues.

As with the composition of the teaching force, the union itself underwent significant change. As schools opened in the developing areas of Sydney, there was a growing demand from teachers to be organised in area units rather than sectional
associations. This reinforced a growing emphasis on the problems which teachers experienced in common, rather than those matters which were of concern to the various sections of the teaching service. Throughout the 1960s country teachers increasingly demanded direct representation on Federation Council. The achievement of a fully representative Council, together with the decline of sectional associations in Sydney, tended to break down the rigid factionalism which had characterised the Federation in the 1950s and early 1960s.

This factionalism had been manifested in bitter internecine warfare within the union in the 1950s. In 1957 an accommodation between the Left, Centre and Right wing factions took place: all factions were represented on the Executive and figures from the Centre and the Left shared the leadership. As the political rigidities of the 1950s began to loosen and the structure of the union began to change, the factions became less sharply defined. These well defined factional alignments had, ironically, promoted overall stability within the union despite the occasional outbreak of warfare among the various groups. The decline of rigid factionalism became a threat to stability within the union.

The Left, under the leadership of Sam Lewis, nevertheless re-emerged as the single most powerful force within the union after the accommodation of 1957. Its strength was such that there was no serious opposition to Lewis succeeding as President after Don Taylor's retirement at the end of 1963. This did not mean, however, that the Left had a free hand within the union. The
controversy over the affiliation to the A.I.C.D. indicated that a significant section of the membership resisted the Left's wider political objectives. On the other hand, Lewis was able to withstand attacks by conservative politicians and assaults upon his leadership by the Federation Reform Committee. There were clear limitations to the effectiveness of anti-Communism as a tactic against the Left in the union.

Within the Left itself and within the Communist Party education fraction in particular, there were elements that eschewed the more cautious united front tactics of the older comrades who had survived the bitter union and wider political struggles of the Cold War period. These more adventurous, sometimes confrontationist elements, recognised the greater political fluidy of the period and saw the opportunity to translate political change into more militant industrial tactics within the union. Even the older elements, so badly bruised in the 1950s, began to detect a new industrial militancy among sections of the membership. They cautiously attempted to direct this new militancy towards the great act of redefined 'united action'; the strike of 1968.

The arguments used to persuade members to support the 1968 strike were not, for the most part, those of traditional industrial militancy. Great care was taken to give salaries a subsidiary role in the numerous grievances identified by the Federation as the reasons for the strike. Indeed the work 'strike' itself was avoided in Federation parlance. Members were 'refraining from duty', they were taking 'professional action'.
Increased class sizes and shortages of staff were perceived as being as much an assault upon the status of teachers, as professionals, as they were on the working conditions of teachers as employees. Both supporters and opponents of the strike invoked various conceptions of professionalism in arguing for or against the strike.

Nevertheless once the strike weapon had been used so successfully, the question of who should initiate and who should control industrial action was hotly contested. The 'united action' of 1968 had been so successful, partly because it had been controlled by, and often initiated by, the central bodies of the union. It was based on the leadership's calculation of what was likely to attract the widest support within the union and, where relevant, attract support within the wider community. The 1968 strike however, had originated in local action by industrially more advanced vanguard elements within the union. The strike had been, indeed, undertaken to ensure that those elements did not act in an uncontrolled manner. The period from late 1968 to the end of 1973 was characterised by continuing warfare between those who wished to maintain the maximum degree of central control possible and those who wished to encourage vanguard sections of the union to exercise a considerable amount of local autonomy and initiative.

During this period of internecine warfare, the union was facing a government and its agencies determined to use all powers available to them to curb what were regarded as the excesses of the union. The imposition of fines on the union after the 1968 strike, the penal provisions of the 1970 Teaching Service Act, the use of the Summary Offences Act, the cessation of deductions of
union fees and the use of Section 37 against individual members were all examples of this process. In this endeavour the government was enthusiastically supported by a tough and determined Director-General of Education, possessed of considerable powers and who, unlike his two predecessors, was less disposed to compromise with Federation. Much of the disputation within the union during 1972 and 1973 when the government sought the deregistration of the Federation, was about the best tactics to be employed against a government determined to limit the power of the Federation.

The internal struggle within the union also reflected changes in the wider society. The arguments used by the dissidents about autonomy, participation, democracy and local initiative reflected the 'New Left' critique of the tactics and attitudes of the Old Left. This situation was also a reflection of the profound conflicts within the Communist Party of Australia. The Communist fraction within the Federation had been large, powerful and influential since the 1940s. Since the setbacks of the 1950s, however, it had exercised its influence and leadership, for most part, in a rather cautious manner. The politics of caution were less palatable to younger members of the Party who had not experienced the difficulties of the 1950s and had been profoundly influenced by the New Left critique of the Old Left and, in the case of university graduates, had experience of 'student power' in those institutions in the mid to late 1960s. In some important senses, then, the conflicts within the Federation were important, although not exclusive manifestations of the growing conflicts within the Communist Party.
The 'old guard' leadership, nevertheless, probably on balance, correctly calculated that the bulk of the membership was not as industrially advanced as the vanguard elements. Arguments about professional status had been sufficient to mobilise the membership on certain occasions; they were not, however, sufficient to arouse the membership in a continuing and sustained manner. The election of Len Childs as President in 1971 was an indication that a significant section of the membership preferred his vague promise of 'professional leadership' to the militant tactics of the dissidents and even the more cautious approach of the 'old guard' leadership.

The motley alliance of various dissident and vanguard elements had challenged sufficiently the 'old guard's' united front leadership, for a majority of the membership to reject the 'old guard', as well as Childs, in the 1973 senior officers elections. The dissidents' team promised that they would endeavour to integrate industrial, educational and professional issues. They appealed not only to those who took an essentially union approach to Federation activity, but also to those who argued that direct action should be primarily directed towards achieving professional and educational objectives.

The challenges faced by the leadership were, however, hardly new. The union faced a hostile state government and a hostile Director-General. The membership was, moreover, in decline following the cessation of the deduction of union fees from members' salaries. N.S.W. teachers' salaries had been severely affected by inflation. Class size was still an important problem for the union. Arguments about professional status were
invoked, together with other arguments, to mobilise the membership on these issues. The resistance to the school boards proposal was based, for the most part, on the fear that the existing professional autonomy of teachers would be undermined. Essentially conservative arguments about the majesty of the law and the sacred quality of parliamentary democracy were used to resist the withdrawal of preference for teacher unionists. On the other hand, the first state wide strike on salaries alone took place during this period. The preference strike, moreover, was called with a minimum of consultation with the membership. The leadership had demonstrated a degree of unity and determination which had been lacking, to a considerable degree, in its immediate predecessors.

How much had really changed? Is it largely illusory to see the 1974 and 1975 period as a 'new era' in Federation history?

Strike action was taken by both the union as a whole, and sections of the organisation. The industrial behaviour of teachers from 1968 and 1975 was manifestly different from in the first fifty years of Federation history when no strike action had occurred. Industrial initiative was no longer the exclusive province of the leadership and central decision-making bodies of the union. Local units of the Federation could legitimately exercise a considerable degree of industrial initiative. It was now possible for local units and vanguard elements to exercise considerable influence over the industrial priorities of the union. The establishment of action priorities and tactics was no longer the sole preserve of the centre. This shift in the balance of power between the centre and the smaller units in the union probably gave additional impact to the campaigns on relief and
class sizes. This situation, nevertheless, created problems when the priorities of vanguard elements came into conflict with the perceived interests of the great majority of union members. This was particularly true of the salaries campaigns of 1969 and 1970 and in 1972. Salaries campaigns still required 'united action' of the whole membership, as determined by the central decision making bodies of the union.

The apparent effectiveness of the strike weapon meant that long established and traditional campaigning methods seemed somewhat tame in comparison to the more dramatic strike action, yet the resistance to the school boards proposals largely involved the use of traditional methods, including seeking the support from the parents organisations in a 'united front' opposition to the threat of school boards. On the other hand the use of local strikes assisted considerably in forcing the state government to establish a plan for the progressive reduction of class sizes.

In the late 1960s it was argued by some 'old guard' elements that there were only two industrial choices for the union: 'united action' or 'industrial anarchy'. The latter was inevitable, it was claimed, if local units of the union were permitted a considerable degree of industrial initiative. By 1971 local units and vanguard sections had won the right to take industrial action in support of union policy without the prior endorsement of the leadership. While this probably contributed to a greater level of industrial action, it could hardly be said that 'industrial anarchy' reigned unchecked. Strike action occurred more frequently, but strikes of the whole union never exceeded more than one day, and extended strikes by individual schools were not common.
While the industrial behaviour of members of the N.S.W.T.F. did undergo some change, their position as State employees did not. Strikes by teachers could still only be a political embarrassment to the State authorities. They still could not inflict economic damage upon the State. By taking strike action, teachers had begun to use the principal weapon of the traditional working class. In taking such action, however, they had not purged all notions of professionalism. Consciousness of professional status still motivated much industrial action by teachers. Although increasing numbers of teachers thought of themselves more as workers than as professional employees, it could not be said that teachers as a whole, were motivated by class consciousness. Arguments about professional status still needed to be used in certain circumstances to mobilise the mass of teacher union members. In industrial behaviour teachers began to act like members of the new 'white-collar' proletariat, but as far as class consciousness was concerned, teachers tended to be bourgeois militants rather than new proletarians. Until teachers discard the mantle of professionalism, they are more likely to remain bourgeois rather than working class. Nevertheless the resort to militant methods is likely to remain necessary while ever education has to compete with the private sector for the limited social surplus produced by a capitalist society. In that context then, the 1968 strike was a event of pivotal importance in the recent history of the New South Wales Teachers' Federation.
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