

AN EVALUATION OF THE 1973 ONE-YEAR GRADUATE

COURSE FOR PRIMARY TEACHERS AT

CHRISTCHURCH TEACHERS' COLLEGE

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the Degree

of

Master of Arts in Education

in the

University of Canterbury

by

R. T. Murdoch

University of Canterbury

April, 1975

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	1
LIST OF TABLES	2
LIST OF FIGURES	5
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	6
II. CURRICULUM EVALUATION	8
1. Needs in curriculum evaluation	8
2. Cronbach's contribution	9
3. The professional judgement school	10
4. Decision-management approaches to evaluation	13
5. Objectives-performance evaluation studies	15
III. DESIGN AND METHODS	19
1. Broad purpose of this study	19
2. Alternative conceptual frameworks	21
3. The Stake model	22
4. Data collection	22
IV. ANTECEDENTS	26
1. The One-year Graduate Course: historical	26
2. The 1973 Graduate Course: structure and organisation	35
3. The staff, 1973	42
4. The students, 1973	43
5. Summary	63
V. TRANSACTIONS	65
1. Students and school experiences	65
2. Students and college course structure	72
3. Students and course content	76
4. Students and college staff	88
5. Summary	91
VI. OUTCOMES	95
✓ 1. Students' view of teaching	95
✓ 2. Students' view of themselves as teachers	99
3. School Principals' view of the students	108
4. College Principal's and Course Tutors' view of the course	108
5. Summary	112
VII. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	114
1. Conclusions	114
2. Recommendations	115
3. Further research	119

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	120
REFERENCES	121
APPENDICES	
Appendix A: First Associate Teacher questionnaire, March, 1973	123
Appendix B: First Student questionnaire, April 1973 ..	125
Appendix C: Second Associate Teacher questionnaire, July 1973	136
Appendix D: Six-audience questionnaire, November 1973 ..	138
Appendix E: Graduate Group questionnaire, November 1973	142
Appendix F: College Staff questionnaire, November 1973	152
Appendix G: Third Associate Teacher questionnaire, November 1973	154
Appendix H: Year One Teacher questionnaire, April 1974	156
Appendix I: School Principal questionnaire, May 1974 ..	163
Appendix J: Newman-Keuls tests of a posteriori differences between means	164
Appendix K: Statement from the Principal, Christchurch Teachers' College	174
Appendix L: Graduate Course Report, December 1974 ..	176

ABSTRACT

This study is a pioneering evaluation of a New Zealand teachers' college curriculum, namely the 1973 one-year pre-service primary teacher education programme at Christchurch Teachers' College for university graduates. It comprises an historical survey of the course in that College, together with other antecedent data, an analysis of selected course transactions, and a limited follow-up of course outcomes in 1974. Nine questionnaires given to student, teacher, school principal and teachers' college lecturer audiences were the main sources of data. The major conclusion reached concerns the attitudes of ambivalence towards the place and preparation of university graduates for the primary teaching service. A number of recommendations are made.

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Composition of the One-year Graduate Group at Christchurch Teachers' College, 1966 - 1973	27
2. The trend over recent years has been towards a higher level of education for primary teachers, and the recruiting of university graduates to train for one year as primary teachers seems to have become accepted practice (comment) ..	33
3. Major courses and their duration in the One-year Graduate Programme, 1973	38
4. Assuming that an end-on course for university graduates is acceptable, how long do you think it should be?	41
5. University subjects passed by One-year Graduate Course Students, 1973	45
6. Selection Committee ratings of entrants to the One-year Graduate and Three-year Courses, 1973	47
7. Selection Committee ratings of the 24 graduate entrants who went through the Elmwood selection procedures	48
8. As far as you can remember, when did you decide on a teaching career?	50
9. What were your main reasons for choosing a teaching career?	51
10. Why did you decide upon primary rather than secondary teacher training?	52
11. How sure are you about your choice of teaching as a career?	53
12. In general, do you believe teaching is a profession?	54
13. Indicate the approximate "social level" of each occupation by writing a number from 1 to 5 opposite it	55
14. Which one of the following aspects of teaching will give you personally the greatest satisfaction?	57

Table

	Page
15. Most young teachers have a particular model or style of teaching that they would like to emulate. Rank the following teachers in the order that they appeal to you ..	58
16. Assuming that you had the qualifications to teach at any of the following levels, which would you choose?	59
17. If you are still teaching in ten years, what sort of school would you like to be in, and if you were to teach in an intermediate school, what type of class would you like? ..	60
18. Assuming you are still in the education service, what position do you hope to hold after five years of teaching and after ten years of teaching?	62
19. How successful, in general, were your school postings during your college course, in terms of -	67
20. All other things being equal, who would you prefer to be posted to your class?	69
21. How does the graduate now with you compare with Three-year Course students on the following criteria?	71
22. In 1973, One-year Graduate Course students spent 13 weeks in schools compared with 26 weeks in college. In your view, what length of time in a One-year Course should be spent in schools?	72
23. Number of hours graduate students were scheduled to be in college, 1973	73
24. Alongside the eight subjects, indicate the importance you attach to each in a <u>One-year Course</u> of teacher preparation, by placing a tick under the preferred course length	77
25. How realistic and appropriate do you believe the objectives were, how successfully were these objectives achieved, and how did you find the out-of-class work load for each Syllabus Study course?	79
26. Now that you have your class programme in the various curriculum areas under way, how successful do you feel your college course was in preparing you for this task?	81
27. Comment on the relevance, strengths and shortcomings of the Education courses this year	83
28. After your first term as a Year One Teacher, how successful do you now feel your total college course was in preparing you for the following aspects of teaching?	84

Table

	Page
29. What specific aspect or component of your college course stands out as having been the most valuable to you personally?	86
30. In general, how do you rate your college course?	87
31. For the first time, in 1973, two Course Tutors have been charged with the oversight of the Graduate Programme. Do you believe this arrangement has been a good one?	88
32. How does the graduate student this year compare with the other student groups named?	90
33. Final student assessments for Syllabus Studies courses at Christchurch Teachers' College, 1973	92
34. In general, have you enjoyed teaching so far?	95
35. What single things have you enjoyed most and least about teaching?	96
36. Is teaching what you expected it to be?	97
37. How sure are you at this stage about your choice of a career in education?	99
38. Do you feel that you get on well with your class and with other children in the school?	100
39. What class level did you hope for at the end of last year, what class have you got and, at this stage, which class level would you choose for next year?	101
40. Which subject, or area of the curriculum, (a) have you felt most confident in and (b) has caused you most concern so far?	103
41. Give reasons for your feelings of confidence in teaching the subjects or areas of the curriculum you have mentioned	105
42. Should you have the chance to attend an in-service course right now, what aspect of teaching would you most like some help in?	107
43. Compared with most Three-year Course Year One Teachers of your experience, how does your ex Graduate Year One Teacher(s) rate on the following criteria?	109
44. (a) - (1) Newman-Keuls tests of a posteriori differences between means	164

LIST OF FIGURES

Page

Figure

1. The statements and data matrix (after Stake) 23

CHAPTER I

I N T R O D U C T I O N

The 1973 One-year Graduate Course at Christchurch Teachers' College, Primary Division, was in a number of ways exceptional. First, it differed from the course into which approximately 250 students, mainly school leavers around 18 years of age, entered for a three-year College programme before beginning their teaching career. There was a course of study consisting of four main components - English, Professional Studies, Teaching Practice and Selected Studies. The English component was concerned with improving the students' own use of spoken and written language. Professional Studies included studies of child development, educational psychology and other studies in education, as well as the eight Syllabus Studies which looked at the various primary school subjects, and Curriculum Studies which tied these together into a broader view of curriculum development in the third year. Teaching Practice enabled students to develop and practise teaching techniques in schools, and Selected Studies were academic studies designed to further the students' own education. One-year Graduate Course students, with their degree subjects counting in lieu of Selected Studies, and with their assumed greater facility with English, undertook a College programme of Professional Studies and Teaching Practice only.

Second, the Graduate Course differed from a two-year course for primary trainees who had from five to eight university degree unit passes. The 14 students comprising that group in 1973 joined the normal second-year course but were provided with additional Professional Studies missed from the first year. In 1974, they undertook the third-year course. In their case, as for One-year Graduates, university unit

passes generally substituted for College Selected Studies enabling them to cope more easily with the extra demands of Professional Studies.

The One-year Graduate Course was quite separate from the Three-year Course. However, there was also a third course difference, and that was from Graduate Courses of previous years. For the first time, two of the College lecturing staff were temporarily seconded to act as almost full-time Tutors and co-ordinators of the programme, and there were consequent alterations to the content and structure of the course itself. Moreover, the largest number of students to date entered it - 39 students, or over 13 per cent, of the total Primary Division intake.

The Graduate Students themselves too, were older (average age of about 23 years), came from a widely varied background of New Zealand and overseas experience, and almost one-third had had experience in other full-time occupations.

Because of these differences, together with the relative newness of this form of primary teacher training end-on to a university degree and the continuing debate by teacher educators over its viability and effectiveness, the course of 1973 was seen to be in particular need of evaluation. The writer's position as one of the Course Tutors gave him a particular interest in it (although he had misgivings, discussed later, about making a study from such a close position), and the wider need for a formal evaluation of various College programmes, including this one, had long been recognised.

A survey of the literature of curriculum evaluation follows in the next chapter, the design and methods of this study are described in Chapter III, and the data are presented in the subsequent three chapters, each of which has its own summary. Throughout the thesis, "the Graduate Group", "Graduates" and "Graduate Students" are all used in referring to students of this particular course, even though a small number were in fact undergraduates (see Table 1).

CHAPTER II

CURRICULUM EVALUATION

1. NEEDS IN CURRICULUM EVALUATION

Few educators today publicly debate the need to thoroughly and meaningfully evaluate curriculum programmes. Indeed, evaluation has become something of a catchword alongside "relevance", "accountability" and "programme appraisal". Yet despite this, only a very small proportion of programmes receive more than cursory evaluative treatment and the whole field of evaluation methodology remains unclear in the minds of many. The 1971 Phi Delta Kappa Commission on Evaluation went as far as to say that evaluation has been "seized with a great illness"¹ and lacks "certain crucial elements without which the science or art of evaluation cannot be expected to make significant forward strides".² The lacks, it suggests, are in adequate theory; specification of types of information which are most needed; appropriate instruments and designs; good systems for organising, processing and reporting information; and sufficient well-trained personnel. More recently, Worthen and Sanders³ have suggested that other disciplines

¹ Stufflebeam, D.L. et. al. Educational Evaluation and Decision-Making, Itasca, Illinois, F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1971, p.2. Quoted in Worthen, B.R. and Sanders, J.R., Educational Evaluation: Theory and Practice, Worthington, Ohio, Charles A. Jones Publishing Co., 1973, p.8.

² Ibid., p.8.

³ Worthen, B.R. and Sanders, J.R. Educational Evaluation: Theory and Practice, Worthington, Ohio, Charles A. Jones Publishing Co., 1973, p.8.

should be thoroughly investigated for relevant methodologies and that more effective use be made of measurement theory and instruments to help cure these ills. But most important, they say, is to provide evaluators with useful theoretical frameworks and practical guidelines.

2. CRONBACH'S CONTRIBUTION

Cronbach,⁴ in one of the comparatively early attempts to provide such a framework, greatly broadened the traditional measurements approach to evaluation which concentrated on preparing tests to produce fair and precise scores for comparing individuals. He described a process which plays a broader and more vital role in rational decision making about course improvement, about individuals, and in judging administrative operations. "Course evaluation should ascertain what changes a course produces" he said, "and should identify aspects of the course that need revision".⁵ Outcomes should range "far beyond the content of the curriculum itself"⁶ to include such criteria as attitudes, aptitude for further learning, general understandings and career choices. These outcomes are multidimensional, with pupil performance being but one component. Opinions, as well as tests, are to be valued as sources of evidence, and the many available measurement techniques such as measures of proficiency and attitudes, as well as process studies should be tapped. The lasting effects of the course are also extremely important, giving yet a different dimension. On the question of absolute versus relative studies, Cronbach sees the evaluator's task as determining "the post course performance of a well-described group, with respect to many important objectives and side effects" rather than comparing one course against another which, he claims, gives "equivocal results".⁷

⁴ Cronbach, L.J. Course Improvement Through Evaluation. Teachers' College Record, Vol. 64, No. 8, May 1963, pp. 672 - 683.

⁵ Ibid., p. 247.

⁶ Ibid., p. 248.

⁷ Ibid., p. 238.

3. THE PROFESSIONAL JUDGEMENT SCHOOL

Since the publication of Cronbach's paper, there has emerged a rather influential genre of more formal curriculum evaluation strategies, the "professional judgement"⁸ school. It emphasizes judgement as a critical component of evaluation. To the fore are the names of Scriven and Stake, with Messick, Astin and Panos, and Worthen and Sanders among the others making worthwhile contributions.

Scriven⁹ works towards a more adequate methodology for curriculum evaluation, with three aspects being of particular note. First, he makes three sets of useful distinctions. Of roles and goals of evaluation he says that whereas there are many roles there is only one functional goal, and that is to assess the worth or merit of something. In other words, some judgement should accompany any evaluation. He sees a place for both formative and summative evaluation, where Cronbach stressed the former, and he separates intrinsic (evaluation of the means used to reach certain ends) and pay-off evaluation (evaluation of those ends or effects), with a balance between the two being perhaps a "worthwhile compromise". Second, Scriven expresses concern throughout his paper to evaluate objectives themselves as a prerequisite to total programme evaluation. He clearly separates two types of question, "How good is the course?" and "How well does the course achieve its goals?" Within a context of evaluation having so often been equated with assessing the level of goal achievement, his strong plea to appraise the goals per se is a major contribution. Third, and perhaps of greatest practical value, he presents a taxonomy of criteria for evaluation studies which, rather than representing a finite model, can be used as a springboard for generating evaluation plans.

⁸ Worthen and Sanders, op. cit., p.126.

⁹ Scriven, M. The Methodology of Evaluation, Social Science Education Consortium, Publication No.110, 1966.

Stake¹⁰ formalizes Scriven's wide ranging, profound and rather philosophical view into a systematic process. He discards informal (subjective) procedures in favour of the more formal (objective), in order that rational judgements can be made, and is primarily concerned with total educational programmes rather than the mere products of these. Too little effort has been made to spell out antecedent conditions and classroom transactions in evaluation studies, and in linking these to programme outcomes, he feels, and what he attempts, in fact, is to conceptualize evaluation within the context of complex and dynamic total education systems. Descriptions and judgements are the two major activities of formal evaluation studies, and both are essential.

"The specialist (evaluator) sees himself as a 'describer', one who describes aptitudes and environments and accomplishments. The teacher and school administrator, on the other hand, expect an evaluator to grade something or someone as to merit. Moreover, they expect that he will judge things against external standards, on criteria perhaps little related to the local school's resources and goals ... neither sees evaluation broadly enough".¹¹

In elaborating his more measurement-oriented strategy than either Cronbach or Scriven, Stake develops two data matrices, one for descriptions and the other for judgements, within which the evaluator may list the information necessary to rationally judge a programme. This framework, together with practical details of design, instrumentation, data collation and analysis enumerated in his later paper¹², are certainly among the most valuable contributions to the field over the last ten years.

¹⁰ Stake, R.E. The Countenance of Educational Evaluation. Teachers' College Record, 68, 1967, pp. 523-540.

¹¹ Ibid., p.525.

¹² Stake, R.E. Evaluation Design, Instrumentation, Data Collection, and Analysis of Data. In Worthen and Sanders, op. cit., pp. 303-316.

Messick,¹³ a little later, highlights the many factors outside the programme itself which operate on a student. Included here is an assessment of the compatibility of the programme with the wider goals and values of society. He also gives a prominent place to appraising possible, not just intended, outcomes. Scriven had stressed that evaluation was more than gauging goal achievement, and Messick suggests that the side effects of a programme may, indeed, be even more important. Important in the aftermath of measurement-oriented and quasi-experimental designs borrowed from research, he acknowledges the role of value judgements in evaluation, for example, in choosing goals and in choosing criterion measures. He sees a need to both evaluate value judgements themselves, and to study the relationships between them. Finally, Messick argues that individual cognitive style variables should be taken into account in evaluation studies.

Messick offers no clear working model, but Astin and Panos¹⁴ do. Theirs is a three-component framework - inputs (talents and pre-tests), operations (means and environments) and outputs (ends and criteria) - and where all three are handled, and where causal relationships are yielded, they claim that the greatest value in decision making results. They stress measures of operations, so often less developed in the research, as being essential. Four main sources of information are identified - folklore, anecdotal information, descriptive information and research information. In their emphasis on all three components of their model, the practical guidelines given to sort out operations

¹³ Messick, S. The Criterion Problem in the Evaluation of Instruction: Assessing Possible, Not Just Intended, Outcomes. In Willrock, M.C. and Wiley, D.E. (eds.), The Evaluation of Instruction: Issues and Problems, New York, Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1970, pp. 183-202.

¹⁴ Astin, A.W. and Panos, R.J. The Evaluation of Educational Programs. In Thorndike, R.L. Educational Measurement, 2d ed., Washington, American Council on Education, 1971.

data, and in their expressed concern for objectivity and sound methodology and design, they adopt a stance very similar to Stake's, except for their emphasis on controlled studies.

Worthen and Sanders¹⁵ bring together the key contributions to the field of curriculum evaluation over the last fifteen years, and develop their own definition. They see evaluation as making "judgements about the worth of the programme, product or process being evaluated", purposely excluding "activities such as describing programmes, collecting and reporting information, or monitoring ongoing programmes" which are viewed as "evaluation-attendant activities rather than evaluation per se".¹⁶ This is a somewhat narrower definition, but in formulating it they make useful distinctions between evaluation, research and what they see as separate fields of "development in education" and "diffusion".¹⁷

4. DECISION-MANAGEMENT APPROACHES TO EVALUATION

Third to the measurement and judgement approaches to evaluation, and bound up with the rapidly growing field of educational planning, there has emerged a school of so-called "decision-management strategies"¹⁸ which emphasises programme description - the collection, organisation and storage of data for use by decision makers.

¹⁵ Worthen, B.R. and Sanders, J.R. Educational Evaluation: Theory and Practice, Worthington, Ohio, Charles A. Jones Publishing Co., 1973.

¹⁶ Worthen and Sanders, op. cit., p.38.

¹⁷ Worthen and Sanders, op. cit., p.19.

¹⁸ Worthen and Sanders, op. cit., p.128.

Stufflebeam, one of the proponents of this school, defines evaluation as assessing the worth of "competing alternatives ... (or) ... delineating, obtaining and providing useful information for judging decision alternatives"¹⁹. His approach is widely known as the CIPP model after his four types of evaluation - context, input, process and product. The most basic of these is context evaluation which provides a rationale for determining objectives by defining the relevant environment, describing desired and actual conditions in that environment, identifying current needs and unused opportunities, and diagnosing problems preventing these from being met and used. Input evaluation is to provide information on how resources can be utilized in order to achieve objectives. Once the evaluation study is under way, process evaluation is needed to provide periodic feedback, and finally, product evaluation is to measure and interpret attainments during, as well as at the end of, the project cycle. Stufflebeam emphasises description, but also important in a practical way is his cycle in which feedback is continually provided and which may result in modifying earlier decisions.

In a very similar approach, Alkin²⁰ separates five areas. Systems assessment "is a statement of the status of the system as it exists in comparison to desired outputs"²¹; programme planning provides information to enable the decision maker to select from alternatives; programme implementation evaluation "determines the extent to which the implemented programme meets the description formulated in the planning decision"²²; programme improvement involves on-going evaluations which

¹⁹ Stufflebeam, D.L. An Introduction to Educational Evaluation and Decision-Making, Itasca, Illinois, F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1971. In Worthen and Sanders, op.cit., p.129.

²⁰ Alkin, M.C. Evaluation Theory Development. Evaluation Comment, 2, 1969, pp.2-7.

²¹ Alkin, M.C. Evaluation Theory Development. In Worthen and Sanders, op. cit., p. 151.

²² Alkin, M.C., op. cit., p. 153.

can be of value in modifying the programme; and programme certification yields information which may help decision makers assess the worth of the programme and the extent to which it may be generalised to another situation. Alkin has also outlined details of a "cost-effectiveness" evaluation model²³ which is financially oriented, but which, he claims, can also be used to assess the worth of "alternative ways to do a given job".²⁴

5. OBJECTIVES-PERFORMANCE EVALUATION STUDIES

The fourth and last major approach to evaluation emphasises the relationships between behavioural performance and clearly stated objectives. Leading the way here is Tyler, whose approach was evident as early as the 1930's in the Eight Year Study²⁵ and as recent as the National Assessment Project in the United States²⁶. According to him, the major steps in programme evaluation are:

- "(a) to establish broad goals or objectives;
- (b) to classify objectives;
- (c) to define objectives in behavioural terms;
- (d) to find situations in which achievement of objectives can be shown;
- (e) to develop or select measurement techniques;
- (f) to collect student performance data; and
- (g) to compare data with behaviourally stated objectives."²⁷

²³ Alkin, M.C. Evaluating the Cost-Effectiveness of Instructional Programs. In Wittrock, M.C. and Wiley, D.E. (eds.) The Evaluation of Instruction: Issues and Problems, New York, Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1970, pp. 221-238.

²⁴ Alkin, op. cit., p. 237.

²⁵ Smith, E.R. and Tyler, R.W. Appraising and Recording Student Progress, New York, Harper and Row, 1942.

²⁶ Wormer, F.B. What is National Assessment? Ann Arbor, Michigan, National Assessment of Educational Progress, 1970.

²⁷ Worthen and Sanders, op. cit., p. 156.

Evaluation compares student performance with behaviourally stated objectives. It is a recurring process, with feedback being continually used to reformulate or redefine objectives, and with information being drawn from previous studies to modify assessment and interpretation plans.

Metfessel and Michael's eight-step evaluation strategy²⁸ is very similar to Tyler's. Their paper is especially valuable for its list of multiple criterion measures and techniques.

Hammond²⁹ makes a plea for local personnel to be trained to evaluate (Metfessel and Michael also aim to involve the total community), uses Tyler's suggestions of specifying behavioural objectives and utilizing evaluation feedback, and makes a unique contribution in the form of a "programme description cube". This three-dimensional view of the evaluation process, with its interacting variables of behaviour, instruction and institution, give a more "panoramic view", to use Stake's term, than some would allow. It also serves as a reminder of important programme factors which are often overlooked in evaluation studies.

"The purpose of program evaluation", according to Provus, "is to determine whether to improve, maintain or terminate a program"³⁰. He is very specific about explicating standards, gives practical details to back up his approach, and with Stufflebeam, focusses the evaluator's attention on the several different stages in developing a programme.

²⁸ Metfessel, N.S. and Michael, W.B. A Paradigm Involving Multiple Criterion Measures for the Evaluation of the Effectiveness of School Programs. In Worthen and Sanders, *op. cit.*, pp. 269-279.

²⁹ Hammond, R.L. Evaluation at the Local Level. In Worthen and Sanders, *op. cit.*, pp. 157-169.

³⁰ Provus, M. Evaluation of Ongoing Programs in the Public School System. In Worthen and Sanders, *op. cit.*, p. 172.

His three phases are "(a) agreeing upon program standards, (b) determining whether a discrepancy exists between some aspect of the program and the standards governing (it) ..., and (c) using discrepancy information to identify the weaknesses of the program".³¹

Finally, a mention of one writer who proposes a methodology for investigating the apparent decision-making behaviour of educators in formulative evaluation, as they deal with educational objectives. In the argument between the objectives-performance school, and those who doubt whether all or any objectives can be stated behaviourally, Maguire suggests that what appears to be overlooked is that "purposes served by objectives may dictate the form of their statement".³² Critical decisions about objectives are made at several points in a programme's history, and it may be useful to distinguish between "initiators" (those who propose the objectives revolving around content, sequence, materials and strategies) and "recipients" (those who make decisions to accept, reject or modify objectives in the knowledge of the local situation and about a programme already in existence). Each has different purposes which affect the form of the objectives, and both implicit and explicit decisions about objectives determine the ultimate shape and direction of the programme. For those wishing to improve the state of curriculum evaluation, therefore, these are "legitimate objects of study"³³ he claims.

³¹ Loc. cit.

³² Maguire, T.O. Decisions and Curriculum Objectives: A Methodology for Evaluation. The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 15, No. 1, March 1969, p. 17.

³³ Maguire, op. cit., p. 21.

In summary, the needs in curriculum evaluation for viable theoretical frameworks and practical guidelines for advance to be made have been pinpointed, and some recent attempts to meet this challenge have been surveyed. From a historical backdrop of measurement and quasi-experimentally oriented strategies, Cronbach widened the view of evaluation in the early 1960's, and Scriven and Stake quickly developed his ideas while adopting a strongly judgemental role. Stufflebeam and Alkin, on the other hand, emphasised comprehensive programme description as a tool for the decision makers, while the Tyler school focussed on clearly stated behavioural objectives as a necessary precursor to meaningful measurement of performance. In the next chapter the approach adopted for this study will be discussed and the design explained.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODS

1. BROAD PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY

Over recent years the Primary Division of Christchurch Teachers' College has made attempts to evaluate its various programmes. For example, the Principal has conducted regular student forums, usually each term, with a view to tapping student verbal judgements of courses and general college organisation. Although these may be seen as a valuable contact between the administration and students, their evaluative function is very restrictive due to such methodological shortcomings as the small number willing or able to contribute in a large gathering, and to the gross subjectivity of the exercise. Many College departments also seek students' appraisals at the end of courses, usually written, but these are spasmodic, and questions are often so broad and open-ended as to make meaningful analysis virtually impossible. Another form of evaluation involves students being invited to join a group of staff to discuss the degree of course success, but student representation is usually very small and the task of recording the comments may fall to a participating staff member, which is likely to reduce objectivity. In perhaps the most ambitious evaluation project to date, the College conducted a survey in 1970 of one hundred Year-One Teachers who had graduated from Christchurch.¹ The task was to gain judgements of the College programme in retrospect, and some useful information was obtained. Yet, in general, the liaison

¹ Year One Teacher Survey: Report to the Board of Studies,
Christchurch Teachers' College, Primary Division, July 1971.

and public relations aspects of all these exercises have probably been of much greater value than the body of useful information derived from them. There is need for a formal, carefully planned and structured approach to evaluating college programmes.

With this backdrop, it was decided to attempt a more profound evaluation of some aspect of teacher education at Christchurch Teachers' College, and the one-year graduate programme was identified as having a special need. Making provision to prepare university graduates for primary teaching was relatively new; the College was still approaching the organisation and structuring of this course rather tentatively; for the first time, in 1973, the course was to have two tutor-co-ordinators seconded to it on almost a full-time basis; the graduate programme was only one-third the duration of a normal college course; and, finally, widespread negative attitudes seemed present towards students in this group from within the College and from teachers.

The study was to have a broad frontal approach, encompassing as many criterion measures as possible, yet all within a formal and structured framework. Close and special attention to the programme operations phase was felt necessary, as well as particular focus on the student and other input variables. A limited follow-up in the first year of teaching, looking at some programme outcomes, was also planned. The main purpose then, was to cast a wide net in search of those variables which could yield lines of congruence between both explicit and implicit course goals and what actually happened, point to functional contingencies between inputs, the course, and outgoing teachers, and useful comparisons between this and other college programmes. This was to be, in a sense, a pioneering study in a New Zealand Teachers' College, and the task was now to find or formulate a suitable conceptual model.

2. ALTERNATIVE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORKS

A test and measurement orientation seemed inappropriate. The characteristics of a good teacher and of good teaching, and the criteria for effective teacher education were by no means clear, so to formulate tests to measure these in order to make across programme comparisons, would probably yield little useful information. Moreover, the specificity of such an approach would make for too narrow a programme evaluation.

An objectives - performance base was looked at more closely. But the real problem here was not just in defining broad and specific programme objectives, though difficult enough, but again in the narrowing of scope which is likely when clearly specified objectives are followed up. The programme evaluation could easily become oversimplified with only small facets being scrutinized. Also, objectives - performance studies, by very definition, focus on terminal rather than on-going and pre-programme information, and little attention tends to be given to the assessment of the objectives themselves. Thus, an approach attractive in the relative ease with which it allows educationists to check degrees of congruence between performance and outcomes, on the one hand, and objectives once they are clearly specified, on the other, was put aside in favour of a multi-dimensional framework.

A "decision - management" framework would have been more global, as well as being strong in its emphasis on collection, description and organisation of data, and sensitive to continuous feedback. But there would be little place for value judgements, and this approach is altogether too complex and demanding for one researcher to operate in its entirety.

A broadly based descriptions and judgements slant was decided upon. The widening view of Cronbach, with his focus on the dynamics of the programme itself and his multidimensional outcomes, was influential, and Scriven's stress on assessing objectives themselves and his taxonomy

of criteria were relevant. But it was Stake's view of total programme evaluation which most closely matched the felt needs of the study, and it was he who provided a viable and functional framework for organising the data.

3. THE STAKE MODEL

The strengths Stake's approach brought to this study were its systematic and formal structure, its specificity and the all-important "panoramic view". Its scope included both descriptions and judgements from as many audiences as possible connected with the programme, with both inter- and intra-relationships arising within this dual framework. Due cognizance was given to programme "transactions" as well as to "antecedent" conditions and "outcomes", with programme "intentions" strongly developed at all three phases rather than being restricted to anticipated student behaviour. Finally, both absolute and relative judgements had their place. Figure 1 shows how Stake's matrices were used to assemble the wide-ranging set of data and statements in this study.

4. DATA COLLECTION

College records, reports and the writer's own knowledge as a Graduate Course Tutor² were used extensively for descriptions and some judgements, but it was on the results of nine questionnaires that the study largely rested. The first questionnaire (Appendix A) went out to all 33 teachers who hosted the Graduates in March, 1973,³ and the return was 100 per cent. This was followed in July and November of that year

² Some concern was felt throughout the study that such close day-to-day involvement with the group under study would create methodological problems and unduly affect objectivity. Certainly some audiences may have reacted differently to questionnaires set by a Course Tutor, and the writer's own subjective assessments of certain situations (especially in Chapter IV) are acknowledged, but no undue methodological difficulties arose, and objectivity was striven for in analysing all questionnaire data.

³ Twelve of the 39 students were posted in pairs, hence only 33 teachers.

FIGURE 1

The Statements and Data Matrix (after Stake)

		DESCRIPTIONS		JUDGEMENTS	
		INTENTS	OBSERVATIONS	STANDARDS	JUDGEMENTS
ANTECEDENTS	1. The Course : Historical		The first years The early 1970's	Higher education for primary teachers	
	2. Structure and Organisation of the 1973 Course		A report to the Principal A new course structure New selection procedures	Course length	
	3. The Staff, 1973		Course staff, 1973	Academic and other background	
	4. The Students, 1973		Academic/other background When and why teaching Perception of teaching Personal aspirations	Selection Committee judgements	
TRANSACTIONS	1. Students and School Experiences	Intents and student judgements Attitudes of teachers Duration of postings
	2. Students and College Course Structure	Intents and Integration in college Student groupings student judgements Integration into college Duration Syllabus Studies Studies in Education
	3. Students and Course Content	Syllabus Studies objectives and student judgements Skills of teaching
	4. Students and Staff	Role of Course Tutors			Role of Course Tutors Specialist lecturers
OUTCOMES	1. Students' View of Teaching		Enjoyment of teaching Expectations of teaching Future in teaching		
	2. Students' View of Themselves		Class level preferences Curriculum areas		Relationships children Students' college course
	3. School Principals			School Principals' judgements of students	judgements of students
	4. College Principal and Course Tutors			College Principal's judgements of the course Course Tutors' judgements of the course	judgements of the course

by virtually identical questionnaires (Appendices C and C) to 36⁴ and 37⁵ teachers respectively who had Graduates in their classrooms for the second and third postings. The return rates were 94 per cent. and 100 per cent.

The first questionnaire presented to Students in April 1973 (Appendix B) was given to all 39 Graduates (100 per cent. return), all 66 First-year Students with Higher School Certificate as the minimum academic qualification on College entry (78.8 per cent. return), and to all 64 Third-year Students with one or more university unit passes to date (78.1 per cent. return). These particular Three-year Course Student samples were chosen as those likely to be closest to Graduates in academic potential and, to some extent, in general background. The main purpose of this questionnaire was to obtain antecedent descriptive data which would make later intergroup comparisons more pertinent.

At the end of the 1973 College year, a questionnaire was presented to six audiences (Appendix D). Its main purposes were to probe attitudes towards higher education for primary teachers, towards the One-year Graduate Course concept, and towards various aspects of course structure. The audiences selected were (a) the 37 Students left in the Graduate Group (100 per cent. return), (b) the 76 First-year Students from two alphabetically arranged⁶ College groups present on the particular day (100 per cent. return from those present), (c) the 64 Third-year Students from two College groups present (100 per cent. return from those present), (d) the 54 on the Primary Division, Christchurch Teachers' College teaching staff, excluding the Principal, Vice-principal, Dean and the two

⁴ There were 38 Students left in the group by July, posted singly to teachers. Two teachers were excluded as they had been in the first teacher sample.

⁵ By November the Student Group was down to 37, and was again posted singly.

⁶ Although a sample of Students grouped according to the alphabetical position of their surnames is not strictly a random sample, for the practical purposes of this study it was deemed to be so close as to justify using the convenience of the already existing College groups.

Course Tutors (81.5 per cent. return), (e) the 41 Principals of Christchurch schools where Graduates had been placed over the year (90.2 per cent. return) and (f) all 96 teachers who had had Graduates with them over the year (86.5 per cent. return). It is pointed out that the First- and Third-year Student samples are not the same as for the first Student questionnaire, and that nowhere in the study are data from these two compared.

At this time also (November, 1973) two of the six audiences just described received additional questionnaires - one was the Graduate Group (Appendix E) and the other the College Staff (Appendix F). The particular purposes here were to have these two groups specifically scrutinise the 1973 Graduate Course, mainly to obtain "transactions" data.

Finally, two questionnaires went out to schools at the end of Term One, 1974. The first went to Year-one Teachers (Appendix H) - the 32 Graduates still teaching (97 per cent. return), and a sample of 45 ex-Three-year Course Students comprising every fourth Year-one Teacher trained at Christchurch Teachers' College in an alphabetical listing of Canterbury Education Board schools (77.8 per cent. return). The second questionnaire went to all 30 Principals of schools throughout New Zealand where the 1973 Graduate Students were serving as Year-one Teachers⁷ (100 per cent. return). These two questionnaires sought selected transaction and outcome data.

All questionnaires were returned anonymously, except for those from the first and second teacher groups. Most, though not all, questionnaire data are used in this study, and they are generally presented in table form.⁸ Some other data from Christchurch Teachers' College records is also presented in table form.

⁷ As three schools had two each from the 1973 Graduate Group, the 30 Principals in fact returned 33 questionnaires, one for each teacher.

⁸ Note that, unless otherwise stated, "n" in a table refers to the numbers responding to that particular item, and not to the number returning the particular questionnaire.

CHAPTER IV

A N T E C E D E N T S

1. THE ONE-YEAR GRADUATE COURSE: HISTORICAL

(1) The First Years

In 1966, three students entered the first one-year course for university graduates and near graduates at Christchurch Teachers' College, Primary Division. One held a Master of Arts degree, another a Bachelor of Arts and the third was an Arts undergraduate with eight units. A group of primary trainees with such academic qualifications was a novelty at a time when the majority of college entrants came straight from school, when many other employment avenues were open to university graduates and when it was assumed by many that graduates would automatically enter the secondary service with its specialist subject teaching opportunities.

Over the next three years the Graduate Group grew from three to sixteen. In the first year all had been women, and the group remained predominantly female over successive years. Most graduate students held Bachelors' degrees, and for the first time, in 1968, the group was joined by returning university studentship holders who were in fact completing the second of a two-year teachers' college programme.¹

¹ University studentships are awarded to teachers' college students to enable them to study at university full-time. A very small number are awarded to school leavers of proven academic ability, but most go to students at the end of their first college year during which they have successfully taken university units concurrently. Some studentship holders return to complete their college programme with a degree finished, while others have still one unit to study.

Table I sets out Graduate Group numbers, academic status, those who held university studentships and those with some previous full-time employment, for the years 1966 to 1973.

TABLE 1

Composition of the One-year Graduate Group at Christchurch Teachers' College, 1966 - 1973

	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973
Males	-	2	4	3	3	5	13	8
Females: Single	1	2	5	6	8	12	8	25
Married	2	1	1	7	2	6	12	6
Total	3	3	6	13	10	18	20	31
Total in Group	3	5	10	16	13	23	33	39
Academic Status on Entry:								
Undergraduate	1	-	4	1	2	6	12	4
Bachelor's Degree	1	4	5	14	8	15	14	29
Bachelor's (Hons) or Double Bachelor's or Master's Papers	-	1	1	-	2	-	4	4
Master's Degree	1	-	-	1	1	2	3	2
Ex University Studentship Holders	-	-	1	2	6	5	9	10
Previous Full-time Employment Experience	1	2	5	5	3	5	2	12

Source: Christchurch Teachers' College records

By 1971, the number in the Graduate Group could no longer be regarded as insignificant within the total College, and its steady growth belied thoughts of its transiency some staff members in the College may have had. Moreover, it became apparent that the group needed a programme specially tailored to it, and that the somewhat stop-gap course provisions made for it were no longer appropriate. Indeed, at a time in the College's history when the lecturing staff was preoccupied in planning and phasing in a completely new three-year programme for the majority of students, the Graduate Group was viewed by many as something of an enigma.²

(2) The Early 1970's

Even though many within the College and outside had reservations about end-on training after the acquisition of a degree as a viable alternative form of primary teacher education, the one-year graduate programme did become slowly recognised within the College. In commenting on the increase in graduate numbers, for example, a report in 1970 predicted that 9 or 10 per cent of all students graduating from the Primary Division in 1971 could be university graduates.³ It went on, "There is little doubt about the importance of this development to the quality of staffing of the schools and to the status of primary teaching in the eyes of the public", and it identified certain characteristics which had distinguished the group in the College to date:

² The 1967 student intake was the first to undertake a three-year course at Christchurch Teachers' College. The comments and observations made in Sections 1, 2 and 3 of this chapter are based on the writer's own experience since joining the staff in May, 1968.

³ Christchurch Teachers' College, Primary Division: One-Year Graduate Course, 1970, p.1. (Mimeographed)

- "1. They tend to have high professional ideals, though this might not always be obvious. They tend to value highly teaching as a profession and have a strong wish to teach.
2. They are involved in a difficult transition from university study (or home commitment) to the profession ... as a rule a university student's responsibilities are largely to himself alone. These students readily revert to this concern for themselves when, for example, they become critical of arrangements that are inadequate.
3. Though they have varied academic backgrounds, they tend to display certain intellectual qualities in common: (a) outstanding ability to grasp ideas quickly whether from books, people or practical situations, (b) a capacity for independent study and (c) a highly critical attitude of mind - evident in their readiness to challenge ideas and judge relevancy.
4. They are highly motivated when they can see purpose in an activity and are able to relate their own knowledge and experience to a situation.
5. Their approach to professional training is thorough and they show particular sensitivity to areas of weakness or uncertainty.
6. They tend to have had little personal involvement in the creative arts in recent years.
7. As their professional knowledge builds up they develop an uncommon capacity to range from practice to theoretical considerations.
8. They develop a keen group feeling."⁴

The report also noted the academic success these students had had at university, but it isolated the needs seen at the "personal-professional development" level, namely:

- "1. to prove themselves as people - they sustain a good deal of criticism of their choice of primary teaching, which makes them very keen to succeed and to feel satisfaction in their work,
2. for assistance in making the transition from concern with the 'product' of learning to an understanding of the process - involvement in the arts appear to help here,
3. (for) a unified, cohesive course with obvious relevance to teaching yet not losing contact with their academic strengths,
4. for methods of teaching that are appropriate - in an adult atmosphere with free, frank discussion at all times,
5. to understand fully the regulations and conditions under which they work during training and in subsequent years,

⁴ Loc. cit.

6. to have work evaluated - though they display a healthy cynicism towards marks, they respond well to lecturers' comments, group discussion and opportunity to test themselves in practice,

7. for an identity in the College with opportunity to be involved in the wider life of the College, and

8. for guidance in relating to the profession and the various facets of their training."⁵

The broad aims of the course were, it was suggested, to assist in the growth of "well-developed personal qualities", provide "good academic training" and help in the acquisition of

"superior professional equipment ...

1. By presenting a cohesive course that recognises the maturity of thought and the speed of assimilation of ideas characteristic of graduate students.

2. By providing a programme sufficiently flexible to capitalise on the particular educational backgrounds and interests and to meet the individual needs of the students.

3. By affording the opportunity for each student to build confidence as a primary school teacher and to develop specially his thinking and practice at a chosen level in the primary school."⁶

Finally, some observations were made on what appeared to be appropriate teaching methods with the group. Graduate students can read for themselves the philosophy behind a syllabus subject, but are very dependent upon Lecturers to explain, outline and illustrate teaching activities and sequences. They become interested in their own methods of learning vis-à-vis the learning styles of primary school children, and they have an "outstanding potential" to learn through group discussion and to tap the collective knowledge and experience of their group. Ways by which students can direct their own learning seemed worthy of special investigation, and it was also felt that the various course components, including classroom experience, should be interrelated and mutually reinforcing. This 1970 report was wide-ranging, profound in its analysis, and was the first statement from the College which recognised the potential and very special requirements of one-year Graduate Students.

⁵ Ibid., p.2.

⁶ Loc. cit.

Yet, despite these report findings, the group remained inadequately staffed. The Dean's availability to co-ordinate the programme of a group which had risen to 33 in 1972, by meeting "the students regularly to maintain the direction of the course, to be alert to individual needs ..., to arrange additions and modifications to the course, to keep students informed about College, and act in a guidance capacity",⁷ was severely restricted by his many other College responsibilities. He issued biographical notes on students to subject Lecturers to help them understand individuals over short courses, and Graduate Students were assigned personal Tutors on the same basis as for Three-Year Students.⁸ But probably few subject Lecturers really got to know Graduates, and Tutors were not directly involved in their course work.

At this same time a working party met in Auckland to discuss the growing graduate course, and it echoed many of the characteristics and needs stated in the Christchurch report. But it focussed attention more sharply on problems of staffing, on course structure and content, and on the anomalous position of returning studentship holders as undergraduates being added to the Graduate Group.⁹

On staffing, a case was strongly argued for additional Lecturers because of the extra demands made by such a group. These students, it was suggested, were more demanding both academically and personally; their re-orientation from a university environment to the primary school classroom required special guidance and help; small groups for

⁷ Ibid., p.3.

⁸ The tutor system at Christchurch Teachers' College is concerned with a student's personal development, and operates quite apart from any course of study. About eight or nine students typically make up a "tutor group", and they are assigned to a lecturer who remains their personal tutor for their entire College course.

⁹ Report on Lopdell House National Half Course, November 1970 on the One Year Course for Graduates and Near Graduates (Mimeographed).

course work were especially desirable; the shortness of the course required more assignments and staff supervision; and the weekly course hours were considerably briefer than for three-year students. Second, regarding course structure and content, representatives of all colleges agreed that special programmes are essential for the graduate student. "It is unsatisfactory and inadequate to 'absorb' them in other student groups' courses unless these can be said to be at the academic pressures of university courses. Even then, this group of students prefers practical workshop programmes rather than extensive lecturing."¹⁰ The Graduate Course had unique needs, different from university courses and different from the College three-year programme, and it was to be hoped that course structure would continue to be experimental and flexible. Finally, in a reference to returning university studentship holders, many of whom still having to complete their degree, the report concluded "that the one-year course should not be handicapped by including in the group other students with heterogeneous backgrounds of teacher training or university studies."¹¹

By 1972, therefore, the One-year Graduate Course for primary teachers had become established, and efforts were being made in Christchurch to highlight problems and issues and to seek solutions.

(3) Attitudes Towards Higher Education for Primary Teachers

In 1973 six audiences were asked for their views on the value of higher education for primary teachers. Table 2 sets out the responses of the group to five questions.¹² A one-way analysis of variance with

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 5.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 1.

¹² See Appendix D, Questions A1 and A2. To simplify reading, the headings of all Tables which set out data from questionnaires in this study follow the pattern of Table 2, viz. the original statement or question is quoted or paraphrased as the heading, and a reference to the question in the original questionnaire is given as a textual footnote. Audiences previously described on p. 24

TABLE 2

The trend over recent years has been towards a higher level of education for primary teachers, and the recruiting of university graduates to train for one year as primary teachers seems to have become accepted practice -

	School Principals (n = 37)	Teachers (n = 83)	College Lecturers (n = 44)	First-year students (n = 76)	Third-year Students (n = 64)	Graduate Students (n = 37)	F
Do you believe that the three-year course for most students is better, in general, than the previous two-year course ?	4.27 ^a	3.95	4.72	3.49	3.95	3.20	11.91**
All other things being equal, do you believe that to have a university education makes a person a better teacher ?	3.75	2.77	3.86	2.32	1.96	3.54	24.03**
All other things being equal, do you believe that university graduates should have better promotion prospects over non-graduates in the New Zealand primary school system ?	2.97	2.37	3.23	2.30	1.75	3.27	12.21**
All other things being equal, do you think university graduates at present have better prospects of promotion ?	3.54	3.75	3.93	4.05	3.89	3.10	6.83**
Leaving aside the question of course length meanwhile, do you agree in principle with end-on training after a degree is completed ?	4.08	3.79	3.79	3.64	3.20	4.35	6.05**

^a Means of responses on the following scale -

- "Strongly yes" - 5
- "Probably yes" - 4
- "Uncertain" - 3
- "Probably no" - 2
- "Strongly no" - 1

** p < 0.01

unequal n's was calculated for each question, followed by a Newman-Keuls test of a posteriori differences between means. The harmonic mean of the numbers of cases within cells was used for the Newman-Keuls tests. All comparisons between responses of groups in this thesis are regarded as unplanned, and the Newman-Keuls test of the significance of the differences between ordered means is used only when a significant F-ratio beyond the 1 per cent. level is observed.

The analysis of group differences on the first topic -- the merits of three-year training versus two-year training -- showed that Principals, Teachers, Lecturers and Third-year Students were significantly more in favour of three-year training than First-year Students and Graduates.¹³ This is not surprising, as neither Graduates nor First-year Students had had any close experience of the total three-year course. The second question asked whether a university education makes a person a better teacher. Analysis of group differences showed that the Graduate Students, School Principals and Teachers' College Lecturers answered significantly more strongly in the affirmative than did Teachers and First- and Third-year Students.¹⁴ A simple interpretation is that those having degrees value university education more highly than those who have not had the opportunity nor the inclination to obtain such higher education. The third question asked whether university graduates should have better promotion prospects. Again the analysis of the significant group differences suggests a difference in attitude between those having degrees and those who do not.¹⁵ Principals', Lecturers' and

¹³ See Appendix J, Table 44(a) for Newman-Keuls test.

¹⁴ Appendix J, Table 44(b).

¹⁵ Appendix J, Table 44(c).

Graduate Student's answers were significantly more strongly towards the affirmative end of the scale than were Teachers' and First- and Third-year Students'. However, when asked to comment on the actual prospects of promotion, the Graduate Students had significantly less confidence in the role that a degree played in promotion than did the other groups. This presents an interesting conflict - non-graduate teachers' college students believing that a university education does not tend to make a better teacher and should not play a part in promotion, but, in fact, they believe it plays a more significant part in promotion than do the Graduate Students. This relatively negative attitude of non-graduate students to the place of a degree in primary teaching could be a present or future source of conflict. The last topic asked for the groups' attitude towards an end-on teacher education course following the acquisition of a university degree. The only significant difference between groups was that Graduates and Principals supported the end-on course more strongly than did First- and Third-year Students.¹⁶

2. THE 1973 GRADUATE COURSE: STRUCTURE AND ORGANISATION

(1) A Report to the Primary Division Principal

At the end of 1972 the Graduate Course at Christchurch Teachers' College came under the close scrutiny of the Acting Dean of the Primary Division, and a number of specific changes were proposed in his report to the Principal.¹⁷ The first recommendation was that more opportunity should be given for in-school experience. The shorter time and narrower range of class experiences available made the school posting programme more crucial for the graduates than for three-year students. Schools, classes and Associate Teachers needed utmost care in their selection, a home school to which students were attached each term was "a major

¹⁶ See Appendix J, Tables 44(d) and (e) for Newman-Keuls tests.

¹⁷ Wilkie, D.B. Proposed Graduate Group Course, 1973, a report to the Primary Division Principal, Christchurch Teachers' College. (Mimeographed)

necessity", the first term posting should be split into two, and consideration be given to posting graduates in pairs to classrooms in their first school. Other proposals were that the number of scheduled hours be reduced to allow greater individual study freedom, that college courses relate more directly to school experiences, that courses be differentiated to suit the major sub-groupings in terms of student background, and that within courses themselves the ideas and ideals being propounded be demonstrated.

However, a major contribution of this report came under a heading "The Spirit of the Course". Here an attempt was made to express concerns which had for some time been voiced by those most closely associated with the group. Graduates had made it clear that they desired treatment different in some degree from that given to the younger students, and the report stated that graduates "need to feel that both they and their course is (sic) valued in the institution ... (and lecturers) ... must never apologise for their courses in any way and should never compare the graduate course they are offering with a three-year course to the detriment of the graduate course."¹⁸ Implicit here was the acknowledged second-in-priority status some lecturers had accorded the Graduates by merely adapting for them a course prepared for three-year students, rather than devising one tailored to the needs of the Graduate Student. Greater college recognition of the Graduate Group, in terms of staffing, was considered necessary. "It needs a staff member - fully committed to it as his major responsibility, one who will take part in the course and guide it from within."¹⁹ The report concluded, "Graduate students are still largely unknown quantities and their impact on the teaching profession still lies ahead. Such now are their numbers, however, and such is their potential value that they must demand an increasing share of our professional attention."²⁰

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 4.

¹⁹ Loc. cit.

²⁰ Loc. cit.

(2) A New Course Structure

An important staffing reorganisation was made for 1973. No doubt a major catalyst for this was the 39 students accepted for the course, the largest number to date, but the report just discussed had also highlighted important issues which called for attention. The Dean retained responsibility for the course, but delegated the all-over organisation and day-to-day running to two lecturers who had been seconded from their respective subject departments. They retained some teaching within their departments, but for the first time in seven years the Graduate programme now had two Course Tutors whose main commitment was to it. The intention of this staffing change was threefold. First, by being so closely involved with the Graduate Group throughout the year, the two Course Tutors would be able to more quickly identify and attempt to remedy individual and group problems and special needs. Second, better total programme unity and cohesiveness would be aimed for, especially if the Course Tutors were also closely involved in students' work in schools. Third, because of the primary teaching backgrounds and particular educational interests of the Course Tutors, the emphasis previously given to students' academic backgrounds would be likely to alter to a greater highlighting of students' professional needs.

There were some changes too in course content. The major study components of the Graduate Programme for 1973, and their duration, are set out in Table 3. The main difference in the programme itself was the great deal of Course Tutor involvement, both in planning and in teaching. The respective College departments assumed responsibility for six of the eight Syllabus Studies, while the Tutors taught most of the Language and Social Studies Syllabus Studies. A course titled "Educating Exceptional Children" was conducted by the Tutors, and they also assisted in some other education courses. Studies in Teaching and curriculum Studies were entirely developed and taught by the Course Tutors. There were three school postings in 1973 - a two-week period followed later by three weeks in the same class in Term One, two two-week

TABLE 3

Major courses and their duration in the One-year Graduate Programme, 1973

Course	Hours
Foundation Studies in Education	
The School in Society	9
Mental Health and Classroom Climate	9
A Study of Primary School Children	5
How Children Learn	10
Educating Exceptional Children	17
Total	50
Studies in Teaching	
Classroom Interaction Analyses	2
Microteaching	8
Total	10
Curriculum Studies	
Curriculum Issues, Planning and Teaching	25
Teacher Planning Workshop	10
Total	35
Syllabus Studies	
Art	25
Language	25
Mathematics	30
Music	25
Physical Education	25
Reading	40
Science	40
Social Studies	20
Total	230
Administration (approx.)	25
Other	
Group meetings, forums, visits, etc.	50
Total in College ^a	420
First School Posting, Term One (50 + 75)	125
Second School Posting, Term Two (50 + 50)	100
Third School Posting, Term Three (100)	100
Total in Schools ^b	325
Total Course	745

^a 26 of 39 weeks were spent in College (= two-thirds).

^b 13 of 39 weeks were spent in schools (= one-third).

periods in one class in Term Two, and a final posting of four consecutive weeks in Term Three. Prior to each, the Course Tutors consulted with the Principal Lecturer in charge of postings on individual placements, and they briefed all Associate Teachers.²¹ During each posting the Tutors visited schools, discussing the observing students' work. Finally, the Tutors called regular group meetings, arranged forums with visiting speakers, organised visits to various educational agencies and were constantly available for one-to-one guidance.

The 39 graduate students were sub-divided into two groups, with a Course Tutor assigned to the group which best matched his own special interests. The basis for the division was university background - those with science and social science (other than Education and Psychology) degrees were placed in one, and those with English and the humanities in the other. Students with Education and Psychology majors were divided between the two. This attempt to build on the specialised knowledge of students was essentially a carry-over from previous years when degree subjects received some prominence. Students were grouped in this way for most personal and professional meetings with Tutors, and for some of the teaching programme where the size of the total Graduate Group made a two-way division preferable.

(3) New Selection Procedures

The 1973 group had been subjected to new selection procedures too. With greatly increased competition to enter the course,²² and an awareness that a single interview is unreliable as a method of selection, it became important to look for other procedures. Moreover, the

²¹ Associate Teachers are teachers to whom students are attached during their school postings. They are specially appointed and receive an allowance for each week they have a student in their classroom.

²² Over 70 applications were received from graduates for the 1973 course, a small number of whom withdrew before being interviewed. Only 29 of these were accepted.

confidential information supplied by the school for a school leaver applicant, early contact with the Recruitment Officer and an opportunity to spend two or three days in a primary school at the time of application, were not always available for older applicants.²³ Consequently, it was felt that deeper consideration should be given to three broad areas -

"the relevance for primary teaching of the degree subjects taken, the personal qualities of the candidate, particularly in the ability to adapt readily from an academically oriented course to one which is professional and vocational in nature, and an ability to relate easily to both children and adults,

(and) a commitment to teaching which should show some evidence of involvement with people, and an ability to communicate readily."²⁴

It was decided by the Selection Committee to give graduate candidates the opportunity, after they had been through the initial interview, to -

"meet and relate to children,
 reveal adaptability and resourcefulness in a novel situation,
 show sensitivity to a practical teaching situation,
 relate to a fellow professional,

(and) demonstrate quality and depth in thinking, particularly in a socially oriented sense."²⁵

This was done on an experimental basis by having each candidate conduct a discussion with a small group of five- or six-year-old children, by having a senior member of the profession interview the candidate again, and by obtaining a written comment on a teaching situation portrayed on a videotape. The results of these new procedures are discussed later, but the fact that they were used again for 1974 and 1975 applicants indicates that other useful dimensions were seen to have been added.

²³ Information had been obtained from the head of the university department in which the graduate applicant had majored, and from referees, but these related only to academic achievement and potential, and to his character.

²⁴ Mann, J.F. Teachers' College Selection Not 'Hit-or-Miss' Procedure, National Education, Well., N.Z.E.I., 23 Sept. 1974, p. 174.

²⁵ Herbison, J.M. Selection of Candidates for 1973 Associate Teacher Newsletter, Primary Division, Christchurch Teachers' College, Vol. 2, No. 2, May 1973, p. 1.

(4) Attitudes Towards Course Length

Six audiences were asked during 1973 for their views on the desirable length of a Teachers' College course end-on to a university degree or a degree minus one unit.²⁶ The responses are set out in Table 4.

TABLE 4

Assuming that an end-on course for university graduates is acceptable, how long do you think it should be ?

	School Staff		College Personnel			
	Principals (n = 34)	Teachers (n = 76)	Lecturers (n = 42)	1st Year Students (n = 67)	3rd Year Students (n = 59)	Graduate Students (n = 34)
Less than one year	-	-	-	1.5	-	-
One year or about one year	35.3 ^a	40.8	31.0	25.4	11.9	88.2
Two years or about two years	61.8	55.3	66.7	68.7	71.2	11.8
Three years or about three years	2.9	3.9	2.4	4.5	16.9	-
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

^a Percentage choosing this course length.

Only 11.8 per cent. of Graduate Students saw their one-year course as having been too short,²⁷ whereas 88.1 per cent. of Third-year Students and between 59.2 per cent. and 73.2 per cent. of the other four audiences regarded a one-

²⁶ See Appendix D, Question A 3. Audiences described on p. 24.

²⁷ Note that almost one-third of the Graduate Students were returned university studentship holders who were completing the second of two years at College. This means that some of these students may have believed that their two years at College was too long, although the question was somewhat ambiguous for them.

year course as too short. An interpretation of these figures is that all audiences, other than Graduate Students, believed that graduates from previous one-year college courses have been under-prepared for teaching. Also, an attitude of slight resentment by some Third-year Students, that Graduate Students spent only one year at College to the normal three before going out on an equal footing into a Year One teaching position, may be reflected here.²⁸

3. THE STAFF, 1973

As already noted, the Dean continued to have oversight of the Graduate Course in 1973. For the first term his role in the College was essentially that of Primary Division administrator under the Principal and Vice Principal, although he did some teaching in the Third-year Curriculum Studies course. Among his particular responsibilities in the total College were short courses, the tutoring system, the Curriculum Studies course, university studies by College students, and rooming. His background was in primary teaching, lecturing in mathematics and Education in the College, heading the College Education Department, and, finally, secondment to the primary inspectorate for the previous year while holding the Dean's position at College. In May he resigned, and a new "Dean of Professional Studies" was appointed with a wider responsibility for all professional courses in the Primary Division as well as having the former administrative tasks. His previous designation was Principal Lecturer in Education, and his background was also in the primary teaching service. Throughout the year the two Deans had only one meeting each with the total Graduate Group, but kept abreast of the course through contacts with individual students and occasional meetings with Course Tutors.

²⁸ This comment is also based on informal and unsolicited remarks made by Third-year Students over the year.

The Course Tutors were Lecturers in English and Social Studies respectively. Each had been on the College staff about five years and had come from teaching positions in primary schools. Both were trained specialists in Science, and had spent their first few years of service as itinerant Science Organisers. One had spent three years as relieving Lecturer in Science at Dunedin Teachers' College, and a further eighteen months as principal of a Grade III B school. Both held Bachelor of Arts degrees, in Geography and Education respectively, gained by part-time and extra-mural study, and both were completing thesis research for Masters' degrees in Education at the beginning of the year.

Teaching the Graduate Course was shared by 41 of the 66 total teaching staff available at that time. Just over half the staff taught course units of more than two hours' duration. Three-quarters of the staff had had teaching contact with Graduate Students in a previous year, and just over 10 per cent. had been personal tutors to Graduate Course students prior to 1973.

4. THE STUDENTS, 1973

(1) Academic and Other Background²⁹

Thirty-nine students entered the 1973 one-year graduate programme.³⁰ Six of the 31 women in the group were married on entry, and two others married during the year. Twenty-seven came straight from full-time university study, including the ten who had been on special College studentships for university study, and another who was re-admitted to College after completing a degree at her own expense. The other twelve (nearly 31 per cent.) had spent up to seven years in various other occupations immediately prior to entering College, compared with

²⁹ The source of information for this section, and the next on Selection Committee judgements, was Christchurch Teachers' College records.

³⁰ Through one death in May, and a termination of studentship during Term Two, 37 actually completed the course.

just over 8 per cent. of all entrants to the three-year course in 1973 who had some previous full-time work experience. Of the ten ex-university studentship holders, six had earlier spent the first year of the three-year course at College, while the other four had gone to university straight from school. Four of the ten still had to complete their final degree unit during 1973.

Two students held a Master of Arts degree, three had completed M.A. papers, one was a Bachelor of Science (Honours), and the remaining 29 graduates held Bachelors' degrees, three in Science and the rest in Arts. The greatest number of units passed was in English, with the three social sciences - Sociology, Psychology and Education - together with History, also having been popular. Of special note was the one-third who had taken introductory units in the biological sciences, and although only five advanced in the sciences, the proportion with some science background was higher than for any previous Graduate Group. Table 5 shows the undergraduate and postgraduate subjects passed by the 1973 Graduate Group. 5½ per cent. of all passes were at the "A" grade level, 48½ per cent. at the "B" level, and 46 per cent. were "C" grade passes. Only just over 3 per cent. of all units sat by the group were failures (not included in the Table). This was a highly qualified group academically. By comparison, the highest attainment of the 232 entrants to the three-year course in 1973 whose records were surveyed, was -

a pass in up to three university units	:	4.7 per cent.
some other tertiary qualification	:	1.3 per cent.
Higher School Certificate	:	23.7 per cent.
University Entrance	:	69.8 per cent.
and School Certificate	:	0.4 per cent.

(2) Selection Committee Judgements

In terms of Selection Committee judgements also, this was an able group. Candidates for the Graduate Course went through the same initial selection interview as did all other applicants, and were rated on the

TABLE 5

University subjects passed by One-year Graduate Course Students, 1973

	Undergraduate Passes				Post-graduate Passes			T o t a l
	Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3 ^a	Total	Dip.Ed. Papers ^b	M.A. Papers ^c	M.A. Complete	
English	35	23	13	71			1	1
Sociology	24	9	8	41		1		1
Psychology	20	10	11	41				
History	29	5	4	38				
Education	17	9	10	36	1	2		3
Geography	8	5	6	19				
Biology	12			12				
French	9	2		11				
Philosophy	4	2	3	9				
Political Science	4	3	2	9			1	1
Religious Studies	9			9				
American Studies	6	1		7				
Anthropology	3	2	2	7				
Zoology	1	4	2	7				
Law	7			7				
Chemistry	4	1	1	6				
Botany		3	2	5				
Economics	5			5				
Mathematics	5			5				
Music	1	1		2				
Geology	1			1				
German	1			1				
Greek Studies	1			1				
Latin	1			1				
Total	207	80	64	351	1	3	2	6

^a Includes "Additional" units and "Starred" papers.

^b Two papers.

^c All M.A. papers completed (viz. only thesis to do).

same 20-point scale. Less than one in two of the original graduate applicants (not counting returning university studentship holders) were accepted for the course, and an analysis of Selection Committee ratings reveals that graduates rated significantly higher on the initial interview than students entering the three-year course that year.³¹ Table 6 sets out the Selection Committee ratings on the initial interview for both graduates and three-year students, together with ratings of graduates for the additional selection procedures at Elmwood Normal School, described in Section 2 (3) of this chapter. Neither three-year course candidates nor returning university studentship holders who were to join the one-year course, were required to go through these additional procedures.

Table 7 compares the individual ratings given to the 24 graduates who went through the additional selection procedures at Elmwood Normal School. Although Student A's high initial rating was not replicated, and Student S's contact with children was marked down, the Elmwood ratings confirm the student's high ratings on the initial interview.³² This is not surprising as those selected to undertake the Elmwood tasks were those already regarded as suitable.³³ A problem in using the applicant's ability to relate to young children as a criterion for selection arises with Student E who came out top on both interviews but low for the Elmwood teaching experience. Student E held a science degree (which included no study of human communication or relationships), and also had had no previous teaching experience. She thus may have been prematurely judged

³¹ Mean of Graduates 18.17, versus mean of Three-year Students 17.75, $F = 5.22$, $p < 0.05$. However, if returning university studentship holders are excluded (they returned to College automatically and did not have to compete for entry at this time), the intergroup difference would be even greater (Graduate mean rating 18.63 - see Table 7, $F = 13.91$, $p < 0.01$).

³² Student A was subsequently judged to be unsuited to teaching and her studentship was terminated in Term Two, and Student S resigned from teaching early in her Year One teaching position on her own volition.

³³ Care must therefore be taken in using these Elmwood results as evidence to support the quality of the initial interview.

TABLE 6

Selection Committee ratings of entrants to the One-year Graduate and Three-year Courses, 1973

Rating ^a	One-year Graduate Group			Three-year Group
	Initial Interview	Elmwood Interview	Elmwood Teaching ^b	Initial Interview
20	7	6	1	8
19+	-	-	-	1
19	6	4	4	40
18+	-	-	1	1
18	13	7	5	82
17+	-	1	3	2
17	8	4	5	78
16+	1	1	-	2
16	2	1	2	5
15+	-	-	-	-
15	-	-	1	7
14+	-	-	-	-
14	-	-	2	-
None recorded	2	15	15	6
Total	39	39	39	232
Mean ^c	18.17	18.33	17.38	17.75

^a 20 was highest on the scale.

^b Ratings for the third component of the Elmwood exercise - written comments on a video-taped lesson - were not available to this study.

^c A plus (+) is taken as .5.

TABLE 7

Selection Committee ratings of the 24 Graduate entrants who went through the Elmwood selection procedures

Student	Initial Interview	Elmwood Interview	Elmwood Teaching
A	19	16	14
B	18	17	17+
C	20	18	18+
D	19	20	19
E	20	20	16
F	18	17+	16
G	20	20	19
H	18	16+	18
I	18	20	18
J	19	18	17
K	20	18	20
L	17	19	17+
M	17	18	17
N	20	19	18
O	18	20	17
P	18	17	17
Q	18	18	15
R	18	18	19
S	18	17	14
T	20	17	17
U	19	19	18
V	20	20	19
W	18	19	18
X	17	18	17+
Mean ^a	18.63	18.33	17.38

^a Plus (+) taken as .5.

on skills for which the College course was created to help her develop. The danger in this exercise is the possible assumption that the teaching skills demonstrated by the candidate on College entry equate with teaching potential.

When the high initial Selection Committee ratings were taken into account, together with the one in two acceptance ratio, it was obvious that many potentially able teachers were lost to the primary service, at least for 1973. It is interesting to note that, whereas the Department of Education's quota for graduates entering each teachers' college was 40, excluding returning university studentship holders, only 29 were in fact selected for entry to the 1973 Graduate Course at Christchurch Teachers' College.³⁴

(3) When and Why the Decision to Teach

Three student audiences were asked early in 1973 when they had decided to take up a teaching career, and their responses are given in Table 8.³⁵ Most of the Graduate Group (69.2 per cent.) decided to enter teaching after leaving high school, whereas only 17 per cent. of First-year Students and 16 per cent. of Third-year Students had made up their minds after leaving school. The difference between graduates and other students would have been greater had the ten ex-university studentship holders been excluded, as their commitment to teaching would generally have come while at school (as for three-year students). Just over 15 per cent. of Graduates said that they had decided while at primary school, but as many as one-fifth of First-year Students and one-third of Third-year Students reported that they had made their decision this early.

³⁴ Compare the Christchurch numbers with those of the three other primary teachers' colleges which had well-established Graduate Courses in 1973: Christchurch - 29 plus 10 returned studentship holders, North Shore - 41 plus 5 returned studentship holders, Auckland - 40 plus 5 returned studentship holders, Wellington - 43 plus 3 returned studentship holders.

³⁵ See Appendix B, Question A3. Audiences described on p. 24.

TABLE 8

As far as you can remember, when did you decide on a teaching career ?

	Graduate Group (n = 39)	First-year Students (n = 53)	Third-year Students (n = 50)
During primary school years	15.4 ^a	20.8	32.0
During third or fourth form years	2.6	1.9	6.0
During fifth or sixth form years	10.3	24.5	42.0
During seventh form	2.6	35.8	4.0
Later	69.2	17.0	16.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

^a Percentage choosing at this time.

The same three student audiences were asked for their main reasons for choosing a teaching career.³⁶ Nine possible reasons were stated, and students were asked - (a) to indicate which of the reasons had been seriously considered by them (they could choose more than one), and (b) to rank those reasons seriously considered in order of importance. The results are summarised in Table 9. Not surprisingly, more Graduate Students than First-year or Third-year Students cited the limited currency of their degree subject qualifications in other occupations as a reason for entering teaching, and a slightly higher proportion of Graduates were attracted by teachers' salaries. However, the mean rankings for all three groups are similar.

Seven possible reasons for choosing primary rather than secondary teaching were presented to the same three student groups, and they were asked to indicate one or more reasons which they had considered.³⁷ The results are shown in Table 10.

³⁶ See Appendix B, Question A 4.

³⁷ See Appendix B, Question B 6 (a).

TABLE 9

What were your main reasons for choosing a teaching career ?

	Graduate Group Students (n = 39)		First-year Students (n = 53)		Third-year Students (n = 50)	
	Was a Reason	Mean Ranking ^a	Was a Reason	Mean Ranking	Was a Reason	Mean Ranking
Enjoyed working with children	100.0 ^b	1.6	96.1	1.6	95.9	1.5
Job variety of teaching	76.9	2.5	76.5	2.1	76.6	2.6
Offered a stepping stone	41.0	3.0	35.3	3.5	29.2	3.4
Academic quals. not suited to other occupations	59.0	3.4	28.9	3.5	38.8	3.2
Attracted by long vacations	82.1	3.4	73.1	3.8	87.8	3.7
Teachers' salaries appeared good	82.1	3.8	69.2	3.6	67.4	3.6
High public standing of teachers	46.2	5.1	36.5	6.1	44.9	4.2
Were talked into teaching	7.9	5.3	11.5	4.3	24.5	4.3
Close friend entering teaching	12.8	6.0	7.7	5.5	8.2	4.8

^a On this ranking scale, 1 is highest.

^b Percentage reporting this as a reason.

TABLE 10

Why did you decide upon primary rather than secondary teacher training ?

	Graduate Group (n = 39)	First Year Students (n = 53)	Third Year Students (n = 50)
More interested in primary age group	37.0 ^a	37.5	39.2
More confident with primary age group	28.4	36.3	40.5
Academic qualifications more suited to primary	13.6	1.3	2.5
Preferred Primary to Secondary Division of Christchurch T.C.	12.4	1.3	1.3
Primary offered better promotion prospects	8.6	2.5	3.8
Did not wish to do the necessary university study	-	8.8	8.9
Did not feel capable of doing the necessary university study	-	12.5	3.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

^a Percentage choosing this reason.

Proportions citing an interest in primary children are very similar across groups, and only a slightly lower proportion of Graduates compared with First-year and Third-year Students give confidence with primary children as a reason. The 12.4 per cent. of Graduate Students who preferred the Primary Division to the Secondary Division of Christchurch Teachers' College indicates a knowledge of both Divisions (true or otherwise) passed on by friends and acquaintances, and supports unsolicited comments made by Graduates over the year that they found out about primary and secondary courses from people within the College, or from those who had passed through as students. Other group differences relate to university qualifications, and are essentially differences in

the backgrounds of the respective groups.

Finally, the degree of confidence over the choice of teaching with which the three student groups entered teaching was sought, and Table 11 shows a significant difference across groups.³⁸

TABLE 11

How sure are you about your choice of teaching as a career ?

	Scale	Graduate Students (n = 39)	First-year Students (n = 53)	Third-year Students (n = 50)
I shall definitely not change to another occupation	4	5	11	15
I am not likely to change	3	11	33	23
I may possibly change	2	16	8	9
I shall probably change	1	7	1	3
Mean		2.36	3.02	3.00

F = 9.09

p < 0.01

Graduate Students were significantly less certain of their choice than both First-year and Third-year Students, but there was no significant difference between First-year Students and Third-year Students.³⁹

(4) Perception of Teaching

Graduate Students, First-year Students and Third-year Students were asked early in 1973 whether they believed teaching to be a profession.⁴⁰ Their responses are given in Table 12.

³⁸ See Appendix B, Question A5.

³⁹ See Appendix J, Table 44(f) for Newman-Keuls test.

⁴⁰ See Appendix B, Question B2(a).

TABLE 12

In general, do you believe teaching is a profession ?

	Graduate Students (n = 39)	First-year Students (n = 53)	Third-year Students (n = 50)
Yes	61.5 ^a	83.0	84.0
No	15.4	7.6	4.0
Not sure	23.1	9.4	12.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

^a Percentage of responses in this category.

$\chi^2 = 10.19$
df = 4
p < 0.05

By inspection it is obvious that the First- and Third-year Students do not differ from each other. The data were reanalysed after pooling First- and Third-year Students and pooling the "no" and "not sure" categories. The chi-square for this two-by-two contingency table was also significant,⁴¹ suggesting that Graduate Students are less certain about the professional status of teaching than First- and Third-year Students.

Another question sought responses to statements on teachers' salaries.⁴² On a four-point scale (with 4 the highest) of the general adequacy of salaries, the means of 2.33, 2.12 and 2.04 for Graduate Students, First-year Students and Third-year Students respectively, showed no significant difference.⁴³

⁴¹ $\chi^2 = 7.81, df = 1, p < 0.05.$

⁴² See Appendix B, Question B3.

⁴³ F = 2.43.

By seeking judgements of the "social level"⁴⁴ of teaching, compared with other occupations, a third attempt was made to assess perceptions by the same three student groups towards teaching as a profession.⁴⁵ The results are shown in Table 13.

TABLE 13

Indicate the approximate "social level" of each occupation by writing a number from 1 to 5 opposite it.

	Graduate Students (n = 39)	First-year Students (n = 53)	Third-year Students (n = 50)	F
Member of Parliament	4.17 ^a	4.44	4.55	1.68
Accountant	4.21	4.28	4.31	0.24
Dentist	4.07	4.26	4.18	0.60
Airline Pilot	3.58	4.08	4.10	5.97 ^{**}
Secondary Teacher	3.47	3.84	3.91	5.85 ^{**}
Primary Teacher	3.40	3.60	3.62	1.41
City Store Manager	3.50	3.58	3.55	0.13
Minister of Religion	3.35	3.63	3.60	1.38
Private Secretary	3.00	3.26	3.34	2.51
Newspaper Reporter	3.02	3.32	2.97	4.05 [*]
Carpenter	2.92	3.18	2.95	2.19
Clothing Shop Salesman	2.00	2.12	2.00	0.43
Women's Hairdresser	1.89	1.96	1.97	1.52
Waterside Worker	1.48	1.60	1.26	2.27

^a Mean rating on a five-point scale with 5 the highest.

* p < 0.05

** p < 0.01

⁴⁴ Adapted from Nuthall, G.A. Research Note: Sex Differences in Ratings of the Occupational Status of Teaching, N.Z.J. of Ed. Studies, Vol. 4, No. 2, Nov. 1969, pp. 170 - 176.

⁴⁵ See Appendix B, Question B1, which also describes the five-point scale used.

Graduate ratings were slightly lower than First-year and Third-year Students' for most occupations, but the intergroup difference was significant beyond the 1 per cent. level for only two. For both an Airline Pilot and a Secondary Teacher, Graduates rated the social levels significantly lower than did the other two Student Groups, but there was no significant difference between First-year and Third-year Students.⁴⁶ Probably of most interest is this difference between groups in the perceived status of Secondary Teachers. Possibly having a degree themselves causes Graduates to see Secondary Teachers in a different way from First- and Third-year Students.

(5) Personal Aspirations

Of special interest in this study was how Graduate Students saw themselves as teachers. First, did the prospect of teaching areas of the curriculum most closely associated with their degree majors assume an importance to them? Certain assumptions are made by the College Staff that there is a relationship between degree units or College Selected Studies⁴⁷ and subsequent curriculum areas of teaching strength, and the new selection procedures described earlier did seek information on "the relevance for primary teaching of the degree subjects taken."⁴⁸ Whether or not such a relationship exists, and to what degree, is seen as a potentially useful field of research, but of greater concern to this study was the extent to which an enthusiasm for their subject may have loomed larger to the Graduates than did a broader view of the curriculum and an understanding of children's learning. Graduate Students, First-year Students and Third-year Students were therefore asked early in 1973

⁴⁶ See Appendix J, Tables 44(g) and 44(h) for Newman-Keuls tests.

⁴⁷ Selected Studies courses are elective courses taken by Three-year Students not studying at university. They are tertiary level courses, not necessarily related to teaching.

⁴⁸ See Section 2(3) of this Chapter.

to indicate which of a number of aspects of teaching would give the greatest personal satisfaction.⁴⁹ Only one aspect was to be chosen, and the results are given in Table 14.

TABLE 14

Which one of the following aspects of teaching will give you personally the greatest satisfaction ?

	Graduate Students (n = 39)	First-year Students (n = 53)	Third-year Students (n = 50)
Seeing children grow in knowledge and skills under your guidance	65.8 ^a	63.0	66.0
Working with enthusiastic children	21.1	5.6	18.0
Reaching an understanding of children's needs and development	10.5	27.8	14.0
Teaching the subject matter of special interest to you	2.6	3.7	2.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

^a Percentage citing this aspect.

The important finding here was that Graduate Students were little different from other Students, and they were more like Third-year than First-year Students. Only one Graduate stated that teaching his own subject was most important to him, and this was soon after entry to College, before the full impact of the course with its emphasis on children and their learning could have had much effect.

Second, the same three student groups were asked to rank a number of teacher models according to personal preference, and Table 15 shows the results.⁵⁰

⁴⁹ See Appendix B, Question B4(a).

⁵⁰ See Appendix B, Question B11 for a description of the eight teaching models.

TABLE 15

Most young teachers have a particular model or style of teaching that they would like to emulate. Rank the following teachers in the order that they appeal to you.

	Graduate Students (n = 39)	First-year Students (n = 53)	Third-year Students (n = 50)
Questioner	1.60 ^a	1.86	2.02
Partner	2.83	2.46	2.62
Tutor	3.28	3.08	3.48
Prompter	3.48	3.63	3.21
Manipulator	4.70	4.97	4.87
Therapist	5.05	5.45	5.52
Model	5.97	6.20	6.52
Entertainer	7.10	7.12	7.63

^a Mean ranking with 1 the highest.

The rankings are the same for all groups, with one exception. Third-year Students expressed a preference for the "prompter" model over the "tutor".

An apparent assumption by those who place Graduate Students into Year One teaching positions has been that, because of their degrees, a higher proportion than of three-year course students will want to teach in intermediate schools. So, third, the same student groups were asked to indicate preferred teaching levels, and Table 16 shows the results (any number of levels could be chosen).⁵¹ It is true that just over a half of the Graduate group choices were preferences for intermediate or higher, but so was it true with other Students.⁵² The relatively even

⁵¹ See Appendix B, Question B5.

⁵² The nature of the First- and Third-year samples must be remembered here, however. They were students of the highest academic attainment in their respective intakes, and may, therefore, have been more likely to pursue further university study and teach at a higher level.

TABLE 16

Assuming that you had the qualifications to teach at any of the following levels, which would you choose?^a

	Graduate Students (n = 39)		First-year Students (n = 53)		Third-year Students (n = 50)	
	Chose Ranking Level		Chose Ranking Level		Chose Ranking Level	
Pre-school	11.0 ^b	4.6 ^c	9.6	4.8	11.5	4.1
Junior Primary	16.5	2.5	16.0	2.5	16.4	2.0
Middle Primary	18.9	1.6	24.0	1.4	17.0	1.8
Intermediate	17.3	2.5	19.2	2.8	17.0	2.8
Lower Secondary	11.0	4.5	12.0	3.4	12.7	5.0
Upper Secondary	11.8	4.2	10.4	3.8	12.7	4.8
Adult	13.4	3.7	8.8	5.7	12.7	4.7
Total	100.0		100.0		100.0	

^a Students were also asked to rank their choices in order.

^b Percentage choosing this level.

^c Mean ranking, with 1 the highest.

spread of Graduate choices through all age levels was very similar to those of Third-year Students.

Fourth, Students were asked to express a preference for school and class type, as shown on Table 17.⁵³ Only one choice of school and one choice of class was to be made. The only notable difference between groups was the smaller proportion of Graduates expressing a preference for country schools and the number in this group with no expressed preference for a particular type of school.

⁵³ See Appendix B, Questions B7 and B9(b).

TABLE 17

If you are still teaching in ten years what sort of school would you like to be in, and if you were to teach in an intermediate school what type of class would you like ?

	Graduate Students (n = 39)	First-year Students (n = 53)	Third-year Students (n = 50)
City school	30.8 ^a	35.9	42.0
Small town school	38.5	30.2	28.0
Country school	18.0	34.0	30.0
No preference expressed	12.8	-	-
Total school preference	100.0	100.0	100.0
Mixed ability class	38.5 ^b	39.6	38.0
Average ability class	28.2	30.2	26.0
Top stream class	23.1	22.6	24.0
Low stream class	10.3	7.6	12.0
Total class preference	100.0	100.0	100.0

^a Percentage choosing this school type.

^b Percentage choosing this class type.

Finally, the three student audiences were asked to indicate the positions they hoped to hold (a) after five years of service and (b) after ten years of service.⁵⁴ This was an open-ended question, and answers were grouped under General Teaching Positions, Positions of Responsibility and Special Teaching Positions. Table 18 shows the responses to this question given early in 1973, and follow-up questions of intentions and aspirations were to be taken up again a year later.⁵⁵ About one-fifth of each group did not respond to either part of the question, supporting verbal comments from students over the year that they held no clear ambitions at that stage, but preferred to wait and see how effective they felt in their own classrooms. Graduates differed from other Students in two main respects. Fewer were desirous of taking on positions of responsibility, and appreciably more had their sights set on specialist teaching positions. A possible interpretation of the first is that Graduates had made up their minds to teach more recently than other Students, and not having consolidated their position, felt less confident about future positions of responsibility (if indeed they had even thought of these). The special interest shown by Graduates in specialist positions is likely to have been linked to the high proportion with Sociology, Psychology and Education degrees.

⁵⁴ See Appendix B, Question B9(a).

⁵⁵ See Chapter VI.

TABLE 18

Assuming you are still in the education service, what position do you hope to hold after five years of teaching, and after ten years of teaching ?

	Graduate Students (n = 39)		First-year Students (n = 53)		Third-year Students (n = 50)	
	After 5 yrs	After 10 yrs	After 5 yrs	After 10 yrs	After 5 yrs	After 10 yrs
General Positions -						
General Teacher	40.9 ^a	22.7	46.3	16.7	54.0	29.6
Relieving Teacher	-	-	-	1.9	-	-
Independent School Teacher	-	2.3	-	-	-	-
Teaching Overseas	-	-	1.9	-	4.0	1.9
Secondary Teacher	2.3	2.3	-	-	-	1.9
Total General	43.2	27.3	48.2	18.6	58.0	33.4
Positions Responsibility -						
Sole-charge Teacher	4.6	2.3	5.6	3.7	-	-
Senior Teacher	-	6.8	7.4	14.8	12.0	20.4
Deputy Principal	-	-	1.9	7.4	2.0	3.7
Principal	2.3	2.3	1.9	14.8	-	7.4
Lecturer	2.3	4.6	-	1.9	-	1.9
Total P.R.	9.2	16.0	16.8	42.6	14.0	33.4
Special Positions -						
Subject Specialist in a School	2.3	4.6	5.6	-	4.0	5.6
Teacher in field of Special Education	9.1	11.4	5.6	9.3	2.0	1.9
Adviser	6.8	9.1	-	-	-	1.9
Social Worker	-	-	-	1.9	-	-
Teacher-Counsellor	9.1	9.1	-	-	2.0	7.4
Total Special	27.3	34.2	11.2	11.2	8.0	16.8
No Response	20.5	22.7	24.1	27.8	20.0	16.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

^a Percentage choosing this position.

5. SUMMARY

From the first small, somewhat enigmatic group of 1966, it was four years before a College report sought to define the special characteristics and professional needs of Graduate Students, and another two years before serious moves were made for course changes and a greater College recognition of the group. Meanwhile, this group grew to 39 in 1973, and two Lecturers were seconded almost full-time to act as course co-ordinators and as Tutors to Graduate Students.

In regard to the length of the course, the majority of School Principals, Teachers, Teachers' College Lecturers and Three-year Course Students surveyed in 1973 felt that two years was the minimum needed for teacher training, whereas the Graduate Group of 1973 felt that one year was sufficient. Students, Lecturers and Teachers with degrees valued university education significantly more than did those without degrees, yet non-graduate Students believed that a degree played a more significant part in promotion than did Graduate Students. Also, Graduate Students and School Principals supported the end-on course more strongly than did First- and Third-year Teachers' College Students.

Graduate candidates for 1973 went through additional selection procedures for the first time, but the real screening still took place at the initial interview where successful Graduate applicants rated significantly higher than other applicants. Furthermore, only 29 out of 70 Graduate applicants were finally accepted, despite the Department of Education's upper limit of 40.

Most Graduates decided to enter teaching after leaving school, unlike other Teachers' College Students, though their reasons for the decision were similar to those of other Students. However, Graduates were significantly less committed to their choice of teaching as a career (see Table 11), and significantly more Graduates felt uncertain of the professional status of teaching than other Students did. Fewer

Graduates expressed a desire to take up positions of responsibility in the future, but more were looking towards specialist positions in the educational service. Graduates were similar to other Students (a) in their ranking of the "social levels" of certain occupations (although they had a different perception of secondary teachers); (b) in aspects of teaching likely to give the greatest satisfaction; (c) in preferred teaching models; and (d) in preferred class levels, and school and class types.

CHAPTER V

TRANSACTIONS

1. STUDENTS AND SCHOOL EXPERIENCES

(1) Intents and Student Judgements

"Teaching practice periods provide for students' practical experience in the classroom. Their purpose is to enable students to acquire the skills and techniques of the art of teaching and to gain the necessary confidence to develop competency and an individual style of teaching."¹ The Associate Teachers to whom students are assigned are expected to offer help and guidance, and at least once during each school posting a College Lecturer visits the school to observe the student's teaching and to discuss his work with him. In 1973 the One-year Graduate Group spent a total of 13 weeks in three different schools.² This represented one-third of its course, compared with the 23 weeks or one-fifth for Three-year Course Students, and was virtually the same as for previous Graduate Groups, despite the Acting Dean's recommendation that it be increased.³

¹ Christchurch Teachers' College, Primary Division Calendar, 1971,
p. 24.

² See Table 3.

³ See Chapter IV, Section 2(1).

After one term's teaching in their 1974 Year-one position, ex-Graduate Course Students and a sample of Three-year Course Students⁴ were asked to judge the quality of support and guidance received during school postings while at College.⁵ The results are summarised in Table 19. On four criteria - support and guidance from teachers, demonstrations of teaching techniques, opportunities for teaching and developing a better understanding of children - both groups rated school experiences to have been "of much value". "Some value" was seen by both groups in the help received from visiting Lecturers, in help from the school in planning programmes of work and in developing a better understanding of the role of the school in its community. The only significant intergroup difference was that Graduates rated the help received from Lecturers higher. This is probably because the two Course Tutors visited the Graduates on two out of three of their school postings. A Three-year Course Student on the other hand was often visited in schools by a Lecturer he had not met before, or one who was primarily involved in Selected Studies courses which had no direct relationship with the primary school classroom.

At the end of their College year the impressions of the same Graduates were sought on the degree of acceptance and help they had received during particular school postings.⁶ Over one third (37 per cent.) had felt "accepted as a professional colleague" in all three schools, the same proportion in two of the three schools, a quarter (24 per cent.) in one school only and two students had felt accepted in no school. On the question of "help and encouragement" from Associate Teachers, half the group felt they had received this in all schools, 41 per cent. in two schools, one student in only one school, and three

⁴ Sample previously described in Chapter III, Section 4.

⁵ See Appendix H, Question C 4.

⁶ See Appendix E, Question G 11 (a) and (b).

TABLE 19

How successful, in general, were your school postings during your College course, in terms of -

	Ex-Graduate Course Students (n = 32)	Ex-Three-year Course Students (n = 34)	F
Receiving support and guidance from teachers	4.13 ^a	4.06	0.06
Having teaching techniques demonstrated	4.03	3.97	0.07
Having opportunities to practise teaching skills	4.00	4.21	1.16
Having opportunities to develop better understanding of children	3.97	4.00	0.01
Receiving support and guidance from Lecturers	3.84	3.31	4.30*
Receiving help in planning programmes of work	3.53	3.61	0.07
Developing a better understanding of the role of the school in the community	2.75	3.19	3.23

^a Mean on the scale -

- "Of very great value" - 5
- "Of much value" - 4
- "Of some value" - 3
- "Of a little value" - 2
- "Of no value" - 1

* p < 0.05

students felt that help had not been forthcoming in any school. There were thus some shortcomings in the school-student relationship which must have restricted the extent to which the objectives of school postings were attained.

(2) Attitudes of Teachers

Attitudes towards Graduate Students were sought from the three groups of Associate Teachers with whom the 1973 Graduates were placed for their teaching practices.⁷ Associate Teachers for the first posting were all in the two Christchurch Normal Schools.⁸ All but three had previously had First-year Students in their classrooms, and over two-thirds had had Graduate Students in previous years.⁹ They were asked to compare Graduates with First-year Students on their first posting, as the teacher training course was just beginning for both. Fifty-one and a half per cent. preferred Graduates, with most of the remainder expressing no preference (see Table 20). This supports a number of verbal comments from these particular teachers regarding the "more mature" and "more perceptive" Graduate Group.¹⁰

The Associate Teachers with whom the Graduates were placed for their second posting were asked to make a comparison with Second-year Students, as both groups were half way through their College course. A little over 13 per cent. expressed a preference for Graduates, while a similar percentage expressed a preference for Second-year Students (see Table 20).

⁷ See Appendices A, C and G, Question 5 in each case.

⁸ Demonstration Schools attached to the Teachers' College, to which teachers are specially appointed.

⁹ See Appendix A, Questions 3 and 4.

¹⁰ Unsolicited comments made to the Course Tutors in 1973.

TABLE 20

All other things being equal, who would you prefer to be posted to your class ?

	First Teacher Group (n = 33)	Second Teacher Group (n = 33)	Third Teacher Group (n = 36)
A Graduate Student	51.5 ^a	18.2	8.3
A First-year Student	6.1	-	-
A Second-year Student	-	15.2	-
A Third-year Student	-	-	44.4
No Preference	42.4	66.7	47.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

^a Percentage choosing this student group.

The group of Associate Teachers for the third posting were asked to make a comparison with Third-year Students, as at this stage both Third-years and Graduates were having their last section of school practice. This group of Associates, like the second group, was drawn from a wide variety of schools, but unlike the second group, expressed a strong preference for Third-year Students (Table 20).

The trend is obvious - a decrease in the preference for Graduates as the comparisons are made from First- to Third-year Students. The reason may, in part, be due to the nature of the two courses - Third-year Students had a course which was more strongly oriented towards their final posting over a longer period, and they had more unscheduled time during the College day in which to prepare programmes of work. Third-year Students may also have understood more clearly where they were going during extended periods of teaching, and they may have been seen by the teachers as more useful in the classroom. It is possible, too, that because Graduates by now were compared with Students closer to their own age, they had lost the advantage of maturity which seemed important to the Associates in the early postings.

The other indicator of attitudes towards Graduates in the schools came through a questionnaire item which asked the same Associate Teachers in 1973 to judge the teaching performance of Graduates compared with Three-year Students.¹¹ The criteria of teaching performance chosen for this item were based on a Christchurch Teachers' College printed report form which Associates regularly use to assess Students, and these criteria were, therefore, well known. The results of the questions are shown in Table 21. A clear pattern is shown whereby Graduates are perceived to be better than First-year Students on all criteria, about the same or a little better than Second-year Students (except for classroom control and the use of the blackboard and other aids), and about the same or a little below Third-year Students (except that Graduates are seen to respond to advice better and be more flexible in planning). Intergroup differences on all criteria are significant, but a Newman-Keuls test was not run across groups as the order is consistent throughout - Graduates are seen best alongside First-years, next best alongside Second-years, and worst alongside Third-years. These findings strongly replicate student group preferences of these Associate Teachers (see Table 20).

(3) Duration of School Postings

Eight audiences were asked to indicate the desired number of weeks One-year Graduate Course Students should spend in schools¹², and the results are given in Table 22. All audiences thought that there should be appreciably more than the 13 weeks spent in schools. Also, Associate Teachers, First-year Students, School Principals, ex-Graduate Course Students and Graduate Students all believed that the number of weeks in

¹¹ See Appendices A, C and G, Question 6 in each.

¹² Six of the eight audiences - School Principals, Associate Teachers, Lecturers, First-year Students, Third-year Students and Graduate Students - were asked in November 1973 (see Appendix D, Question A 4). The two Year-one Teacher groups were asked in April 1974 (see Appendix H, Question C 5). The nature of the audiences has previously been described in Chapter III, Section 4.

TABLE 21

How does the student now with you compare with Three-year Course Students on the following criteria ?

	First Teacher Group ^a (n = 31)	Second Teacher Group ^b (n = 34)	Third Teacher Group ^c (n = 37)	F
Enthusiasm for teaching	3.79 ^d	3.17	3.00	4.42*
Initiative	4.30	3.08	2.97	13.20**
Personal qualities	4.25	3.55	2.24	10.37**
General help and co-operation	3.74	3.39	3.02	4.32*
Response to advice	3.93	3.35	3.29	3.56*
Ability to talk and mix with children	3.90	3.23	3.00	6.28**
Warmth and encouragement towards children	3.90	3.14	2.97	21.19**
Understanding children's needs	4.16	3.27	2.97	10.97**
Classroom control	3.80	2.85	2.59	16.51**
Quality of planning and preparation	3.73	3.17	2.83	5.23**
Originality in planning	4.12	3.17	3.08	9.34**
Setting realistic and specific objectives	4.13	3.14	2.88	13.46**
Flexibility in evaluating and modifying the plan	4.36	3.35	3.13	16.65**
Use of blackboard and other aids	3.58	2.91	2.77	7.89**

^a First Teacher Group compared Graduates with First-year Students.

* p < 0.05

^b Second Teacher Group compared Graduates with Second-year Students.

** p < 0.01

^c Third Teacher Group compared Graduates with Third-year Students.

^d Mean rating on the scale: "Much better" - 5
 "A little better" - 4
 "About the same" - 3
 "Not quite as good" - 2
 "Decidedly inferior" - 1

schools should have been significantly higher than the number expressed by Teachers' College Lecturers.¹³ Thus, there is an important difference in length between the views of the practitioners and those in training on one hand, and those doing the training on the other.

TABLE 22

In 1973 One-year Graduate Course Students spent 13 weeks in schools compared with 26 weeks in College. In your view what length of time in a One-year Course should be spent in schools ?

	Mean Desired No. of Weeks in Schools
School Principals (n = 37)	18.86
Associate Teachers (n = 82)	20.28
Lecturers (n = 43)	15.25
First-year Students (n = 75)	19.09
Third-year Students (n = 58)	17.87
Graduate Students (n = 37)	18.48
Ex-Graduate Course Year-one Teachers (n = 31)	18.77
Ex-Three-year Course Year-one Teachers (n = 32)	18.91

F = 3.63

p < 0.01

2. STUDENTS AND COLLEGE COURSE STRUCTURE

(1) Intents and Student Judgements

The report to the Principal of the previous year had recommended fewer weekly time-tabled hours for Graduate Students. It suggested that a major theme or assignment should be introduced during a Monday group meeting, that most of the week should be given over to independent study and that a Friday meeting be used to pool ideas. Accordingly, for the first term, the number of time-tabled hours for the 1973 Graduate Course

¹³ See Appendix J, Table 44 (i) for Newman-Keuls test.

was kept close to the 13 suggested. However, such were the expressed needs of individuals and the group, and such was the impatience of Students to get on with the task of preparation for teaching and to receive greater professional direction, that each week subsequently contained more scheduled hours. Table 23 summarises the time Graduate Students were scheduled to be "in class" at College.

TABLE 23

Number of hours Graduate Students were scheduled to be in College, 1973

Term One:	One week at 15 hours	15
	Two weeks at 15 hours	30
	Five weeks at 13 hours	65
Term Two:	Four weeks at 18 hours	72
	Four weeks at 20 hours	80
Term Three:	Three weeks at 18 hours	54
	One week at 10 hours	10
	Four weeks at 16 hours	64
	One week at 20 hours	20
	One week at 10 hours	10
Total scheduled hours in College		420

Source: 1973 Graduate Course Timetables

At the end of the year Graduate Students were asked to make judgements on the timetable.¹⁴ Twenty-four per cent. said the amount of scheduled time had been "about right", 5 per cent. only "would have preferred more free time during the day" and 70 per cent. felt that "some courses could have been longer even if this had meant more scheduled hours in some weeks". Even allowing for some ambiguity in the last statement, the response reinforces the impression gained by the Course Tutors that Graduates were prepared to work harder than they did in Term One (and even harder than they did in the rest of the year) so long as the tasks were seen to be relevant to their professional needs.

¹⁴ See Appendix E, Question G 2.

Throughout the year an attempt was made to provide enough all-over programme structure to make the broad objectives clear, and yet to allow enough flexibility to modify and restructure courses at any time as circumstances changed. An over-all timetable for the year had been drawn up and a more detailed weekly timetable devised for each term. Unspecified weekly group meeting and forum times added to programme flexibility (they could be used in any way the Tutors saw fit), as did the appreciable amount of course teaching by the Tutors. Sixty-two per cent. of 1973 Graduate Students judged the balance between structure and flexibility to have been "about right", 10 per cent. thought the programme had been "a little too rigid at times" and 24 per cent. thought it was "a little too unstructured and flexible".¹⁵ Only one student saw the programme as having been "far too unstructured and flexible". On a separate, but closely related issue, 43 per cent. felt that their programme requests had "always received attention", the same proportion said these had "usually received attention" and the rest (14 per cent.) judged requests as having only sometimes been met.¹⁶ No student responded to the "only occasionally" or "never" categories.

(2) Student Groupings

The basis for assigning 1973 Graduate Students into the two tutor and teaching groups was university background.¹⁷ Again, this closely followed a recommendation in the report to the Principal of the previous year. No student judgement of this differentiation was sought, but the Course Tutors felt at the end of 1973 that, as no useful purpose had been served by such groupings, a change would be made to arbitrary group allocation (alphabetically by surnames) for the 1974 intake. Experience

¹⁵ See Appendix E, Question G 3 (a).

¹⁶ See Appendix E, Question G 3 (b).

¹⁷ For a full description of this, see Chapter IV, Sections 2 (2) and 4 (1).

had indicated that the common bond of professional preparation outweighed any highlighting of different academic backgrounds, and that a cross-fertilization of ideas could be an additional benefit coming from a wider range within each group.

(3) Integration into College Life

With a study programme separate from the three-year course, and with student affiliations having already been established with university organisations, there had always been a tendency for Graduate Groups to remain outside the corporate life of the College. Over seven years the group had grown steadily in size, and now that a special staffing provision had been made for it, authorities in the College were more concerned than ever to integrate Graduate Students. This could only be done to a very limited extent through common courses because of time-tabling and differing group needs, and the main avenues seen were through the various cultural and sporting clubs, and such facilities as the student cafeteria and commonroom.

The 1973 Graduate Group was asked at the end of the year to comment on the level of involvement in College affairs it thought was desirable and possible within the constraints of the course as then structured.¹⁸ Responses fell into three categories - 36 per cent. believing that there should be greater involvement even though it was difficult, 30 per cent. feeling that such involvement was not important but that one's contribution to the Graduate Group itself was, and 33 per cent. saying that wider involvement in the College was quite impossible anyway.

On a question of actual involvement in 1973,¹⁹ only one-fifth judged their College activities outside the course to have been comparable with that of most Third-year Students, and just five Students had in fact been associated with more than one College club or organisation. A large

¹⁸ See Appendix E, Question G 13 (c).

¹⁹ See Appendix E, Question G 13 (a) and (b).

proportion of those participating were probably ex-university student-ship holders renewing their earlier associations in some cases, so the participation rate in wider College affairs seems particularly low for the rest in the group. However, comparable proportions of the Three-year Student population participating in College affairs are needed before any real assessment can be made.

(4) Duration of Syllabus Studies Courses

As over a half of the 1973 Graduate Course was taken up by the Syllabus Studies courses, and because they varied in length in a departure from general College policy, eight audiences from school staffs, the College and Year-one Teachers were asked to make judgements about the relative importance of each.²⁰ Table 24 sets out their responses. An obvious trend is that all of the eight audiences felt that more time should have been spent on Language, Mathematics and Social Studies. These three areas, together with Reading and sometimes Science, were consistently judged to need more time than the other Syllabus Studies. Thus, the principle of varying the lengths of Syllabus Studies courses in 1973 to suit the judged needs of One-year Students was supported here, although the actual length of six of the courses fell short of what the Graduates as Year-one Teachers now felt to be desirable.

3. STUDENTS AND COURSE CONTENT

(1) Syllabus Studies Objectives and Student Judgements

During 1973 all eight College departments teaching Syllabus Studies courses were asked to provide a short statement of their objectives for the Graduate Programme. In November Graduate Students were presented with

²⁰ See Appendix D, Question A 6, and Appendix H, Question C 2. The audiences have previously been described in Chapter III, Section 4.

TABLE 24

Alongside the eight subjects, indicate the importance you attach to each in a One-year Course of teacher preparation, by placing a tick under the preferred course length.

	Art	Language	Mathematics	Music	Physical Education	Reading	Science	Social Studies
School Staffs (Nov. 1973):								
Principals (n = 36)	20 ^a	40	40	25	25	40	25	30
Associate Teachers (n = 76)	20	40	40	25	25	40	30	35
College Personnel (Nov. 1973):								
Lecturers (n = 33)	25	35	35	25	25	35	30	30
First-year Students (n = 73)	25	35	35	25	30	35	30	30
Third-year Students (n = 54)	25	35	40	25	25	40	32.5	35
Graduate Students (n = 37)	25	40	40	25	30	40	35	30
Year-one Teachers (May 1974):								
Ex Graduate Course (n = 31)	35	40	40	30	30	40	40	40
Ex Three-year Course (n = 32)	25	40	42.5	30	30	45	35	37.5

^a Median course length in weeks.

these objectives and asked to indicate how "realistic and appropriate" they believed them to be. They were also asked to judge how successful each course was "in achieving these stated objectives", and to comment on the out-of-class work-load of each.²¹ The results are summarised in Table 25. First, most sets of objectives were seen to be largely relevant, but with a range from Music at the lowest level of relevance to Science at the highest. Second, in Mathematics, Physical Education and Science, objectives were judged to have been largely achieved, and in the other subjects they had been achieved only to some extent. Third, in terms of work-load, Science most closely matched what Students saw as a desirable amount, Reading was seen to have demanded a little too much and Language, Art and Social Studies not enough.

The responses to open-ended questions on Syllabus Studies course strengths and shortcomings asked at the same time²² were grouped, and the most frequent groups of comments are now reported. The particular strength of Art seemed to be the knowledge of materials and techniques gained during practical sessions, with limitations revolving around the rigidity of course structure, the shortness of the course and its isolation from Art in schools. The shortness of the Language and Social Studies courses was highlighted,²³ but Students appreciated the course flexibility and the relationship with the wider curriculum in Language, and the preparation of teaching units in Social Studies. Mathematics achieved a good balance, in the Student view, between being taught and their practising teaching techniques, and it gave a good coverage. But the course was seen to be too short by many, and to be lacking in practical teaching methods and aids by others. Students responded favourably to practical sessions in Music and Physical Education, but some expressed

²¹ See Appendix E, Questions G 5 and G 6, for a full statement of course objectives and the specific questions asked.

²² See Appendix E, Question G 5.

²³ See also Table 24.

TABLE 25

How realistic and appropriate do you believe the objectives were, how successfully were these objectives achieved, and how did you find the out-of-class work load for each Syllabus Study course ?

	Art	Language	Mathematics	Music	Physical Education	Reading	Science	Social Studies
Objectives were realistic and appropriate	3.89 ^a	4.36	4.48	3.75	4.45	4.02	4.60	4.27
Objectives were achieved	3.43 ^a	3.28	4.02	3.77	3.97	3.37	4.51	3.56
Out-of-class work load	2.64 ^b	2.50	2.92	2.95	2.74	3.69	3.09	2.65

^a Mean on the scale: "Completely" - 5
 "Mostly" - 4
 "In part" - 3
 "To a small extent" - 2
 "Not at all" - 1

^b Mean on the scale: "Far too demanding" - 5
 "A little too demanding" - 4
 "About right" - 3
 "Not quite enough" - 2
 "Far too little" - 1

concern over the lack of specific help in preparing lessons in these two areas. Some also saw the Music course as having been too short. Reading drew favourable comments about materials issued and the course coverage, and criticism centred around its theoretical nature, its emphasis on skills, the lack of a clear, perceived course structure, the lecture-based approach and the fact that the course did not run right through the year. The practical nature of the Science course, the enthusiasm of its Lecturers and the coverage of the syllabus the teaching methods were appreciated by Students, and no particular shortcomings came through strongly. In short, aspects of Graduate Syllabus Studies courses which were important to Students included a close relationship with classroom practice, practical learning sessions, course flexibility, help and practice in preparing lessons and units of study for children, and programmes which ran over a reasonably long period.

In April 1974, Graduates and a sample of ex-Three-year Course Students²⁴ were asked, as Year One Teachers, to judge the all-over value they had found so far in each College Syllabus Studies course as a preparation for teaching.²⁵ Four other curriculum areas were added for judgements also.²⁶ The results are shown in Table 26. All significant intergroup differences favoured the Three-year Course. The disparity for Reading is especially large, and it received the highest rating of the eight Syllabus Studies by one group, and the lowest by the other. This also ties in with the Graduates' feeling that the objectives for Reading had not been achieved.²⁷

²⁴ Sample previously described in Chapter III, Section 4.

²⁵ See Appendix H, Question C 1.

²⁶ Handwriting and Spelling are handled at College as part of Reading Syllabus Study, and Health Education and School Sport as part of Physical Education. Because it was judged that these may be seen separately by Year One Teachers, they were listed apart from the eight Syllabus Studies.

²⁷ See Table 25.

TABLE 26

Now that you have your class programme in the various curriculum areas under way, how successful do you feel your College course was in preparing you for this task ?

	Ex Graduate Course Students (n = 32)	Ex Three-year Course Students (n = 34)	F
Art	3.52 ^a	3.58	0.08
Language	2.88	3.45	4.79 [*]
Mathematics	3.47	3.48	0.01
Music	2.87	2.52	2.45
Physical Education	3.39	4.00	8.47 ^{**}
Reading	2.75	4.03	24.31 ^{**}
Science	3.61	3.32	1.21
Social Studies	2.84	3.09	0.82
Handwriting	2.13	2.18	0.05
Health Education	1.53	1.82	2.12
Spelling	2.59	2.06	5.04 [*]
Sport	2.06	2.44	2.00

^a Mean on the scale: "Of very much value" - 5
 "Of much value" - 4
 "Of some value" - 3
 "Of a little value" - 2
 "Of no value" - 1

* p < 0.05

** p < 0.01

(2) Foundation Studies in Education

Acknowledged by the College as an important component of the Graduate Programme, though one in which it has been found difficult to cater for widely varying backgrounds, the Education courses were presented to Graduate Students for comment at the end of 1973, and the results are shown in Table 27. The questions were open-ended,²⁸ and the answers assembled into three broad categories - those which generally praised the course, those which were critical, and answers which were indefinite. "The School in Society" was a short, nine-hour course, at the beginning of the year, and obviously many Students could not remember much about it. Praising and critical comments were evenly balanced and not particularly strong. "Mental Health and Classroom Climate" drew strong praise for the quality of its teaching, the relevance of its scope, the newness of its content to most Students, and the fact that it was spread out over nine weeks across two terms. "Studies of Children" was too short at five hours to succeed, and "How Children Learn", with its five two-hour weekly lectures taken by four different Lecturers (being thus very disjointed), fared worst in Student opinion. All Students' comments were supportive of the "Educating Exceptional Children" course. The visits and visiting speakers were popular, and the greater amount of time available to this course allowed for a deeper development of ideas. On a separate five-point scale,²⁹ over half of the group judged it "excellent", and another third "very good".

(3) Developing the Skills of Teaching

The College makes assumptions about its role in helping Students grow in the understandings and skills of teaching, but these are rarely stated in specific terms. Indeed, it is very difficult to define and measure such growth, yet six skills and understandings which seemed

²⁸ See Appendix E, Questions G 7 and G 8 (b).

²⁹ See Appendix E, Question G 8 (a).

TABLE 27

Comment on the relevance, strengths and shortcomings of the Education courses this year.

	Comments Generally Praising	Indefinite	Comments Generally Critical	Total
The School in Society	32.4 ^a	29.7	37.8	100.0
Mental Health and Classroom Climate	94.6	-	5.4	100.0
Studies of Children	21.6	13.5	64.9	100.0
How Children Learn	18.9	10.8	70.3	100.0
Educating Exceptional Children	100.0 ^b	-	-	100.0

^a Percentage of comments in this category.

^b This percentage is from a separate question which simply asked for any comment on the course.

important in this College were chosen from doubtless many possibilities, and Year One Teachers were asked to make a judgement of the College's role in their development in Students.³⁰ Table 28 shows the mean responses of two audiences - ex 1973 Graduate Course Students and a sample of ex Three-year Course Students.³¹ Generally, Year One Teachers regarded the College course as having been between "a little" and "some" value in helping them develop these skills and understandings. In only five cases were mean ratings greater than "of some value". On only two of the 12 criteria were intergroup differences significant. Graduates felt they had been helped at College in their understanding of children less than other teachers felt they had, which supports their earlier low opinion of the child development and learning courses.³² They also believed that

³⁰ See Appendix H, Question C 3.

³¹ Sample previously described in Chapter III, Section 4.

³² See Table 27.

TABLE 28

After your first term as a Year One Teacher, how successful do you now feel your total College course was in preparing you for the following aspects of teaching ?

	Ex Graduate Course Students (n = 32)	Ex Three-year Course Students (n = 34)	F
Understanding children of the age in your class	2.50 ^a	3.12	9.48**
Teaching skills (e.g. questioning)	2.91	3.53	9.06**
Techniques of control	2.78	2.88	0.11
Planning programmes of work	2.81	3.21	2.31
Use of audio-visual aids	3.31	2.88	1.05
Classroom management	2.61	2.55	0.54
Legal aspects of teaching	2.78	2.67	1.82
Provisions available for exceptional children	3.16	2.97	0.65
Advisory services available to teachers	2.84	2.88	0.03
Administration within a school	2.94	2.85	0.17
Administration of schools in New Zealand	2.52	2.29	1.18
Parent-teacher relationships	2.56	2.56	-

^a Mean on the scale: "Of very great value" - 5
 "Of much value" - 4
 "Of some value" - 3
 "Of a little value" - 2
 "Of no value" - 1

** p < 0.01

College had helped their own teaching skill development less than others felt it had, and perhaps this is related to their request for an increase in the time spent in schools during training (see Table 22).

(4) General

The same Year One Teachers were asked to indicate the single most valuable component of their College course,³³ and the responses to this open-ended question were assembled into four broad areas - School Postings, Syllabus Studies courses, Other Courses and General. The results are shown in Table 29. The impact of school postings on Students is generally recognised, and over a quarter of both Graduates and other Year One Teachers singled this out. Nearly two-thirds of ex Three-year Students chose a particular College course as having been most valuable, yet just under one-third of Graduates did. However, the major difference between the groups is the 20 per cent. of Graduates choosing "group atmosphere", whereas none of the Three-year group chose this category. This probably reflects the cohesiveness of the Graduate Group.

Finally, two questions were asked about the all-over standard of the College course.³⁴ In November, 1973, in response to a specific question on course quality, none of the Graduates judged all course components to have been "of a high quality", 24 per cent. said most were, 68 per cent. said some were, and the rest felt that "only very few parts were of good quality". After a term's teaching, Graduates and a sample of other Year One Teachers³⁵ were asked to rate the general challenge of their respective College programmes, and Table 30 shows the results. Both groups lean towards a belief that their College courses were not "full and demanding", but on the other issues both were rather uncertain

³³ See Appendix H, Question C 6.

³⁴ See Appendix E, Question G 1, and Appendix H, Question C 7.

³⁵ The same sample as for previous items (described in Chapter III, Section 4).

TABLE 29

What specific aspect or component of your College course stands out as having been the most valuable to you personally ?

	Ex Graduate Course Students (n = 31)	Ex Three-year Course Students (n = 35)
School Postings	15 27.8%	12 26.1%
Syllabus Studies Courses		
Art	2	1
Language	-	2
Mathematics	1	-
Music	-	1
Physical Education	1	1
Reading	1	6
Science	1	-
Social Studies	-	1
Spelling ^a	1	-
	13.0%	26.1%
Other Courses		
Curriculum Studies	-	1
Education	-	3
Human Relationships ^b	3	1
Micro-teaching	1	-
Selected Studies	-	7
Workshop Courses	5	5
	16.7%	37.0%
General		
Clubs and Students' Executive	-	2
General College Teaching	1	-
Group Atmosphere	11	-
Help from Tutor	7	1
Help from Other Staff	4	1
University Studies	-	1
	42.6%	10.9%
Total	54 ^c 100.0%	46 100.0%

^a Spelling was taught as part of Language Syllabus Study course.

^b Human Relationships refers to the "Mental Health and Classroom Climate" course.

^c Total number of responses for this group (many teachers gave two responses).

about aspects of general course organisation and the use they had made of the College resources. There were no significant intergroup differences, and this is consistent with other evidence presented in this study, which also suggests that Graduates and other Students are equally enamoured of or disenchanted with their respective College courses.³⁶

TABLE 30

In general, how do you rate your College course ?

	Ex Graduate Course Students (n = 32)	Ex Three-year Course Students (n = 34)	F
Was your course reasonably full and demanding?	2.50 ^a	2.68	0.41
Should you have had more scheduled time during which you were required to be at College?	3.44	3.29	0.24
Should you have been given more assignments or guidance for your out-of-college study?	3.06	3.21	0.24
Did you try to get the best out of courses and make the best use of College resources?	2.88	3.06	0.45

^a Mean on the scale: "Strongly yes" - 5
 "Probably yes" - 4
 "Uncertain" - 3
 "Probably no" - 2
 "Strongly no" - 1

³⁶ See, for example, Table 28.

4. STUDENTS AND COLLEGE STAFF

(1) The Role of the Course Tutors

The aims of seconding two Tutors to the Graduate Course in 1973 were to involve certain staff more closely with Students, to make for better programme unity and cohesiveness, and to highlight the professional growth of Students rather more than their academic background. Certainly, the greatest amount of staff - student interaction in this course was between Course Tutors and Students. Six audiences were asked at the end of the year to judge the effectiveness of the two-Tutor arrangement,³⁷ and the responses are in Table 31. All groups supported the

TABLE 31

For the first time, in 1973, two Course Tutors have been charged with the oversight of the Graduate Programme. Do you believe this arrangement has been a good one ?

	Scale	School Principals (n = 36)	Teachers (n = 83)	Lecturers (n = 44)	1st Year Students (n = 75)	3rd Year Students (n = 64)	Graduate Students (n = 37)
Strongly yes	5	17	36	16	3	7	31
Probably yes	4	13	31	19	39	27	5
Uncertain	3	5	12	6	20	18	1
Probably no	2	-	1	1	-	2	-
Strongly no	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
No response		1	3	2	13	10	-
Mean		4.34	4.27	4.19	3.72	3.72	4.81
						F =	16.87
						p <	0.01

³⁷ See Appendix D, Question A 7 (a). Audiences previously described in Chapter III, Section 4.

arrangement, but the degree of support varied appreciably. The Graduates believed significantly more strongly than all other groups that the arrangement had been a good one, and First- and Third-year Students together were significantly more uncertain about this than all other groups.³⁸ It is also to be noted that a higher proportion of First- and Third-year Students did not respond. Probably they knew least about the arrangement, whereas Principals and Teachers had all met the Tutors to discuss Students' progress, and Lecturers were also familiar with the Tutors' function. The Graduates themselves strongly approved of the Tutor system, reinforced elsewhere by 20 per cent. selecting "group atmosphere" built up over the year, and 13 per cent. specifically choosing the quality of Tutor help and support as the single most valuable component of the total course.³⁹

(2) Transactions with Specialist Lecturers

Attitudes of College Lecturers towards Graduate Students were sought in a brief questionnaire given in November, 1973, to which 44 responded. Forty Lecturers answered a question enquiring as to which type of Student they preferred to teach, Third-years or Graduates.⁴⁰ Fourteen expressed a preference for teaching Third-year Students, four expressed a preference for teaching the Graduates and 22 had no particular preference. A sign test was run on the 18 Lecturers who had expressed a preference for a particular group and $p < 0.05$ (two tailed).

Lecturers were also asked to judge the 1973 Graduate Group in terms of general attitude and achievement at College, compared with Three-year Students and Graduate Students of previous years.⁴¹ The answers are summarised in Table 32. In terms of attitude towards preparing themselves for teaching, 1973 Graduate Students were seen by Lecturers to have

³⁸ See Appendix J, Table 44 (j) for Newman-Keuls test of the differences in means.

³⁹ See Table 29.

⁴⁰ See Appendix F, Question D 5 (a).

⁴¹ See Appendix F, Questions D 3 and D 4.

TABLE 32

How does the Graduate Student this year compare with the other student groups named ?

	Compared First-year Students	Compared Second-year Students	Compared Third-year Students	Compared Previous Graduates	F
	No. Rp ^a Mean ^b	No. Rp Mean	No. Rp Mean	No. Rp Mean	
In terms of attitude towards preparation for teaching	23 4.00	22 3.73	25 3.08	25 4.24	6.84 ^{**}
In terms of achievement in your subject	18 3.83	19 3.37	20 2.50	19 3.79	8.00 ^{**}

^a Number of the 44 Lecturers replying to this item.

^{**} p < 0.01

^b Mean on the scale: "Much better" - 5
 "A little better" - 4
 "About the same" - 3
 "Not quite as good" - 2
 "Decidedly inferior" - 1

been about the same as Third-year Students, but significantly better than First- and Third-year Students and previous Graduate Groups.⁴² In terms of achievement in the Lecturers' subjects, Graduates were seen to be slightly below Third-year Students but significantly better when compared with the other three groups. The feeling that 1973 Graduates were better than Graduates of previous years on both criteria is interesting in that it reflects a measure of Lecturer support for the changed course organisation and structure that year. However, only approximately half of the Lecturers completing the questionnaire responded to this item, the main reasons being that 12 had not taught the 1973 Group and some others probably felt they had too little knowledge of groups to make meaningful comparisons.

⁴² See Appendix J, Tables 44 (k) and (l) for Newman-Keuls tests.

The finding that the College achievement of Graduate Students, as perceived by Lecturers, compared favourably with First- and Second-year Students, is generally repeated when a comparative analysis is made of actual final Student marks for all Syllabus Studies courses in 1973. These assessments are set out in Table 33.⁴³ From raw scores, all College course marks are translated to a stanine scale. Before stanines for Student groups are confirmed, however, they are "moderated" by the Chairmen of the Assessment Committee in discussion with the Lecturer in charge of the course, and the ratings may be adjusted in the light of any subjective judgements which are made. So it is here, as well as possibly at the earlier stage where the first raw marks are given by Lecturers (as some flexibility is allowed for in the distribution of Student numbers to each stanine rating), that subjective judgements may show Lecturer attitudes towards different Student groups. In Table 33, the Graduate Students rank fourth out of the five groups on mean stanine rating for Art, and they rank second for Mathematics. But for the other five subjects, they rank first. These do not show that Graduate Students were generally better than First- and Second-year Students, as the respective courses were not identical for one thing, but that Lecturers perceived them to be better.

5. SUMMARY

Both Graduate and Three-year Student groups regarded school postings as an important aspect of teacher training. The total duration of school postings should have been longer according to all Students' Groups, Lecturers, Teachers and Principals, and all other groups felt it should have been significantly more than the duration suggested by the Lecturers.

⁴³ Note that Physical Education is not included as Graduates were not given a stanine rating that year. Also note that Syllabus Studies courses are only taken by Three-year Course Students in their first two years.

TABLE 33

Final student assessments for Syllabus Studies courses at Christchurch Teachers' College, 1973

		Art	Language	Mathematics	Music	Reading	Science	Social Studies
Graduate Students:	n	37	37	38	37	37	37	37
	\bar{x}	4.97 ^a	6.49	5.35	5.86	6.11	6.03	5.95
	s	2.08	1.69	1.70	1.83	1.88	2.08	1.86
First-year Students, First Semester:	n	51	49	65	67	49	63	59
	\bar{x}	5.41	5.45	5.82	5.29	5.08	5.36	5.14
	s	1.94	2.00	2.09	1.91	2.04	1.99	1.88
First-year Students, Second Semester:	n	60	62	59	50	63	62	51
	\bar{x}	5.07	5.02	5.07	5.04	5.22	5.47	4.96
	s	2.05	1.93	2.16	2.01	2.33	2.10	1.93
Second-year Students, First Semester:	n	72	66	57	69	61	74	64
	\bar{x}	5.22	5.48	5.09	4.81	4.41	4.19	4.98
	s	2.04	2.03	1.98	2.27	2.30	2.45	1.95
Second-year Students, Second Semester:	n	59	62	73	69	79	42	56
	\bar{x}	4.85	4.98	5.09	5.01	5.03	5.12	5.09
	s	2.01	1.95	2.04	2.02	1.96	1.87	1.84

^a Mean on a stanine scale.

Source: Christchurch Teachers' College records.

However, only one-third of Graduates had felt accepted as professional colleagues in all schools, and only a half reported help and encouragement from all Associate Teachers. Graduates rated the help given by visiting Lecturers significantly higher than did Three-year Students. The Teachers hosting 1973 Graduates (a) expressed a preference for them over, and believed them to be better than, First-year Students, (b) expressed no preference between Graduates and Second-year Students, and saw Graduates as about the same or slightly better than Second-years, and (c) preferred Third-year Students, and saw Graduates to be about the same or slightly below them.

Within the College, three-quarters of Graduates would have accepted more scheduled weekly hours, two-thirds supported the balance between course structure and flexibility in 1973, and most felt that their personal requests had received attention. Only five Graduate Students joined more than one College organisation outside the course, and few believed such involvement was important anyway.

All Student Groups, Lecturers, Teachers and Principals believed that the Language, Mathematics and Social Studies courses should have been longer, and it was also generally felt that these three, plus Reading and sometimes Science, should be longer than the other Syllabus Studies courses. The stated objectives for the Syllabus Studies were seen by Graduates as mostly relevant, with Mathematics, Physical Education and Science achieving these to the greatest extent. But Graduates as Year One Teachers rated the value of the courses in Language, Physical Education and Reading significantly lower than did ex Three-year Course Students, with the discrepancy for Reading being particularly great.

Two Education courses received strong endorsement from Graduates, two were judged to have been unsuccessful and the fifth received a mixed reaction. The College's contribution towards the Student's understanding of children and his development of teaching skills was rated significantly more highly by Three-year Students than by Graduates.

The role of the Course Tutors was supported by all Student Groups, Lecturers, Teachers and Principals, but by Graduate Students significantly more so than by the rest, and by First- and Third-year Students significantly less so.

Lecturers believed Graduates to be better than First- and Second-year Students, and Graduate Students of previous years on general attitude towards their preparation for teaching, and the same as Third-year Students. In terms of achievement at College, Lecturers rated Graduates slightly below Third-year Students, but significantly higher when compared with First- and Second-years and Graduates of previous years. Finally, there was a significant tendency for College Lecturers to express a preference for teaching Third-year Students rather than Graduates.

CHAPTER VI

O U T C O M E S

1. STUDENTS' VIEW OF TEACHING

(1) Enjoyment of Teaching

After three months' teaching in their Year One positions, Students of the 1973 Graduate Course, together with a sample of Three-year Course Year One Teachers,¹ were asked to indicate whether teaching so far had been satisfying.² Their responses are summarised in Table 34.

TABLE 34

In general, have you enjoyed teaching so far ?

	Ex Graduate Course Students (n = 32)	Ex Three-year Course Students (n = 34)
All the time	6.3 ^a	41.2
Most of the time	62.5	55.9
Part of the time ^b	28.1	2.9
Seldom ^b	3.1	-
Never ^b	-	-
Total	100.0	100.0

^a Percentage choosing this category.

$$X^2 = 16.37$$

^b These three categories were pooled for the calculation of X^2 .

$$df = 2$$

$$p < .001$$

¹ Sample previously described in Chapter III, Section 4.

² See Appendix H, Question A 1 (a).

A chi-square test revealed that Graduates had enjoyed their teaching significantly less than other Teachers.

The same two Teacher groups were asked to give the most and least enjoyable aspect of teaching to them,³ and the responses to these open-ended questions were grouped and are shown in Table 35.

TABLE 35

What single things have you enjoyed most and least about teaching?

	Ex Graduate Course Students (n = 32)	Ex Three-year Course Students (n = 34)
Most Enjoyable:		
The children	70.6 ^a	67.6
Feelings of success	17.6	5.4
Professional freedom	5.9	16.2
Other	5.8	10.8
Total	100.0	100.0
Least Enjoyable:		
Extra pressures	42.4	62.5
Behaviour problems	36.4	9.4
Personal anxieties	12.1	9.4
Other	9.1	18.8
Total	100.0	100.0

^a Percentage choosing this category.

Some characteristic of their children (children's enthusiasm, spontaneity, varying personalities and their responses to the Teacher) was mentioned by just over two-thirds of both groups as the most enjoyable feature of teaching, and a chi-square test showed that the over-all intergroup difference was not significant.⁴ The pressures felt by

³ See Appendix H, Question A 1 (b) and (c).

⁴ $\chi^2 = 4.55$, $df = 3$, $p > .1$.

Teachers in trying to handle all the extra clerical and routine tasks over and above the great deal of programme planning required, was the area of teaching least enjoyed by both groups. Behaviour problems concerned more Graduates than other Teachers, and there is an all-over significant intergroup difference.⁵

(2) Expectations of Teaching

At this time too, the same Year One Teachers were asked whether teaching to date had been as they expected,⁶ and Table 36 shows the results. Three-quarters or more of both groups found teaching was

TABLE 36

Is teaching what you expected it to be ?

	Ex Graduate Course Students (n = 32)	Ex Three-year Course Students (n = 34)
Totally	3.1 ^a	14.7
Largely	71.9	70.6
Partly ^b	25.0	8.8
To a small extent ^b	-	-
Not at all ^b	-	5.9
Total	100.0	100.0

^a Percentage choosing this category.

$$X^2 = 3.31$$

^b These categories were pooled for the calculation of X^2 .

$$df = 2$$

$$p > .1$$

⁵ $X^2 = 7.95$, $df = 3$, $p < .05$. N.B. This and the previous calculation of X^2 involved too many expected frequencies less than 5; however no meaningful pooling of categories was possible and the results must be treated circumspectly.

⁶ See Appendix H, Question A 2.

"largely" or "totally" as expected, and the difference between groups was not significant.

Four broad areas in which teaching differed from expectations stood out from comments Year One Teachers were also asked to make. About one-third of each group felt teaching was more demanding in terms of the extra-curricular tasks they had been called on to do, others found it more rewarding (Graduates 17 per cent., others 14 per cent.), a few had received less help from Senior Teachers than expected (Graduates 10 per cent., others 5 per cent.), and 13 per cent. of Graduates mentioned greater control problems (none of the other Teachers mentioned this). Other comments ranged widely.

(3) Future in Teaching

Antecedent data reported earlier included a set of Student responses indicating their degree of confidence over the choice of teaching as a career.⁷ As any indicator of Year One Teachers', as well as Students', commitment to teaching was considered likely to be of value, the earlier question was repeated under "course outcomes".⁸ However, the scale was expanded to five points to give a little more refinement, and the results are given in Table 37. Graduates were significantly more likely to leave the field of education in the near future than were Three-year Course Year One Teachers.⁹ The likely reasons given by those contemplating leaving education were (a) overseas travel (Graduates 56 per cent., Three-year Students 43 per cent.), (b) "domestic reasons" (17 per cent. and 35 per cent.), (c) a change to another occupation (19 per cent. and 5 per cent.) and (d) further full-time study (8 per

⁷ See Table 11.

⁸ See Appendix H, Question A 3.

⁹ Note that, whereas the earlier question (the results of which are summarized in Table 11) referred to the Students' future in teaching, this question referred to their future in the wider field of education. It has been reported earlier that many Graduates looked towards Specialised fields within education (see Table 18).

TABLE 37

How sure are you at this stage about your choice of a career in education ?

	Scale	Ex Graduate Course Students (n = 32)	Ex Three-year Course Students (n = 34)
Shall definitely not change from the field of education in the near future	5	4	17
Unlikely to change in the near future	4	14	10
May possibly change in the near future	3	5	6
Shall probably change in the near future	2	7	-
Definitely intend to change in the near future	1	2	1
Mean		3.34	4.24

F = 11.80

p < 0.01

cent. and 11 per cent.). Five per cent. of Three-year Course Students indicated a likely change to a non-teaching branch of education (even though likely movement within the field of education was not asked for).

Care, however, must be taken in generalizing from these results. They do not show what actually transpired, nor do they show the likely or actual return rate of teachers to education after, for example, overseas travel. These are seen as useful areas for further research.

2. STUDENTS' VIEW OF THEMSELVES AS TEACHERS

(1) Relationships With Children

The same Year One Teachers were asked to judge their own relationships with children over the first term of teaching,¹⁰ and the responses are shown in Table 38. Ex Graduate Course Students differed significantly

¹⁰ See Appendix H, Questions B 4 and B 5.

TABLE 33

Do you feel that you get on well with your class and with other children in the school ?

	Ex Graduate Course Students (n = 32)	Ex Three-year Course Students (n = 34)	F
Current relationships with children good	4.25 ^a	4.50	3.22
Have experienced major control problems	3.03	2.68	0.87
Still concerned about control problems	2.34	1.74	7.26 ^{**}

^a Mean on the scale: "Strongly yes" - 5
 "Probably yes" - 4
 "Uncertain" - 3
 "Probably no" - 2
 "Strongly no" - 1

^{**} p < 0.01

from other Year One Teachers only in the concern still felt about control problems, the latter group being more emphatic that such concern no longer existed. This is in line with the earlier finding that behaviour problems were cited by more Graduates as the least enjoyed aspect of teaching (Table 35), and that 13 per cent. of Graduates mentioned greater control problems than expected, whereas this was not mentioned by any other Year One Teacher.

(2) Class Level Preferences

Class level preferences of Year One Teachers were also sought, and these are compared in Table 39 with their current class, and with the class level they had desired at the end of their College course.¹¹ Of special interest here is that, whereas there is a very close correlation on inspection between the proportions of Three-year Students desiring each level for their Year One positions and the levels actually received, there was a tendency to place more Graduates in the intermediate school level and lower

¹¹ See Appendix H, introductory data and Question A 4.

TABLE 39

What class level did you hope for at the end of last year, what class have you got and, at this stage, which class level would you choose for next year ?

	Pre-school	Infants	Lower Standards	Middle Standards	Intermediate	Secondary	Adult	Total
Year One position desired while at College:								
Ex Graduate Students (n = 34 ^a)	-	20.6 ^b	20.6	44.1	14.7	-	-	100.0
Ex Three-year Students (n = 42)	-	40.5	28.6	26.2	4.8	-	-	100.0
Total	-	31.6	25.0	34.2	9.2	-	-	100.0
Year One position received:								
Ex Graduate Students (n = 40)	-	15.0	30.0	27.5	27.5	-	-	100.0
Ex Three-year Students (n = 38)	-	44.3	26.3	23.7	5.3	-	-	100.0
Total	-	29.5	28.2	25.6	16.7	-	-	100.0
Desired position for next year:								
Ex Graduate Students (n = 39)	-	15.4	17.9	33.3	23.1	7.7	2.6	100.0
Ex Three-year Students (n = 52)	1.9	32.7	26.9	26.9	11.5	-	-	100.0
Total	1.1	25.3	22.1	29.7	16.5	3.3	1.1	100.0

^a Number represents the class levels mentioned, not, in this table, the number of teachers responding to the item (viz. a composite class group is entered under each separate class level).

^b Percentage in this category.

standards than desired these positions. An assumption was probably made by authorities that Graduates should be placed in Intermediate Schools where their specialist qualifications may be better used. Or it may simply have been expedient to channel Graduates into areas of the school for which there were fewer applicants. It is difficult to understand why so many of the Graduates were placed in lower standards against their wishes. Whatever the reason, it could be a bad start for a young teacher to find himself teaching at a level other than that for which he has been preparing and feels comfortable in. Also, there is a possible inherent conflict situation here between the teacher and the school.

About half of the Graduates placed in the lower standards did not intend to remain teaching at this level, and this, in conjunction with the 10 per cent. of Graduates who intended to teach at a secondary or adult level, represents the biggest expected change. It is interesting to speculate whether the concern with control of some of the Graduates and their relatively less enjoyment of teaching was associated with this "misplacement".

(3) Curriculum Areas of Confidence and Concern

Year One Teachers' attitudes towards various areas of the curriculum were sought through a set of open-ended questions which asked for areas of felt confidence and concern, together with the reasons.¹² For each item Teachers were able to nominate one or more subject areas, and the responses are shown in Table 40. The areas of confidence most mentioned were Language, Mathematics, Physical Education, Reading, Science and Social Studies. On inspection, more Graduates were confident in Mathematics, and less in Reading and Physical Education, than Three-year Course Teachers. Mathematics and Reading were the subjects causing greatest concern across both groups, with Music and Social Studies also concern-

¹² See Appendix H, Questions B 1 and B 2.

TABLE 40

Which subject, or area of the curriculum, (a) have you felt most confident in and (b) has caused you most concern so far ?

	Art	Language	Mathematics	Music	Physical Education	Reading	Science	Social Studies	Developmental Programmes	Handwriting	Health Education	Spelling	None	Total
Area of Greatest Confidence:														
Graduate Students (n = 33 ^a)	-	2 ^b	18	3	3	18	9	15	-	6	-	-	3	100
Three-year Students (n = 41)	2	15	7	7	10	37	7	15	-	-	-	-	-	100
Area Also Confident:														
Graduate Students (n = 60)	12	8	12	8	10	5	12	17	-	7	3	7	-	100
Three-year Students (n = 74)	12	18	10	1	14	7	12	19	1	4	1	1	-	100
Total Areas of Confidence:														
Graduate Students (n = 93)	8	14	14	7	8	10	11	16	-	7	2	4	1	100
Three-year Students (n = 115)	9	17	9	4	12	17	10	17	1	3	1	1	-	100
Total (n = 208)	8	15	11	5	10	14	11	17	1	4	1	2	1	100
Area of Greatest Concern:														
Graduate Students (n = 35)	-	3	26	-	6	34	9	17	3	-	3	-	-	100
Three-year Students (n = 33)	-	-	49	18	-	21	3	3	-	-	3	3	-	100
Area Also of Concern:														
Graduate Students (n = 34)	3	9	9	21	6	18	6	18	-	-	3	9	-	100
Three-year Students (n = 22)	5	9	18	9	5	23	18	5	5	-	-	5	-	100
Total Areas of Concern:														
Graduate Students (n = 69)	1	6	17	10	6	26	7	17	1	-	3	4	-	100
Three-year Students (n = 55)	2	4	36	15	2	22	9	4	2	-	2	4	-	100
Total (n = 124)	2	5	26	12	4	24	8	11	2	-	2	4	-	100

^a Number of subject areas mentioned by this group.

^b Percentage in this category.

ing a number of teachers. But Mathematics concerned less Graduates,¹³ Social Studies concerned more, and Reading concerned more Graduates than Three-year Course Teachers taking only the "Area of Greatest Concern".

Students gave a wide variety of reasons for their feelings of confidence in the various subjects, and these were grouped under four broad headings - the student's own background; the contribution made by the College course; special features of subjects themselves; and the organisation within the school which had been found supportive. The reasons are set out in Table 41. It is of special interest to note that only 4.2 per cent. of Graduates cited their degree subjects as a source of confidence, and that there was no difference between groups in the proportions mentioning their own interest and knowledge. When these findings are coupled with the fact that only 6.7 per cent. of Three-year Course Teachers believed that they drew strength from College Selected Studies, the question follows whether Teachers' College Lecturers and others over-rate the relationship between the student's own field of higher education and his area of teaching strength. This as a potentially useful area of research has been mentioned in Chapter IV, and relates to the very low proportion of Graduates looking forward on College entry to using their subject strengths in the classroom.¹⁴ A very similar proportion of both groups drew strength from special features of particular subjects, but only half as many Graduates as Three-year Course Teachers mentioned College courses, and twice as many Graduates mentioned factors from within their school.

¹³ Graduate Students were shown to be better at Mathematics than Three-year Course Students on entry to College (mean 5.76 versus a standardised mean of 5.00 on a stanine scale), which is probably the reason for their feelings of greater confidence, and feelings of less concern in this subject.

¹⁴ See Table 14.

TABLE 41

Give reasons for your feelings of confidence in teaching the subjects or areas of the curriculum you have mentioned.

	Ex Graduate Course Students (n = 48 ^a)	Ex Three-year Course Students (n = 45)	Total
Student's Own Background:			
Own interest and knowledge	37.5 ^b	37.8	37.6
Degree subjects	4.2	-	2.1
Total background	41.7	37.8	39.8
College Courses:			
General college programme	6.3	11.1	8.6
School postings	4.2	4.4	4.3
Selected Studies	-	6.7	3.2
Total college courses	10.5	22.2	16.1
Special Features of the Subject:			
Children naturally interested	4.2	11.1	7.5
Good results seen	12.5	11.1	11.8
Scope for activities and direct experiences	2.1	2.2	2.2
Structured nature of programme	6.3	2.2	4.3
Clarity of needs and objectives	-	2.2	1.1
Total subject	25.1	28.8	26.9
Organisation Within the School:			
Ample resource materials	8.3	4.4	6.5
Help from other teachers	6.3	2.2	4.3
Time spent in planning and preparation	8.3	2.2	5.4
Small class	-	2.2	1.1
Total school	22.9	11.0	17.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

^a Number of reasons expressed.

^b Percentage in this category.

The same Year One Teachers were asked after one term's teaching to indicate the area of in-service training they would most appreciate,¹⁵ and the responses were grouped, as shown in Table 42, into the eight College Syllabus Studies areas, and all other areas of assistance desired. Once again, Mathematics and Reading are the areas the greatest proportion of both groups wanted help in, a fact specially noticeable on first choices of in-service course. Music and Social Studies are the next in frequency. The main group difference is that twice as many Graduates express a need for help in Social Studies, which again reflects the shortness and inadequacy of the College course in this subject.¹⁶

(4) Students' Own College Course

Graduates and Three-year Course Teachers were further asked after three months' teaching to judge in retrospect the length their respective College courses should have been.¹⁷ Three per cent. of Graduates said under one year; 71 per cent. said one year; 13 per cent. said $1\frac{1}{2}$ years; and another 13 per cent. said two years. This generally reinforces the time they actually spent at College,¹⁸ although over a quarter of the teachers felt that they needed more than one year. Forty-four per cent. of the Three-year group chose two years, another 44 per cent. chose three years, with most of the rest in between at $2\frac{1}{2}$ years.

¹⁵ See Appendix H, Question B 3.

¹⁶ See Table 24.

¹⁷ See Appendix H, Question B 6.

¹⁸ Note that of this 1973 Graduate Group, approximately 75 per cent. spent one year at College, whereas 25 per cent. (the university studenthip holders) completed a two-year course.

TABLE 42

Should you have the chance to attend an in-service course right now, what aspect of teaching would you most like some help in ?

	Ex Graduate Students (n = 30)				Ex Three-year Students (n = 35)				Total
	1st Choice	2nd Choice	3rd Choice	Total	1st Choice	2nd Choice	3rd Choice	Total	
Art	-	7 ^a	-	2	-	-	9	2	2
Language	7	7	13	9	9	4	5	6	8
Mathematics	23	17	7	16	37	12	5	21	18
Music	3	10	17	10	6	15	32	16	13
Physical Education	7	4	3	5	-	-	9	2	4
Reading	37	14	10	20	26	12	14	18	19
Science	-	10	7	6	-	15	14	8	7
Social Studies	10	17	17	15	3	15	5	7	11
Audio-visual Aids	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	1	1
Classroom Organisation	-	-	3	1	3	-	-	1	1
Control Methods	10	-	-	3	-	4	-	1	2
Developmental	-	4	7	3	6	4	9	6	5
Evaluation	-	4	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
Exceptional Children	-	-	-	-	6	4	-	4	2
Health Education	-	-	3	1	-	4	-	1	1
Meeting Other Year One Teachers	-	4	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
Meeting Parents	-	-	3	1	-	-	-	-	1
Planning Programmes	3	4	-	2	-	4	-	1	2
Questioning Skills	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	1	1
Spelling	-	-	10	3	-	8	-	2	3
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

^a Percentage in this category.

3. SCHOOL PRINCIPALS' VIEW OF THE STUDENTS

School Principals from throughout New Zealand who had 1973 Graduate Course Students on their staffs as Year One Teachers, were asked in May, 1974, to compare these teachers with other Year Ones.¹⁹ The criteria used were the same as those given to Associate Teachers in the previous year,²⁰ and the same five-point scale was used. The responses show that most Principals tended to see Graduates as about the same or better than other Year One Teachers in all criteria (see Table 43). This outcome is important. It reflects attitudes by Principals of acceptance of Graduates, and even though some Principals mentioned their reservations about this form of teacher education when requested to comment,²¹ it probably also shows a measure of acceptance of the course itself. The wide-ranging comments of Principals included mention of the high calibre, maturity and perception of their Graduate, but some perceived a lack of confidence, planning difficulties and a lack of background in some subject areas. Only two specifically said the course should have been longer.

Further research is needed here to tap attitudes of other teacher groups, and to actually assess the teaching effectiveness of Graduate Course Students alongside others in their Year One teaching position and beyond.

4. COLLEGE PRINCIPAL'S AND TUTORS' VIEW OF THE COURSE

(1) The College Principal

In February, 1975, after the 1973 Graduate Students had completed their first year of teaching, the Principal of Christchurch Teachers' College was asked to make a judgement on the Graduate Course for primary

¹⁹ See Appendix I.

²⁰ See Table 21.

²¹ See Appendix I.

TABLE 43

Compared with most Three-year Course Year One Teachers of your experience, how does your ex Graduate Course Year One Teacher(s) rate on the following criteria ?

	Much Better ^a	A Little Better	About the Same	Not Quite as Good	Decidedly Inferior	Mean
Enthusiasm for teaching	7 ^b	9	13	2	-	3.68
Initiative	9	12	7	3	1	3.78
Personal qualities	6	10	14	3	-	3.58
General helpfulness and co-operation	7	9	13	3	1	3.55
Response to advice	7	13	8	3	2	3.61
Ability to talk and mix with children	7	5	15	5	1	3.36
Warmth and encouragement towards children	9	4	14	5	1	3.45
Understanding children's needs	7	12	7	5	2	3.52
Classroom control	6	7	11	5	4	3.18
Quality of planning and preparation	9	5	9	8	2	3.33
Originality in planning	3	13	11	4	2	3.33
Setting of realistic and specific objectives	3	10	14	3	3	3.21
Flexibility in evaluating and modifying the plan	6	8	2	3	4	3.27
Use of blackboard and other aids	4	5	17	6	-	3.22

^a "Much better" is regarded as 5 on a five-point scale.

^b Number of responses in this category.

teachers. Taken at this stage, the statement was regarded as a course "outcome", on the assumption that what was said would have been influenced by the results of the 1973 course and its students.

The Principal spoke of the earlier administrative problems with the Graduate Course, and of recent improvements resulting from better selection procedures and greater understanding of Graduates' needs.²² He identified Graduate strengths in their "academic potential", their ability to work independently to great effect, their social consciousness and their desire "to question statements of doubtful validity". However, Graduates were seen to have difficulties in establishing relationships, and to reveal an "inflexibility in thinking", a superiority in attitude, and a reluctance to depart from formal classroom procedures. Finally, he expressed his doubt that one year of professional preparation was long enough for students to make necessary adjustments and prepare themselves adequately for teaching, and a hope that either a concurrent or partially concurrent B.Ed. system would develop in the future.

(2) The Course Tutors

Early in this study it was decided to avoid judgements by the two Course Tutors, as the writer's position as one of them was seen to be too close, and evaluation, therefore, likely to be too subjective. However, as the exercise was designed to obtain judgements from as many involved in the course (directly or indirectly) as possible,²³ it was felt later that a gap would be left if those most closely involved with the Graduate Course were not drawn upon. Accordingly, the Graduate Course Report to the Principal, of December, 1974, is included as an appendix to this study,²⁴ on the basis that it was written by the Course Tutors very much with the over-all assessment of the Graduate Course in mind. Although

²² The full statement from the Principal is included as Appendix K.

²³ See Chapter III, Section 1.

²⁴ See Appendix L.

it is a report on the 1974 course, it may also be regarded here as a 1973 course "outcome", as the experiences gained from the 1973 course, together with the knowledge of the progress of Graduates as Year One Teachers in 1974, form an important backdrop to it. Moreover, the report looked ahead, for the first time, towards desirable course changes as seen by the two Tutors.

A number of significant aspects of the course seem to emerge from the Tutors' report. First, they sound a note of optimism regarding the Graduate Course, and express satisfaction with the quality of its students. They mention the additional selection procedures²⁵ as having been helpful, and of special interest is their suggestion that (a) College teaching staff were becoming increasingly committed to the course, and (b) that their own role with the group was a vital one, both making for better group "tone".²⁶

However, some concern was expressed over students' school postings. There were too few good Associate Teachers available, and Graduates could not afford to have even one posting where strong support and encouragement was lacking.²⁷ The Tutors were also concerned that Graduates had to apply for their Year One class levels after only two school postings. It is possible that some Graduates altered their minds after their final posting, which would account for some of the "misplacements" reported earlier.²⁸

Third, and closely related, was the felt need that, throughout the programme, theory be viewed through practice, and that schools be brought in much more as a partner in teacher education. The "pressing need for

²⁵ See Chapter IV, Section 2 (3).

²⁶ Graduates too felt "group atmosphere" had been important at College (see Table 29).

²⁷ Students too had been concerned about this (see Chapter V, Section 1 (1)).

²⁸ See Table 39.

continuing involvement" of the College with young teachers was a fourth aspect, together with the likely value of earlier contact with new students before the College year begins. Finally, a need is expressed for the appointment of a co-ordinator for all shortened courses for primary teachers and for the programme of college students on university studentships.

5. SUMMARY

There had been an apparent tendency to place Graduates in class levels other than those they desired for 1974, but this was not so with Three-year Course Students. Graduates had enjoyed their first three months' teaching significantly less than other Year Ones, but there was no significant difference between groups on whether or not teaching had been as expected. Graduates were significantly more likely to leave education in the near future. Possibly the "misplacement" had created some problems of adjustment for the Graduate Students.

The length of College course the Graduates had undertaken was generally supported, although a quarter of Graduates felt they needed more than one year of preparation. More Graduates than other Year One Teachers were confident in teaching Mathematics (though many felt they needed further help), but less were confident in Reading, Physical Education, Social Studies and Music. More Graduates than other Year Ones were still concerned over behaviour problems in children after a term's teaching.

The College Principal saw Graduates to be strong in the academic and social-consciousness fields, but believed many of them to be somewhat inflexible, superior, formal in teaching and to have some difficulty in establishing relationships. He had doubts that a one-year College course was long enough, and had some reservations about a one-year end-on course, expressing the hope that some form of professional training concurrent with academic studies will be developed in the future. The

Course Tutors expressed satisfaction over the quality of Graduate Students and felt optimistic towards this alternative form of teacher education. However, they expressed concern over the lack of good Associate Teachers available, and the fact that Graduates chose Year One class levels after too little experience. They stressed the importance of the practical nature of the course, the role of the school in the training programme and the need for an earlier association and continuing contact with Students after the year at College.

Despite some of the qualms that both the College Tutors and the College Principal had about the course, most of the school Principals with whom the Graduates were placed as Year One Teachers, rated the Graduates as good as, or a little better than, most products of the normal three-year training course.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. CONCLUSIONS

This study presents evidence that the 1973 Graduate Group at the Primary Division of Christchurch Teachers' College had a number of special strengths. First, Graduates were rated significantly higher by the Selection Committee than were other incoming students, and the extra and special selection procedures for Graduates tended to support their high initial ratings. The academic background of Graduates is shown to have been particularly strong, and the College Principal also commented on this, together with their ability to question educational issues perceptively and their social consciousness. Teachers' College Lecturers believed them to be better in attitude and attainment than either First- or Second-year Students, and better than Graduates of previous years. Their high general quality was spoken of by their Course Tutors. Teachers with whom they were first posted preferred them to, and saw them to be better than, First-year Students, and these Teachers also mentioned their greater maturity and perception. Finally, their Year One School Principals rated Graduates as about the same or better than other Year One Teachers after three months' teaching. The question is therefore asked, why were only 29 of an allowed quota of 40 (excluding returning university studentship holders) accepted for the 1973 course, and why were so many obviously suitable candidates turned away when the number making application exceeded 70 ?

The answer to this question probably lies in the attitudes of suspicion regarding Graduates' motives, and the ambivalent position of College authorities and the Selection Committee regarding the need for highly qualified Teachers on one hand, and reservations about this form of teacher

education on the other. Questions have been raised over recent years, from within the College and from the Department of Education in Wellington, about the commitment of Graduates to primary teaching, and this study does show that the 1973 Graduates were significantly more uncertain about their future in teaching than were Three-year Course Students. But only a marginally greater number of Graduates cited as a reason for entering teaching that it offered a stepping stone into another career (see Table 9), and more Graduates than Three-year Students were looking towards specialist positions in education (Table 18).

Uncertainty also exists over the value of a university education for primary teachers. Non-graduate primary student and teacher groups seemed less convinced than Graduates, Principals and Teachers' College Lecturers of the place of university education in primary teaching, yet non-graduate Students believed that a degree played a more significant part in the promotion of primary teachers than did Graduate Students. Also, groups differed significantly in their support for end-on teacher education after a degree - Graduate Students and School Principals supported it more strongly than did First- and Third-year Students, with Teachers and Lecturers in between.

Regarding the One Year Course itself, further evidence presented here suggests that certain changes seem to be desirable, and that certain areas for further research are potentially fruitful. These are now identified.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

(1) The length of the Teachers' College course for university graduates should be varied for individual students.

Most Graduates, after three months' teaching, believed that one year at Teachers' College was long enough, but others felt a need for a longer period. The majority of School Principals, Teachers, Lecturers and Three-year Course Students believed that two years was the minimum time needed for adequate pre-service preparation, and the College Principal

expressed doubts that one year was long enough. To some extent the concern over behaviour problems, the relatively less enjoyment of teaching and the areas of curriculum concern of some Graduates, may have arisen because of the lack of previous classroom experience and lack of knowledge in some areas. Students vary, and it is suggested that the College course length be more flexible to allow for these variations. For some a year may be long enough, for others an additional term, two terms or a year may be beneficial.

(2) The two-year period before Graduate Course Students receive their Diploma in Teaching should be viewed as a single unit when the course is designed.

The Graduate Course Tutors expressed a desire that the College have continuing contact with students after their one-year college course, and they wished to extend their tutoring role into the students' first year of teaching. Graduates reported significantly more help in schools from lecturers (i.e. the Course Tutors) than did other students, and less enjoyment of teaching and more concern over behaviour problems and some areas of the curriculum than other Year One Teachers. They were also significantly more likely to leave teaching. For these reasons, and taken with the need to vary the College course length, it would be desirable to view the two-year period as a unit, instead of two quite separate and rather inflexible years as at present. For students to have a continuing association with staff over a longer period may avoid some of the Year One problems identified here, and it would allow for variations of the college-school postings pattern (for example, a student may spend two terms in college, followed by one term in a school, a further term in college and the final two terms in a school).

(3) More time should be allotted to school practice and care should be taken in the selection of Associate Teachers.

The total time spent in schools in 1973 should have been longer according to all student, lecturer, teacher and school principal groups asked. Moreover, all other groups felt the duration should have been

significantly longer than the time suggested by Teachers' College Lecturers. A more varied set of school experiences would also help allay the Course Tutors' concern over Graduates having to apply for Year One teaching positions with too little experience to draw upon.

Regarding the quality of school postings, only one third of Graduates had felt accepted as professional colleagues in all schools, and only a half reported help and encouragement from all Associate Teachers. The selection of Associates is a crucial area because a number of primary teachers in this study had reservations about the place of a university education in teacher training, and they also tended to believe that a degree gave unwarranted advantages in promotion. It would be unfortunate if a Graduate Student were placed with a teacher who had latent feelings of hostility towards a university education.

(4) The tutor-student-school link should be maintained.

Ambivalent attitudes towards those with degrees from some teachers are still to be expected. It is of importance, therefore, that those teachers' college lecturers who have a special commitment to the Graduates (viz. the Course Tutors) should develop and maintain a close working association with Associate Teachers. Moreover, the shortness of the school practice periods makes it essential to have a continuous link between the College and schools, which can only be maintained by the Tutors themselves visiting the students in schools and discussing their work with Associates and Principals. A more positive approach to the group and to the course may be expected to develop. In part, the favourable view of Graduates shown by the Normal School Teachers (see Tables 20 and 21) may have been due to the greater contact they had with college staff.

(5) The Year One classes given to Graduates should closely match the class levels they desire.

An inherent conflict between a young teacher and his school may exist if he finds himself in a class other than that for which he has prepared. Also, any problems relating to children, or in the handling of

the curriculum, are likely to be heightened.

(6) More time should be allotted to certain Syllabus Studies courses than others.

Language, Mathematics and Social Studies courses should be longer than they were in 1973, and these three, with Reading, should be given more time than the other Syllabus Studies courses. Also, for some reason, three of the courses had not fulfilled the needs of Graduate Year One Teachers as a preparation for teaching, whereas other Year One Teachers reported the same courses as having been of considerable value (see Table 26). Generally, the college lecturers were the same for both groups, so the difference is probably best explained in terms of differences in the courses. It is possible that the time allotted was too short, or that some other aspect of these courses was inappropriate.

(7) The Teachers' College and the primary teaching service need to clarify the place of a university education in teacher training.

All in all, this study presents evidence which suggest some ambivalence about the place of university education for primary teachers: (a) a significant proportion of Teachers' College Lecturers expressed a preference for teaching Three-year Course Students over Graduates; (b) over 13 per cent. of 44 Teachers' College Lecturers responding to the questionnaire said they were uncertain that a university education makes a better teacher, and another 9 per cent. in fact said it probably did not; (c) only 29 out of a possible 40 Graduates were accepted into the course; (d) the College Principal expressed uncertainty about the place of Graduates in primary teacher training; (e) Primary Teachers were uncertain about the value of a university education to them, and most felt that having a degree should not be a factor in promotion; and (f) the two Tutors have been seconded to the Graduate Course only on a year-by-year basis, implying a tentativeness in the College's approach to Graduate training. Moreover, when a Graduate with a Bachelor's degree leaves college, he receives over \$1,600 less at the top of the basic scale as a primary school teacher than his counterpart in a secondary school.

It would seem, therefore, that a clarification of the value of a university degree in primary teaching is overdue. Either it is desirable to have graduate primary teachers, or it is not. If it is, the College may need to approach the planning of its shortened course for university graduates with more commitment, and to recognise that there is a pool of graduates available who are potentially very able teachers and who can be placed in classrooms in a year's time. The alternatives are to rely, for their influence on the quality of primary teaching, on the small proportion of Three-year Course Students, who eventually graduate through concurrent, part-time and extra-mural study, or to develop a Bachelor of Education course for most students.

3. FURTHER RESEARCH

Finally, certain aspects of the One-year Graduate Course at Christchurch Teachers' College have been identified in this study as being worthy of further research. These include (a) a further examination of the attitudes of various teaching groups towards Graduates and the One-year Course; (b) the assessment of actual teaching success of Graduates compared with Three-year Course Teachers in their first year of teaching and beyond; (c) continuing evaluation of the criteria used in Graduate selection and the procedures adopted; (d) studies which assess the relationship, if any, between degree subjects passed and the subsequent teaching strengths and interests of Graduates; and (e) continuing studies which follow-up the numbers of Graduates and others leaving teaching, when they leave, their reasons for leaving and the likely and actual numbers subsequently returning to teaching.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Acknowledgement is made of the ready co-operation received from all students, teachers, school principals and teachers' college lecturers whose views were sought, and a special word of thanks goes for the patience and help of students in the 1973 Graduate Course on whom this study relied so heavily. To Dr J.F. Mann, Principal of Christchurch Teachers' College, I express my thanks for his support throughout, and to Mr B.F. Tuck, of the University of Canterbury, goes my special appreciation for his valued advice and help in data interpretation.

R E F E R E N C E S

- Alkin, M.C. Evaluation Theory Development, Evaluation Comment, 2, 1969.
- Alkin, M.C. Evaluating the Cost-Effectiveness of Instructional Programs. In Wittrock, M.G. and Wiley, D.E. (eds) The Evaluation of Instruction : Issues and Problems, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970, pp. 221 - 238.
- Alkin, M.C. Evaluation Theory Development. In Worthen, B.R. and Sanders, J.R. Educational Evaluation : Theory and Practice, Worthington, Ohio, Charles A. Jones Publishing Co., 1973, pp. 150 - 155.
- Astin, A.W. and Panos, R.J. The Evaluation of Educational Programs. In Thorndike, R.L. Educational Measurement, 2nd ed., Washington, American Council on Education, 1971.
- Christchurch Teachers' College, Primary Division: One Year Graduate Course, Christchurch, 1970 (mimeographed).
- Christchurch Teachers' College, Primary Division Calendar, Christchurch, 1971.
- Cronbach, L.J. Course Improvement Through Evaluation. Teachers' College Record, 64, 8, 1963, pp. 672 - 683.
- Hammond, R.L. Evaluation at the Local Level. In Worthen, B.R. and Sanders, J.R. Educational Evaluation: Theory and Practice, Worthington, Ohio, Charles A. Jones Publishing Co., 1973, pp. 157 - 169.
- Herbison, J.M. Selection of Candidates for 1973. In Associate Teacher Newsletter, Christchurch Teachers' College, 2, 2, 1973, p. 1.
- Lindvall, G.M. and Cox, R.C. Evaluation as a Tool in Curriculum Development: The IPI Evaluation Program, A.E.R.A. Monograph No. 5, Chicago, Rand McNally, 1970.
- Maguire, T.O. Decisions and Curriculum Objectives: A Methodology for Evaluation. The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 15, 1, 1969, pp. 17 - 30.
- Mann, J.F. Teachers' College Selection Not Hit-or-Miss Procedure. National Education, September 1974, pp. 173 - 174.
- Messick, S. The Criterion Problem in the Evaluation of Instruction: Assessing Possible, Not Just Intended, Outcomes. In Willrock, M.C. and Wiley, D.E. (eds). The Evaluation of Instruction: Issues and Problems, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970, pp. 183 - 202.
- Metfessel, N.S. and Michael, W.B. A Paradigm Involving Multiple Criterion Measures for the Evaluation of the Effectiveness of School Programs. In Worthen, B.R. and Sanders, J.R. Educational Evaluation: Theory and Practice, Worthington, Ohio, Charles A. Jones Publishing Co., 1973, pp. 269 - 279.

Nuthall, G.A. Research Note: Sex Differences in Rating the Occupational Status of Teaching. N.Z. Journal of Educational Studies, 4, 2, 1969, pp. 170-176.

Report on Londell House National Half Course, on the One Year Course for Graduates and Near Graduates, November 1970 (mimeographed).

Provas, M. Evaluation of Ongoing Programs in the Public School System. In Worthen, B.R. and Sanders, J.R. Educational Evaluation: Theory and Practice, Worthington, Ohio, Charles A. Jones Publishing Co., 1973, pp. 170-207.

Scriven, M. The Methodology of Evaluation, Social Science Education Consortium, Publication No. 110, 1966.

Smith, E.R. and Tyler, R.W. Appraising and Recording Student Progress, New York, Harper and Row, 1942.

Stake, R.E. The New Countenance on Educational Evaluation, September 1965, (Draft copy. Mimeographed).

Stake, R.E. The Countenance of Educational Evaluation. Teachers' College Record, 68, 7, 1967, pp. 523-540.

Stake, R.E. Evaluation Design, Instrumentation, Data Collection, and Analysis of Data. In Worthen, B.R. and Sanders, J.R., Educational Evaluation: Theory and Practice, Worthington, Ohio, Charles A. Jones Publishing Co., 1973, pp. 303 - 316.

Stufflebeam, D.L. et al. Educational Evaluation and Decision Making, Itasca, Illinois, F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1971.

Wilkie, D.B. Proposed Graduate Group Course, 1973. A report to the Primary Division Principal, Christchurch Teachers' College, December 1972 (mimeographed).

Wormer, F.B. What is National Assessment? Ann Arbor, Michigan, National Assessment of Educational Progress, 1970.

Worthen, B.R. and Sanders, J.R. Educational Evaluation: Theory and Practice, Worthington, Ohio, Charles A. Jones Publishing Co., 1973.

Year One Teacher Survey: Report to the Board of Studies, Christchurch Teachers' College, July 1971 (mimeographed).

5. All other things being equal, who would you prefer to be posted to your class - a student from the Graduate Group ?
 a First-year Student ?
 or, you have no preference at all.

6. (a) How do you think the Graduate Student(s) now with you compares with most First-year Students on their first posting ?

	Much better	A little better	About the same	Not quite as good	Decidedly inferior
Enthusiasm for teaching					
Initiative					
Personal qualities (voice, bearing, manner)					
General helpfulness and co-operation					
Response to advice you give					
Ability to talk and mix with children					
Warmth towards and encouragement of children					
Understanding of individual needs of children					
Classroom control					
General quality of planning and preparation					
Originality in planning					
Setting of realistic and specific objectives					
Flexibility in evaluating and modifying the plan					
Use of the blackboard and other aids					

- (b) Write down any other differences you see between your Graduate Student(s) and most First-year Students on their first posting.

Your name:

APPENDIX B

FIRST STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE, APRIL 1973

ALL THIS INFORMATION WILL BE
KEPT STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL

Tick

Sex	M	
	F	

College Year	First Year	
	Third Year	
	Graduate Group a	
	Graduate Group B	

- Instructions: 1. Answer all questions. Where your answer is a nil one, write "NIL".
2. When asked to "rank", do so by writing "1", "2", etc. alongside.

A1. Prior to entering Teachers' College, what types of employment have you had ?

- | | <u>Position</u> | <u>Duration</u> |
|-------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|
| (i) | Part-time work while at school. | |
| (ii) | Vacation work while at school. | |
| (iii) | Part-time work while at University. | |
| (iv) | Vacation work while at University. | |
| (v) | Other part-time work. | |
| (vi) | Other full-time work. | |

A2. Since leaving school, what courses of study have you completed (other than at Teachers' College) ?

Duration

- (i) Full-time University study.
- (ii) Part-time University study (include units completed while at Teachers' College).
- (iii) Full-time study at some other institution.
(Institution: _____)
- (iv) Part-time study at some other institution.
(Institution: _____)

A3. As far as you can remember, when did you decide on a teaching career ?

Tick one

- During your primary school years.
- During your third or fourth form years.
- During your fifth form year.
- During your sixth form year.
- During your seventh form year.
- During a subsequent year.
(Stipulate the year: _____)

A4. (a) What were your main reasons for choosing a teaching career ?
(Place an "X" beside any statement not seriously considered.
Rank the others in order of importance.)

- You enjoyed working with children..
- Teachers' salaries appeared good.
- The long vacations were an attraction.
- Teachers appeared to have a reasonably high standing in the eyes of the public.
- With your type of academic qualifications, there appeared to be few other alternatives.
- You were attracted by the job variety offered within a teaching position.
- You were talked into teaching by a friend or relative.
- Your close friend was going teaching.
- Teaching offered a possible stepping stone for the type of position you would really like.

(b) Write down any other reasons.

A8. Write down all the alternative careers you seriously considered at the time of applying for College.

- (i)
- (ii)
- (iii)
- (iv)

A9. (a) From where did you get information about teacher training ?

Tick one
or more

University	<input type="checkbox"/>
Education Board	<input type="checkbox"/>
Recruitment Officer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Newspapers	<input type="checkbox"/>
Radio	<input type="checkbox"/>
Television	<input type="checkbox"/>
Teachers' College	<input type="checkbox"/>
Friends	<input type="checkbox"/>
(Other:)	<input type="checkbox"/>

(b) To what extent did information thus obtained give you a true picture ?

Tick one

Completely correct	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mostly correct	<input type="checkbox"/>
About half correct	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not very correct	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not correct - misleading	<input type="checkbox"/>
Did not contain any correct facts at all	<input type="checkbox"/>

(c) Which aspects, if any, were misleading or insufficient ?

A10. Name any close relative(s) or family friend(s) who has been a teacher.

- A11. (a) What sort of comments had you heard about the Primary Division of Teachers' college before applying for entry ?

Comments

By Whom

(i)

(ii)

(iii)

(iv)

- (b) To what extent, so far, have you found these comments to be true ? (One tick for each line)

	Always True	Often True	Sometimes True	Seldom True	Never True
Comment (i)					
Comment (ii)					
Comment (iii)					
Comment (iv)					

- A12. (a) What specific strengths and shortcomings have you found in the College courses so far this year? For any course undertaken by you, tick the most appropriate remark.

	All aspects of great value to you	Most aspects useful	About half was of use	Few aspects were useful	A complete waste of time
Education Course					
Mathematics					
Social Studies					
Language					
Physical Education					
Maori Studies					
School Posting					

- (b) Write down any other comments about your College course so far this year.

A13. So far this year, have the College courses in general provided you with enough ..

	Too much	About the right amount	Not enough
Lecturing?			
Group discussion?			
Individual help in subject matter?			
Personal assistance from your College Tutor?			
Written assignments?			
Contact with children?			
Work?			

(One tick in each line)

A14. If you were given the following choices on College entry, which type of College group would you prefer to work as a member of ?

- A group put together quite arbitrarily (e.g. alphabetically by surnames).
- A group which, as far as possible, contains people of similar academic and cultural interests to yours.
- A group, all of which are interested in teaching at the same general level of the school as you are.
- A group which is purposely planned to include people with different academic and cultural interests.
- A group which is purposely planned to include people interested in teaching at differing levels of the school.

Tick one

A15. (a) What College clubs or student activities have you become actively involved in this year ?

- (i)
- (ii)
- (iii)

(b) How many N.Z.E.I. Branch meetings have you attended this year ?

- None
- One
- Two
- More than two

Tick

(c) How often do you intend going to N.Z.E.I. Branch meetings in your first year of teaching ?

- Never
- Sometimes
- Regularly

Tick

- B4. (a) Which one of the following aspects of teaching will give you personally the greatest satisfaction ?

Tick one

Teaching the subject matter of special interest to you.

Reaching an understanding of the needs and level of concept development of the children in your class.

Working with enthusiastic children.

Seeing children develop in knowledge and skills under your guidance.

- (b) Write down any other aspect of teaching which you think will give you great satisfaction.

- B5. Assuming you had the qualifications to teach at any of the following levels, which would you choose ?

Rank

Pre-school
Junior School
Middle School
Intermediate School
Lower Secondary
Upper Secondary
Adults

- B6. (a) Why did you decide upon primary rather than secondary teacher training ?

Tick one
or more

Because you were more interested in children of primary school age.

Because you felt more confident working with primary school children.

Because you did not wish to do the necessary university study.

Because you felt you were not capable of doing the necessary university study.

Because your particular academic qualifications were more suited to primary teaching.

Because you preferred the Primary Division to the Secondary Division of Christchurch Teachers' College.

Because primary teaching offered better prospects for promotion.

- (b) Write down any other reasons.

B7. Assuming you are to teach in an intermediate school and the Principal gave you a choice of class, which would you choose ?

Tick one

- A top stream
- An average stream
- A low stream
- A mixed ability class

B8. Assuming your employing Education Board gave you the following choices after, say, five years of teaching, which would you take ?

Tick one

- A general teaching position
- A remedial teaching position (in a subject of special interest to you)
- Teaching a class for intellectually handicapped children
- Teaching a class for physically handicapped children (e.g. deaf, cerebral palsied, blind)
- Teaching a class for emotionally disturbed children
- Teaching a class for gifted children

B9. (a) Assuming you are still in the education service, what position do you hope to hold after say -

Position

Description

Five years of teaching		
Ten years of teaching		

(b) If you are still teaching after ten years of service, where would you like to be ?

Tick one

- In a country school
- In a small town school
- In a city school

B10. In your first year of teaching you are likely to be confronted by the following kinds of situation. Indicate your feelings if you were faced with them now. (Tick)

	Very worried about facing the situation	A little diffident but not unduly concerned	Confident that you could handle the situation in most cases
It is a rainy day and your class is very restless by mid morning			

310. (Cont'd)

	Very worried about facing the situation	A little diffident but not unduly concerned	Confident that you could handle the situation in most cases
A parent asks you to justify a course of action with which he strongly disagrees			
You are asked at short notice to take a Form 1 class outside for sport			
A child in your class persistently defies you in front of his classmates			
A child faints in your classroom			
You suspect a child in your class of stealing from a classmate's lunch			
Your Principal asks you to abide by a point of school policy with which you cannot agree			
You are asked to address the next P.T.A. meeting on a current unit of work your class is doing			
You feel you cannot "get on with" a fellow teacher yet have been asked by the Principal to present a combined report with him/her on some aspect of school work, to the next staff meeting			

B11. Most young teachers have a particular model or style of teaching that they would like to emulate. Rank the following teachers in the order that they appeal to you.

- (i) A skilful questioner who sees himself as a guide, and his pupils as experimenters and adventurers exploring various paths. Exploration, followed by discovery and verification is the way he best likes to operate.
- (ii) An entertainer or performer, who seeks pupil reactions which primarily satisfy his own needs.
- (iii) A prompter, whose pupils are the actors on the classroom stage. He is mainly concerned to foster the child's imagination and creativeness.

B11. (Cont'd)

- (iv) A manipulator of children's behaviour, he instructs his subjects in those social and intellectual skills which he feels need to be absorbed by children in their own best interests.
- (v) Sees himself as a tutor or interpreter. Through dialogue and reflection, the child develops understandings and knowledge.
- (vi) A teacher-pupil partnership is emphasised. By full pupil participation, a sense of responsibility is developed.
- (vii) He is a model whose behaviour patterns are to be imitated and practised by his pupils.
- (viii) A therapist, who is primarily concerned with his pupils' mental health and where the teaching-learning situation is seen as one of pupil adjustment.

APPENDIX C

SECOND ASSOCIATE TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE, JULY 1973

STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL

Your Name: _____

Your School: _____

TICK THE APPROPRIATE BOX

1. How many years of teaching have you completed ?

One year
 Two years
 Three years
 Four years
 Five years
 Between 6 and 10 years
 Between 11 and 15 years
 Over 15 years

2. How long have you had students posted to your class (at this school or elsewhere) ?

This is your first year
 This is your second year
 This is your third year
 This is your fourth year
 This is your fifth year
 This is your 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th or 10th year
 Ten years or more

3. Prior to this section, have you ever had a student from the Graduate Group (Primary Division) posted to your class (at this school or elsewhere) ?

Yes
 No

4. Have you ever had a second-year student from the three-year course posted to your class (at this school or elsewhere) ?

Yes
 No

5. All other things being equal, who would you prefer to be posted to your class -
- a student from the Graduate Group?
 - a second-year student from the three-year course?
 - or, you have no preference at all.
6. (a) How do you think the Graduate Group student now with you compares with most second-year students?

TICK ONE BOX IN EACH ROW

(Please answer Question 6 even if you have had few or no students posted to you prior to this.)

	Much better	A little better	About the same	Not quite as good	Decidedly inferior
Enthusiasm for teaching					
Initiative					
Personal qualities (voice, bearing, manner)					
General helpfulness and co-operation with you and other teachers					
Response to advice you give					
Ability to talk to and mix with children					
Ability to hold children's interest					
Warmth towards, and encouragement of, children					
Understanding of individual needs of children					
Classroom control					
General quality of planning and preparation					
Originality in planning					
Setting of realistic and specific objectives					
Flexibility in evaluating and modifying the plan					
Use of blackboard and other aids					

- (b) Write down any other differences you see between your Graduate Student and most second-year students.

APPENDIX D

SIX-AUDIENCE QUESTIONNAIRE, NOVEMBER 1973

STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL

SEX:	Male	<input type="checkbox"/>	YOUR		
	Female	<input type="checkbox"/>	CATEGORY:	B. Associate Teacher	<input type="checkbox"/>
				C. School Principal	<input type="checkbox"/>
AGE:	Under 20	<input type="checkbox"/>		D. College Staff Member	<input type="checkbox"/>
	21 - 25	<input type="checkbox"/>		E. First-year Student	<input type="checkbox"/>
	26 - 30	<input type="checkbox"/>		F. Third-year Student	<input type="checkbox"/>
	31 - 35	<input type="checkbox"/>		G. Graduate Group Student	<input type="checkbox"/>
	36 - 40	<input type="checkbox"/>			
	41 - 45	<input type="checkbox"/>	YOUR		
	46 - 50	<input type="checkbox"/>	UNIVERSITY		
	Over 50	<input type="checkbox"/>	BACKGROUND:	No completed units	<input type="checkbox"/>
				1 - 3 completed units	<input type="checkbox"/>
				4 - 6 completed units	<input type="checkbox"/>
				7 - 8 completed units	<input type="checkbox"/>
				Bachelor's degree	<input type="checkbox"/>
				Part Master's degree	<input type="checkbox"/>
				Master's degree (including Hons.)	<input type="checkbox"/>
				Higher or double degree	<input type="checkbox"/>

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ANSWERING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE:

1. Please answer all questions if at all possible.
2. If any question quite obviously does not apply to you, please clearly mark "N.A."
3. For the sake of uniformity, use a clear tick wherever there are boxes.
4. Make all comments explicit, and use the reverse side of the page to complete your answer wherever necessary.

Thank you for your help.

- A 1. In New Zealand, as in other developed countries, the trend over recent years has been towards a longer training period and a higher level of teacher education for primary teachers.

ONE TICK FOR EACH QUESTION

- (a) Do you believe that the three-year course for most students is better, in general, than the previous two-year course?

Strongly Yes	Probably Yes	Uncertain	Probably No	Strongly No

- (b) ALL OTHER THINGS BEING EQUAL, do you believe that to have a university education makes a person a better teacher?

Strongly Yes	Probably Yes	Uncertain	Probably No	Strongly No

- (c) ALL OTHER THINGS BEING EQUAL, do you believe that university graduates should have better promotion prospects over non-graduates in the New Zealand primary school system?

Strongly Yes	Probably Yes	Uncertain	Probably No	Strongly No

- (d) ALL OTHER THINGS BEING EQUAL, do you think university graduates at present have better prospects of promotion?

Strongly Yes	Probably Yes	Uncertain	Probably No	Strongly No

- A 2. The concept of recruiting university graduates to train for one year as primary school teachers seems to have become an accepted practice in New Zealand teachers' colleges over the last two or three years.

ONE TICK FOR EACH QUESTION

- (a) Leaving aside the question of course length meanwhile, do you agree in principle with such end-on training after a degree is completed?

Strongly Yes	Probably Yes	Uncertain	Probably No	Strongly No

- (b) What strengths, if any, do you see in such a scheme?

- (c) What problems, if any, do you see in such a scheme?

(Use other side of this page if necessary for A2 (b) and (c))

A 3. At present the teachers' college course for university graduates (and a small number of near-graduates completing their final unit) who wish to enter primary teaching, is of one year's duration.

Assuming that an end-on course for university graduates is acceptable, how long do you think it should be ?

A set course length for all of -					With some flexibility of course length, allowing for individual student strengths and weaknesses, but -			
Less than					More than			
1 yr	1 yr	2 yrs	3 yrs	3 yrs	About 1 yr	About 2 yrs	About 3 yrs	About 4 yrs

(Tick One Only)

A 4. This year, students of the one-year graduate course spent thirteen of their thirty-nine weeks (one-third of the total course time) assigned to classes in schools.

In your view, approximately what proportion of time should be spent in schools ?

S	C	S	C	S	C	S	C	S	C	S	C	S	C
39:	0	35:	4	32:	7	29:	10	26:	13	23:	16	19:	20

S	C	S	C	S	C	S	C	S	C	S	C	(Tick One)
16:	23	13:	26	9:	30	6:	33	3:	36	0:	39	
												(S - Schools C - College)

A 5. This year the graduate course in-college time was allotted as follows: about two-thirds (68%) to the eight syllabus studies and the primary school curriculum in general,

just under one-sixth (13%) to studies in education (viz. The School in Society; Mental Health and Classroom Climate; A Study of Children; How Children Learn; Special Education),

and the rest to various other studies (audio-visual education; workshop courses; Maori studies; etc.) and to group meetings and forums.

(a) In your view, was the proportion of time spent in syllabus and curriculum studies -

Too much	About right	Not enough	Do not know

(b) Was the proportion of time spent in education studies -

Too much	About right	Not enough	Do not know

A 5. (Cont'd)

(c) Write down any other major or minor studies not listed which you would include in the one-year graduate course.

A 6. Christchurch Teachers' College organises studies of the primary school curriculum into eight subject areas ("Syllabus Studies"). This year the graduate group spent 25 hours each in most of these courses, but longer (up to 40 hours) in some.

Alongside the eight subjects indicate the importance you attach to each in a one-year course of teacher preparation, by placing a tick under the preferred course length. Add any other curriculum area relevant to the primary school which you feel warrants a course in its own right, and give it a time allocation too.

	H o u r s							
	20	20	25	30	35	40	45	45
ART								
LANGUAGE								
MATHEMATICS								
MUSIC								
PHYSICAL EDUCATION								
READING								
SCIENCE								
SOCIAL STUDIES								

A 7. For the first time in 1973 two course tutors have been charged in this College with the planning, oversight and general co-ordination of the total graduate programme, and they have been closely associated with its students throughout the year both in College and in schools.

(a) In general, do you believe that this arrangement has been a good one?

Strongly Yes	Probably Yes	Uncertain	Probably No	Strongly No

(b) Please list any reasons for your belief.

A 8. Please write here any comments you would like to make about the general function and nature of the one-year course of primary teacher education for university graduates.

(Use other side if necessary)

APPENDIX E

GRADUATE GROUP QUESTIONNAIRE, NOVEMBER 1973

- G 1. There is a special need in a one-year course for a high level of relevancy to the primary school, and for students to gain as much as possible as individuals from every facet of the programme.

Tick the statement which most closely reflects your view of the general quality of your professional preparation this year.

- All components of the course were of a high quality.
 Most components of the course were of a high quality.
 Some parts of the course were of a high quality.
 Only a very few parts of the course were of good quality.
 None of the course was of good quality.

- G 2. During this year the amount of time you were scheduled to be at College ranged from thirteen to twenty hours per week.

- (a) In general: The amount of class time was about right.
 You would have preferred more free time during the day for your own study.
 Some courses could have been longer, even if this meant more scheduled hours in some weeks.

- (b) Any other comment about the amount of time you were required to be at College?

- G 3. An attempt was made this year to structure the course so you knew where you were going, and yet to allow enough flexibility of planning to cater for your emerging needs.

- (a) Do you feel that this year's programme was:
- Too rigid to cater for your needs?
 A little too rigid at times?
 About right in balance between structure and flexibility?
 A little too unstructured and flexible?
 Far too unstructured and flexible?

G 3. (Cont'd)

(b) Do you feel that your requests over the year:

- Always received attention?
- Usually received attention?
- Sometimes received attention?
- Only occasionally received attention?
- Never received attention?

G 4. This year group meetings were usually held weekly, and you had personal contact with your tutor as required.

(a) Do you think group meetings should be held:

- More than once a week?
- Once a week?
- Once a fortnight?
- Only as required?

(b) Would you prefer meeting your tutor individually, to discuss your course and/or any specific problems:

- On a regular basis (weekly or fortnightly)?
- Only as required by him or by you?

G 5. To follow are the stated objectives for the eight syllabus studies courses undertaken by you this year.

After each - indicate how realistic and appropriate you believe these objectives were,

- evaluate how successful you believe your course was in achieving these stated objectives,
- indicate any particular strengths you saw in the course,
- and, finally, indicate any particular shortcomings you feel should be corrected for next year.

(Please be explicit. Use the back of the page if space is insufficient.)

(i) ART

To "open up an area largely neglected at secondary school develop an understanding of art education's contribution to the child's mental growth explain the possibilities of the art syllabus give knowledge of appropriate materials and techniques study lesson planning and organisation in the primary school".

(a) Objectives realistic and appropriate?

Completely Mostly In part To a small extent Not at all

--	--	--	--	--

G 5. (i) ARI (Cont'd)

(b) Were these objectives achieved?

Completely Mostly In part To a small extent Not at all

--	--	--	--	--

(c) Particular strengths:

(d) Particular shortcomings:

(ii) LANGUAGE

To "look at the implications of the syllabus relate language development to the child's overall growth show the inter- relation of the skills of language, and their exercise and extension through the school day provide practical knowledge of particular aspects of teaching language".

(a) Objectives realistic and appropriate?

Completely Mostly In part To a small extent Not at all

--	--	--	--	--

(b) Were these objectives achieved?

Completely Mostly In part To a small extent Not at all

--	--	--	--	--

(c) Particular strengths:

(d) Particular shortcomings:

G 5. (Cont'd)

(iii) MATHEMATICS

To "learn the purposes of the new mathematics as it grows through the syllabus build up confidence in knowledge of material, in free discussion and in presentation make students aware of classroom techniques and visual aids in presentation and to gain some enjoyment from working in the field of mathematics".

(a) Objectives realistic and appropriate?

Completely Mostly In part To a small Not at
extent all

--	--	--	--	--

(b) Were these objectives achieved?

Completely Mostly In part To a small Not at
extent all

--	--	--	--	--

(c) Particular strengths:

(d) Particular shortcomings:

(iv) MUSIC

To "introduce students to the playing of a musical instrument which can be used in the classroom, and to one other aspect of music teaching".

(a) Objectives realistic and appropriate?

Completely Mostly In part To a small Not at
extent all

--	--	--	--	--

(b) Were these objectives achieved?

Completely Mostly In part To a small Not at
extent all

--	--	--	--	--

(c) Particular strengths:

(d) Particular shortcomings:

G 5. (Cont'd)

(v) PHYSICAL EDUCATION

To "create an enthusiastic interest in physical education through the enjoyment of practical sessions at College introduce a range of teaching units to help students become familiar with the primary school syllabus provide the opportunity to observe children participating in physical education classes inculcate the appreciation of the value of physical activity while growing and as a healthful pastime in adulthood".

(a) Objectives realistic and appropriate?

Completely Mostly In part To a small Not at
extent all

--	--	--	--	--

(b) Were these objectives achieved?

Completely Mostly In part To a small Not at
extent all

--	--	--	--	--

(c) Particular strengths:

(d) Particular shortcomings:

(vi) READING

To "introduce the students to the content of reading through an examination of the processes, skills and attitudes involved in learning to read, and to develop an awareness of the skills involved in adopting a diagnostic approach to the teaching of reading, whether using an ability group or individualised type of organisation".

(a) Objectives realistic and appropriate?

Completely Mostly In part To a small Not at
extent all

--	--	--	--	--

(b) Were these objectives achieved?

Completely Mostly In part To a small Not at
extent all

--	--	--	--	--

(c) Particular strengths:

G 5. (vi) READING (Cont'd)

(d) Particular shortcomings:

(vii) SCIENCE

To " help students appreciate the nature of science and its relevance for children assist students to gain an understanding of knowledge appropriate to teaching science in the primary school, and provide a feeling of competence in teaching science equip students with knowledge of traditional and developing methods of teaching the subject and provide a background of the structure and intent of the primary syllabuses".

(a) Objectives realistic and appropriate?

Completely Mostly In part To a small extent Not at all

--	--	--	--	--

(b) Were these objectives achieved?

Completely Mostly In part To a small extent Not at all

--	--	--	--	--

(c) Particular strengths:

(d) Particular shortcomings:

(viii) SOCIAL STUDIES

To "introduce students to the background and scope of the syllabus and explore some of the possibilities it offers highlight the importance of providing direct and indirect experiences and prepare selected teaching units appropriate to the student's preferred class level next year".

(a) Objectives realistic and appropriate?

Completely Mostly In part To a small extent Not at all

--	--	--	--	--

G 5. (viii) SOCIAL STUDIES (Cont'd)

(b) Were these objectives achieved?

Completely Mostly In part To a small Not at
extent all

Completely	Mostly	In part	To a small extent	Not at all

(c) Particular strengths:

(d) Particular shortcomings:

G 6. How did you find the out-of-class work-load for each syllabus study (general reading, assignment writing, lesson preparation, etc.)?

Far too A little About the Not quite Far too
demanding too de- right amount enough little
manding of work work work

	Far too demanding	A little too demanding	About the right amount of work	Not quite enough work	Far too little work
ART					
LANGUAGE					
MATHEMATICS					
MUSIC					
PHYSICAL EDUCATION					
READING					
SCIENCE					
SOCIAL STUDIES					

G 7. Studies in the theory of education fell into four parts this year. Comment on the relevance, strengths and shortcomings of each. (Use the back of the page if necessary.)

(a) The School in Society (Term One - Mr Pentecost):

(b) A Study of Children (Term One - Messrs O'Rourke, Stevens, Murdoch):

(c) Mental Health and Classroom Climate (Terms One and Two - Mr Gibson):

G 7. (Cont'd)

(d) How Children Learn (Term Two - Messrs Wright, Gibson, Smith, Patrick):

G 8. In the Third Term a study was made of provisions in New Zealand, and Christchurch in particular, for special education. This course included speakers and visits.

(a) In your view was this course -

Excellent	Very good	Good	Of limited value	A waste of time

(b) Any comment on the course?

G 9. Also in the Third Term special provision was made within the broad field of curriculum studies, and especially in preparation for next year, for a number of workshop, lecture and discussion options from which students chose.

(a) In satisfying your own particular needs, was this course -

Excellent	Very good	Good	Of limited value	A waste of time

(b) Any comment on these options?

G10. Your first school posting in Term One this year was just over four weeks and was split into two; your second, Term Two, posting was of four weeks and similarly split; and your final posting of just over four weeks was taken essentially in one block. Assuming a similar total for the year of thirteen weeks in schools, indicate your preferences on its allocation.

	Less than four wks	About the same as this year	More than four wks	Split into two	Blocked into one
TERM ONE					
TERM TWO					
TERM THREE					

(Tick one in each row)

(Tick one in each row)

G11. (a) In general, did you feel accepted as a colleague by the staff in the three schools to which you were posted?

In all three of the schools	In two of the schools	In only one of the schools	In none of the schools

(b) In general, did you get a reasonable amount of help and encouragement from your associate teachers?

In all three of the schools	In two of the schools	In only one of the schools	In none of the schools

(c) Any comment about the role of the schools and associate teachers in a training course such as yours?

G12. Many students had the opportunity to record a short lesson on audio- or video-tape earlier this year.

(a) Did you take - an audio-tape lesson?

a video-tape lesson?

neither?

(b) At an early stage of a one-year teacher education course, do you see value in video-taping mini lessons with small groups of children and analysing them later?

Of very great value

Of some value

Of little value

A waste of time

G13. (a) To what extent have you felt part of the corporate life of the College this year?

To a great extent - probably as much
as most third-years do

To some extent

To a slight extent only

Not at all

(b) List all College clubs, organisations, activities, etc. beyond the requirements of the course, with which you have had some association this year.

G13. (c) Comment on the level of involvement of the Graduate Group in College affairs which you think is desirable and possible.

G14. What changes did you experience when you moved from the university environment to become a student at College? What was different about being a student at College?

G15. Comment on the selection procedures you went through last year at Elwood Normal School.

(a) What did the experience mean to you personally?

(b) How do you see these procedures as part of the College Selection process?

G16. How sure are you at this stage about your choice of a career in education?

Shall definitely not change from the field of education in the near future.

Unlikely to change in the near future.

May possibly change in the near future.

Shall probably change in the near future.

G17. Would you advise a friend to apply for the Primary Division one-year Graduate Course at Christchurch Teachers' College?

Strongly Probably Uncertain Probably Strongly
yes yes no no

--	--	--	--	--

G18. Please make any other evaluative comment on this year's graduate course, using the additional page if required.

Once more, thank you sincerely for your help !

- D 4. In terms of achievement in your subject, how does the graduate course student this year compare with the typical -

	Much Better	A Little Better	About the Same	Not Quite As Good	Decidedly Inferior	Do Not Know
First-year Student?						
Second-year Student?						
Third-year Student?						
Graduate Student of pre- vious years?						

- D 5. (a) In general, which student group would you prefer to work with in your particular subject field -

Graduate Group	Group of 3-year- course Students	No Preference

- (b) Reasons please, if you have a preference.

APPENDIX G

THIRD ASSOCIATE TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE, NOVEMBER 1973

THIS PAGE IS TO BE COMPLETED ONLY BY THOSE TEACHERS WHO HAVE JUST HAD A GRADUATE COURSE STUDENT ON HIS/HER FINAL SECTION (October 29 - December 7, 1973).

B 1. How many years of teaching have you completed?

1 yr	2 yrs	3 yrs	4 yrs	5 yrs	6-10 yrs	11-15 yrs	Over 15 yrs

B 2. How long have you had students posted to your class (this school and elsewhere)? This is your -

1st yr	2nd yr	3rd yr	4th yr	5th yr	6th-10th yr	10 yrs or more

B 3. Have you ever had a Primary Division graduate course student posted to your class before?

Yes	No

B 4. Have you ever had a third-year student (final section) posted to your class before?

Yes	No

B 5. All other things being equal, who would you prefer to be posted to your class -

Graduate Course Student?	Third-year Student?	No Preference

B 6. How do you think the Graduate Group student who has just been with
(a) you compares with most third-year students on their final posting?

	Much Better	A Little Better	About the Same	Not Quite as Good	Decidedly Inferior
Euthusiasm for teaching					
Initiative					
Personal qualities (voice, bearing, manner)					
General helpfulness and co-operation with you and other teachers					
Response to advice you give					
Ability to talk and mix with children					
Warmth towards, and encouragement of, children					
Understanding of individual needs of children					
Classroom control					
General quality of planning and preparation					
Originality in planning					
Setting of realistic and specific objectives					
Flexibility in evaluating and modifying the plan					
Use of blackboard and other aids					

(b) Write down any other difference you see between your graduate student and most third-year students on their final posting. (Continue on other side of this page.)

(Please answer Question 6 even if you have had few or no students in your room previously.)

APPENDIX H

YEAR ONE TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE, APRIL 1974

STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL

Please answer all questions. ("N.A." if definitely not applicable)
 Read each question carefully, and answer with a clear tick in the appropriate box or with a concise and clear statement.

Male	<input type="checkbox"/>	College Course: One year	<input type="checkbox"/>
Female	<input type="checkbox"/>	Three years	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Lower Infants	Upper Infants	S.1	S.2	S.3	S.4	F.1	F.2
Present class (if composite, tick more than one box)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Class hoped for at the end of last year	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

A 1. (a) In general, have you enjoyed teaching so far?

All the Time	Most of the Time	Part of the Time	Seldom	Never
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

(b) What single thing have you enjoyed most about teaching?

(c) What single thing have you enjoyed least about teaching?

A 2. (a) Is teaching what you expected it to be?

Totally	Largely	Partly	To a small Extent	Not at all
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

(b) Comment on any way in which teaching is different from what you expected it to be.

A 3. (a) How sure are you at this stage about your choice of a career in education?

- Shall definitely not change from the field of education in the near future
- Unlikely to change in the near future
- May possibly change in the near future
- Shall probably change in the near future
- Definitely intend to change in the near future

- (b) Do you intend to be teaching in New Zealand -
- next year?
 - in two years from now?
 - in three years from now?
 - in four years from now?
 - in five years from now?

(c) If it is likely that you will give up teaching in New Zealand within the next six years, what will be the probable reason?

- Overseas travel
- Further full-time study
- Change to a non-teaching branch of education
- Change to an occupation outside education
- Domestic reasons
- Other (state: _____)

A 4. At this stage, which class level would you choose for next year?

Pre-School	Lower Inf.	Upper Inf.	S.1	S.2	S.3	S.4	F.1	F.2	Lower Sec.	Upper Sec.	Adult
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

B 1. (a) Which subject, or area of the curriculum, have you felt most confident teaching so far?

(b) Write down any other subject area(s) you have felt confident teaching.

(c) Give reasons for your feelings of confidence.

- B 2. (s) Which subject, or area of the curriculum, (if any) has caused you most concern so far?
- (b) Name any other subject area(s) (if any) which has caused you a fair amount of anxiety.
- (c) Give reasons for your feelings of anxiety.

- B 3. Should you have the chance to attend an in-service course right now, what aspect of teaching would you most like some help in?

First choice:

Second choice:

Third choice:

- B 4. Do you feel that you get on well with your class and with other children in the school?

Strongly Yes Probably Yes Uncertain Probably No Strongly No

--	--	--	--	--

- B 5. (a) Have you had control problems which have been difficult to deal with?

Strongly Yes Probably Yes Uncertain Probably No Strongly No

--	--	--	--	--

- (b) Are you concerned right now about your ability to control children?

Strongly Yes Probably Yes Uncertain Probably No Strongly No

--	--	--	--	--

- B 6. Knowing what you do now about teaching, and about your own strengths and shortcomings, how long should your college course have been?

Less than 1 year 1 year About 1½ years 2 years About 2½ years 3 years More than 3 years

--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Any comment:

- B 7. Describe the style of teaching which seems to suit you best.

- C 3. After your first term as a Year One Teacher, how successful do you now feel your total college course was in preparing you for the following aspects of teaching? College preparation was -

	Of very great value	Of much value	Of some value	Of a little value	Of no value
Understanding the needs and interests of children at your class's age level.					
The skills of teaching (questioning, etc.).					
Techniques of control.					
Planning programmes of work.					
Use of blackboard and other audio-visual materials.					
Classroom administration (roll, P & A Register, duties, class routines, etc.).					
The legal aspects of teaching.					
Knowledge of special provisions for exceptional children.					
Knowledge of advisory services available to teachers.					
Understanding administration within your school (role of Principal, V.P., Sn. Teacher, etc.).					
Understanding the administration of schools (Ed. Dept., Board, School Comm., etc.).					
Understanding the teacher's relationship with parents (through P.T.A. and informal).					

Any comment:

C 4. How successful, in general, were your school postings during your college course, in terms of -

	Of very great value	Of much value	Of some value	Of a little value	Of no value
Having teaching techniques demonstrated to you?					
Giving you the opportunity to practise teaching skills?					
Receiving support, encouragement and constructive criticism from associate teachers?					
Receiving support, encouragement and constructive criticism from college staff?					
Helping you in planning programmes of work?					
Helping you to better understand children?					
Helping you understand the role of the school in the community?					

Any comment:

C 5. (a) The proportion of time spent in schools last year by the one-year graduate course students was 13 weeks compared with 26 weeks in college (viz. one-third of the total time was in schools; three-year course students spent just under one-fifth of their time in schools).

In your view, approximately what proportion of time IN A ONE-YEAR COURSE should be spent in schools?

S	C	S	C	S	C	S	C	S	C	S	C	S	C
39:0	35:4	32:7	29:10	26:13	23:16	19:20	16:23	13:26	9:30	6:33	3:36	0:39	

(S = Schools G = College)

(b) Any comment on the length of each posting and its placement in the course?

C 6. What specific aspect or component of your college course stands out as having been the most valuable to you personally?

- C 7. (a) In general, would you say that your college course was a reasonably full and demanding one?

Strongly yes	Probably yes	Uncertain	Probably no	Strongly no

- (b) In general, should you have had more scheduled time during which you were required to attend college classes?

Strongly yes	Probably yes	Uncertain	Probably no	Strongly no

- (c) Should you have been given more work assignments or guidance for your out-of-college study?

Strongly yes	Probably yes	Uncertain	Probably no	Strongly no

- (d) On reflection, did you try to get the best out of courses while at college and make the best use of college resources?

Strongly yes	Probably yes	Uncertain	Probably no	Strongly no

- (e) Any reasons or comments on your answers to the above questions?

- C 8. (a) Note any specific aspect or component of your college course that you now feel, above all others, should be changed.

- (b) Describe how you would change it.

- C 9. Have you any other comment about your college course which would help us, in light of your teaching experience to date?

APPENDIX I

SCHOOL PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE, MAY 1974

STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL

You have at present on your staff a Year One Teacher who was trained at Christchurch Teachers' College in the one-year course for University Graduates. Please indicate how this teacher compares with those who have gone through a three-year course. Be quite frank, use the full five-point scale and please answer every item of each question.

Compared with most three-year-trained Year One Teachers of your experience, how does your ex-graduate course Year One Teacher(s) rate on the following criteria:-

	Much Better	A little Better	About the Same	Not Quite as Good	Decidedly Inferior
Enthusiasm for teaching?					
Initiative?					
Personal qualities (voice, bearing, manner)?					
General helpfulness and co-operation with you and other teachers?					
Response to advice you give?					
Ability to talk and mix with children?					
Warmth towards and encouragement of children?					
Understanding of individual needs of children?					
Classroom control?					
General quality of planning and preparation?					
Originality in planning?					
Setting of realistic and specific objectives?					
Flexibility in evaluating and modifying the plan?					
Use of the blackboard and other aids?					

(Please tick one box in each row)

Any comment you wish to make about the preparedness for teaching of your Year One Teacher from the graduate course? (Continue on other side if necessary - and thank you sincerely for your assistance!)

APPENDIX J

NEWMAN-KEULS TESTS OF A POSTERIORI DIFFERENCES
BETWEEN MEANS

TABLE 44 (a)

Do you believe that the three-year course for most students is better, in general, than the previous two-year course ?

AUDIENCES		Graduate Students	First-year Students	Third-year Students	Teachers	Principals	Lecturers
	Means	3.20	3.49	3.95	3.95	4.27	4.72
Graduate Students	3.20		.29	.75**	.75**	1.07**	1.52**
First-year Students	3.49			.46	.46	.78**	1.23**
Third-year Students	3.95				-	.32	.77**
Teachers	3.95					.32	.77**
Principals	4.27						.45
Lecturers	4.72						
			r=2	r=3	r=4	r=5	r=6
	$q_{.99}(r, 330)$		3.64	4.12	4.40	4.60	4.76
	$\sqrt{\frac{MS \text{ error}}{n}} \cdot q_{.99}(r, 330)$.55	.62	.66	.69	.71

**
p < 0.01

TABLE 44 (b)

All other things being equal, do you believe that to have a university education makes a person a better teacher ?

AUDIENCES							
		Graduate Students	First-year Students	Third-year Students	Teachers	Principals	Lecturers
	Means	1.96	2.32	2.77	3.54	3.75	3.86
Third-year Students	1.96		.36	.81 **	1.58 **	1.79 **	1.90 **
First-year Students	2.32			.45	1.22 **	1.43 **	1.54 **
Teachers	2.77				.77 **	.98 **	1.09 **
Graduate Students	3.54					.21	.32
Principals	3.75						.11
Lecturers	3.86						
			r=2	r=3	r=4	r=5	r=6
	$q_{.99}(r,334)$		3.64	4.12	4.40	4.60	4.76
	$\sqrt{\frac{MS\ error}{n}} \cdot q_{.99}(r,334)$.58	.66	.70	.74	.76

** p < 0.01

TABLE 4 (c)

All other things being equal, do you believe that university graduates should have better promotion prospects over non-graduates in the New Zealand primary school system ?

AUDIENCES		Third-year Students	First-year Students	Teachers	Principals	Lecturers	Graduate Students
	Means	1.75	2.30	2.37	2.97	3.23	3.27
Third-year Students	1.75		.55	.62	1.22**	1.48**	1.52**
First-year Students	2.30			.07	.67	.93**	.97**
Teachers	2.37				.60	.86**	.90**
Principals	2.97					.26	.30
Lecturers	3.23						.04
Graduate Students	3.27						
			r=2	r=3	r=4	r=5	r=6
	$q_{.99}(r, 331)$		3.70	4.20	4.50	4.71	4.87
	$\sqrt{\frac{MS\ error}{n}}$ $q_{.99}(r, 331)$.63	.71	.77	.80	.83

** p < 0.01

TABLE 44 (d)

All other things being equal, do you think university graduates at present have better prospects of promotion ?

AUDIENCES		Graduate Students	Principals	Teachers	Third-year Students	Lecturers	First-year Students
	Means	3.10	3.54	3.75	3.89	3.93	4.05
Graduate Students	3.10		.44**	.65**	.69**	.73**	.85**
Principals	3.54			.21**	.35**	.39**	.51**
Teachers	3.75				.14**	.18**	.30**
Third-year Students	3.89					.04	.16**
Lecturers	3.93						.12**
First-year Students	4.05						
			r=2	r=3	r=4	r=5	r=6
	$q_{.99}(r, 334)$		3.64	4.12	4.40	4.60	4.76
	$\sqrt{\frac{MS_{error}}{n}}$. $q_{.99}(r, 334)$.07	.08	.09	.09	.10

** $p < 0.01$

TABLE 44 (e)

Leaving aside the question of course length meanwhile, do you agree in principle with ... end-on training after a degree is completed ?

AUDIENCES		Third-year Students	First-year Students	Lecturers	Teachers	Principals	Graduate Students
	Means	3.20	3.64	3.79	3.79	4.08	4.35
Third-year Students	3.20		.44	.57	.57	.88**	1.15**
First-year Students	3.64			.15	.15	.44	.71**
Lecturers	3.79				-	.29	.56
Teachers	3.79					.29	.56
Principals	4.08						.27
Graduate Students	4.35						
			r=2	r=3	r=4	r=5	r=6
	$q_{.99} (r, 332)$		3.64	4.12	4.40	4.60	4.76
	$\sqrt{\frac{MS \text{ error}}{n}} \cdot q_{.99} (r, 332)$.57	.64	.69	.72	.74

** p < 0.01

TABLE 44 (f)

How sure are you about your choice of teaching as a career ?

AUDIENCES		Graduate Students	Third-year Students	First-year Students
	Means	2.36	3.00	3.02
Graduate Students	2.36		.64**	.66**
Third-year Students	3.00			.02
First-year Students	3.02			
			r = 2	r = 3
		$q_{.99} (r, 139)$	3.70	4.20
	$\sqrt{\frac{MS \text{ error}}{n}}$	$q_{.99} (r, 139)$.48	.55

** p < 0.01

TABLE 44 (g)

"Social level" of an Airline Pilot (N.A.C. Captain).

AUDIENCES		Graduate Students	First-year Students	Third-year Students
	Means	3.58	4.08	4.10
Graduate Students	3.58		.50**	.52**
First-year Students	4.08			.02
Third-year Students	4.10			
			r=2	r=3
		q .99 (r, 135)	3.70	4.20
	$\sqrt{\frac{MS\ error}{n}}$	q .99 (r, 135)	.04	.05

** p < 0.01

TABLE 44 (h)

"Social level" of Secondary Teacher.

AUDIENCES		Graduate Students	First-year Students	Third-year Students
	Means	3.47	3.84	3.91
Graduate Students	3.47		.37**	.44**
First-year Students	3.84			.07
Third-year Students	3.91			
			r=2	r=3
		q .99 (r, 134)	3.70	4.20
	$\sqrt{\frac{MS\ error}{n}}$	q .99 (r, 134)	.37	.42

** p < 0.01

TABLE 44 (i)

How many weeks should One-year Graduate Course Students spend in Schools ?

AUDIENCES		Lecturers	Third-year Students	Graduate Students	Ex-graduate Students	School Principals	Ex-three-yr Students	First-year Students	Associate Teachers
	Means	15.25	17.87	18.48	18.77	18.86	18.91	19.09	20.28
Lecturers	15.25		2.62	3.23**	3.52**	3.61**	3.66	3.84**	5.03**
Third-year Students	17.87			.61	.90	.99	1.04	1.22	2.41
Graduate Students	18.48				.29	.38	.43	.61	1.80
Ex-Graduate Students	18.77					.09	.14	.32	1.51
School Principals	18.86						.05	.23	1.42
Ex-Three-Year Students	18.91							.18	1.37
First-Year Students	19.09								1.19
Associate Teachers	20.28								
			r=2	r=3	r=4	r=5	r=6	r=7	r=8
	$q_{.99} (r, 387)$		3.64	4.12	4.40	4.60	4.76	4.88	4.99
	$\sqrt{\frac{MS\ error}{n}} \cdot q_{.99} (r, 387)$		2.84	3.21	3.43	3.59	3.71	3.81	3.89

** p < 0.01

TABLE 4 (j)

Do you believe that the arrangement of two course tutors charged with the planning, oversight and general co-ordination of the graduate programme has been a good one ?

AUDIENCES	First-year Students		Third-year Students		Lecturers	Teachers	Principals	Graduate Students
	Means							
		3.72	3.72	4.19	4.27	4.34	4.81	
First-year Students	3.72	-	.47**	.55**	.62**	1.09**		
Third-year Students	3.72		.47**	.55**	.62**	1.09**		
Lecturers	4.19			.08	.15	.62**		
Teachers	4.27				.07	.54**		
Principals	4.34					.47**		
Graduate Students	4.81							
			r=2	r=3	r=4	r=5	r=6	
	$q_{.99}(r,304)$	3.64	4.12	4.40	4.60	4.76		
	$\sqrt{\frac{MS\ error}{n}}$	$q_{.99}(r,304)$.33	.37	.40	.41	.43	

** p < 0.01

TABLE 44 (k)

How does the Graduate Student this year compare with other Students
in terms of attitude ?

COMPARISON GROUPS		Third-year Students	Second-year Students	First-year Students	Previous Graduate Students
	Means	3.08	3.73	4.00	4.24
Third-year Students	3.08		.65**	.92**	1.16**
Second-year Students	3.73			.27	.51
First-year Students	4.00				.24
Previous Graduate Students	4.24				
			r=2	r=3	r=4
	$q_{.99}(r,91)$		3.70	4.20	4.50
	$\sqrt{\frac{MS\ error}{n}}$	$q_{.99}(r,91)$	0.74	0.84	0.90

** p < 0.01

TABLE 44 (l)

How does the Graduate Student this year compare with other Students
in terms of achievement ?

COMPARISON GROUPS		Third-year Students	Second-year Students	Previous Graduate Students	First-year Students
	Means	2.50	3.37	3.79	3.83
Third-year Students	2.50		.87**	1.29**	1.33**
Second-year Students	3.37			.42	.46
Previous Graduate Students	3.79				.04
First-year Students	3.83				
			r=2	r=3	r=4
	$q_{.99}(r,72)$		3.76	4.28	4.60
	$\sqrt{\frac{MS\ error}{n}}$	$q_{.99}(r,72)$	0.83	0.94	1.01

** p < 0.01

APPENDIX K

STATEMENT FROM THE PRINCIPAL, CHRISTCHURCH TEACHERS' COLLEGE

Because of the shortage of secondary teachers, little or no effort was made until quite recently to recruit university graduates for primary teaching. A few graduates did find their way into the Primary College, but provisions made for them were far from satisfactory. Difficulties caused by timetabling and staffing for a small group were almost insurmountable. In turn this led to the development of a rather sceptical and deprecatory attitude about graduate trainees.

However, with the introduction of a graduate quota in the primary colleges a much closer study of the problem has resulted in a better understanding of the issues involved and a very positive change in attitudes from both college teachers as well as from graduates themselves. This has been greatly assisted because of the large numbers of graduates applying for entry and the need, therefore, to be more knowledgeable about the nature of the raw material involved and of the special needs of graduates in teacher preparation. This has led to specially designed selection procedures which are much more rigorous than those for other applicants.

It has now been possible to make special provision for the graduate group and to assign tutors almost wholly concerned with the designing and teaching of graduate programmes.

Experience with larger groups of graduate students over the last few years has revealed a number of general characteristics displayed by this rather selective group of able young men and women that appear to either facilitate or hinder their professional preparation.

On the positive side, most graduates have considerable academic potential, can work independently, are highly productive, are aware of the social problems of the day and have an ability and a desire to question statements of doubtful validity.

These are very great strengths indeed and attempts are made in our programming to capitalise on them.

However, a number but by no means all, have difficulties in establishing warm relationships with children and can be insecure in making personal relationships particularly with those in authority. They may also reveal an inflexibility in thinking, be superior in attitude, and through a reluctance to depart from formal classroom procedure take, or encourage, a passive rather than active student role in the teaching situation.

With the very obvious strengths they have, graduates make a determined effort to prepare themselves for the classroom in the limited period of time available. Even so they appear to be at a disadvantage compared to the better three year students and have more difficulty in establishing themselves in the classroom. It seems that one year's preparation is too short to guarantee the necessary changes in professional attitudes and the development of teaching skills that make for ease of entry to the classroom. It should be said, however, that after a longer period of settling in that graduate trainees develop well as teachers. Time may show that with their higher level of general education that they are better prospects than many of our normal entrants.

I would like to find some way, either through a concurrent or partially concurrent B.Ed. system or by an extension of the college course, to see an increase in the professional component of their teacher preparation. There are a number of other possibilities that I won't detail here that could be attempted.

Finally, I would like to give support to the extension of graduate admission to teaching and at the same time encourage the development of a thorough going research programme to look at such matters as pre-training preparation, degree structures, selection, length of professional preparation, induction into the teaching service, length of service, and progress made in both the short and long term.

J.F. MANN
10 March, 1975

APPENDIX L

GRADUATE COURSE REPORT, DECEMBER 1974

1. Students

Of the thirty students accepted into the course, twenty-eight graduated. One student resigned and another studentship was deferred.

1.1 Composition of the Group:

Masters' Degrees	2
Bachelors' Degrees	24
Undergraduates	<u>2</u>
Total	<u>28</u>
Ex Division 'S'	4

1.2 For tutorial purposes the group was divided into two. The division was an arbitrary one and proved as workable an arrangement as any other considered so far.

1.3 The Tutors note with satisfaction the quality of the group as a whole. The tone was, they believe, assisted by:

- selection procedures which found suitable applicants but which did not cull out colour or diversity from the group.
- the increasing commitment of staff generally to the graduate students.
- the opportunity given to Tutors to personally assist this particular group of students. This has proved to be an integral part of the course, and the Tutors feel that the quite considerable time so spent has been worthwhile.

1.4 In general, graduates were discouraged from continuing university work. Two ex Div. 'S' students read their final unit to complete their degrees.

2. Professional Studies

2.1 As in previous years, the professional studies component received greatest emphasis, with the eight Syllabus Studies occupying most of this time. The length of Syllabus Studies courses were -

- Science: 40 hours
- Reading, Mathematics, Language, Social Studies and Music: 30 hours each
- Art and Physical Education: 25 hours each

2. Professional Studies (Cont'd)

- 2.1 From an evaluation of the previous year's courses, college departments were given an analysis, in February of this year, of student judgements, of (a) course objectives and (b) the degree of objective achievement, to assist in 1974 course planning. It is hoped that benefit was gained from this material, and a similar evaluation of 1974 courses was carried out on 3 December.
- 2.2 Curriculum Studies, taken by the course Tutors, was viewed as most important. To show students over just one year the unity of the total curriculum and to convince them of the importance of sound and adequate personal preparation, remains one of the greatest challenges of this course. However, the amount of effort directed here in 1974 bore fruit, and it is felt that the quality of work during the sustained teaching experience of the final posting was comparable with most third-year students. The course will be further strengthened by involving the Ag group with two units of the third year Curriculum Studies programme in 1975.
- 2.3 Foundation Studies in Education continued to cause some concern this year - in the widely varying backgrounds of students and in the disunity where many staff are brought in to conduct short courses. Next year it is proposed to offer students alternatives under the themes "The Nature of Primary School Children", "The School in Society" and "Special Topics" (1975 Evaluating Learning and Educating Exceptional Children) in an attempt to overcome these shortcomings.
- Notable aspects of the 1974 courses were the visits to independent schools and special education facilities, and the "position papers" students were asked to present on an issue of current debate in New Zealand education which they felt close to.
- 2.4 The Studies of Teaching course continued to develop this year, and a programme is evolving which seems particularly appropriate to short course university graduates. As well as assisting the development of specific teaching skills (e.g. questioning), the use of micro-teaching with video facilities has proved to be particularly useful early in the year to re-orient thinking from subject teaching to the teaching of children. This year's course went well. It included an eight-week Mini-course using children in Heaton Intermediate School, followed by a close examination of and practice in inquiry teaching in Social Studies.

3. School Practice

- 3.1 Students spent two periods, each of two weeks, in one classroom in Term One. The return to a class after further college work proved beneficial.

The second posting was of four weeks in the middle of Term Two, and most students had contact with their Associate Teachers throughout the term. This was not a "home school" idea - merely a longer association with one Teacher to allow for additional teaching episodes in Social Studies and Science related to College course work.

3. School Practice (Cont'd)

- 3.1 Five weeks in Term Three were spent in a class as closely aligned as possible to the likely class level for 1975.
- 3.2 The problem remains of finding good Associate Teachers for all students. Unfortunately, a number of postings this year were unsatisfactory, and the resulting loss of confidence by the students concerned was difficult to restore. It is particularly important for one-year students to receive strongly supportive and encouraging postings. This reflects the difficulty, particularly in Terms Two and Three, of finding suitable associates who are not involved in in-service courses.
- 3.3 Another recurring problem is the student having to elect a Year One teaching level before having had experience in all major sections of the primary school. The College may need to consider three separate postings before the end of Term Two in the future. Meanwhile, for next year it is planned that the first split posting be at two different levels of the junior school, followed by either a middle or upper posting in Term Two. This will give a little more breadth of experience.
- 3.4 The course Tutors are more convinced than ever of their need to spend a great deal of time in schools working with both students and teachers to provide good College-school liaison and to help build better understandings of university graduate student teachers. Both Tutors were frustrated this year in not being able to do all that they would have wished in this direction. Nevertheless, each saw all his own group teach at least once while "on section"; saw all teach small groups on a number of other occasions; and was able to brief Associate Teachers individually before every posting.

4. Other Courses

- 4.1 **Maori Studies:** The group spent a semester joining with the third-years in the Maori Studies programme. The benefits of working with the third-year students were considerable, and the increasing acceptance of the graduate student into the third-years' circle gives satisfaction.
- 4.2 **A.V. Education:** A twelve hour course was mounted by Mr J. Lewthwaite. A feature of the 1974 course was the large number of students who sat for projectionist's certificates.
- 4.3 **Teacher Planning Workshop:** In response to requests from the 1973 group, provision was made for this year's graduates to join fully in the T.P.W. course. This move was very successful, and T.P.W. will undoubtedly become an integral part of the graduate course again.
- 4.4 The Tutors feel that some courses have become an established part of the one-year graduate programme. These should be, in their opinion, more formally recognised in discussions on lecture load, and notes in College transcripts as well as departmental records. It is hoped that the discussions will be initiated in 1975 to clarify the position and have Board of Studies ratify those courses deemed fit for recognition.

5. Staffing and Resources

- 5.1 Two course Tutors, Messrs R.F. Murdoch and H.S. Stedman, worked under the Dean of Professional Studies, Mr C.J. Wright.
- 5.2 Each College department is responsible for teaching its own Syllabus Study, and the Principal Lecturer Teaching Practice arranges school postings, but the course Tutors keep closely in touch with these two areas.
- 5.3 Liaison with schools has been reasonably effective, but Tutors recognise there is room for improvement. Of interest has been the worthwhile visits from teachers, including the following:

Mr D. Matthews, Senior Teacher, Elmwood
 Mrs C. Rossiter, Senior Teacher, Heaton
 Miss D. Jelley, Year One Teacher, Harewood
 Mrs E. Shamy, Senior Teacher J.C., Northcote
 Mr D. Stewart, Principal, Russley
 Mr D. Bond, Psychological Service

These visits were appreciated by the students.

- 5.4 Besides professional resources, community facilities were used by the graduate group. Visits were made to a variety of places, including Battery Point, Governors Bay School and a wide range of facilities involved in care for the handicapped or special education.

6. Lopdell House Working Party

- 6.1 Both course Tutors joined a Lopdell House working party from 5 to 9 August, 1974, which was set up to evaluate the one-year course. All colleges were represented, and the deliberations were most ably chaired by Mr H.L. Francis, Vice-Principal, Auckland Teachers' College.
- 6.2 On 23 September, a brief report was made to our staff, outlining the main thrusts of the Working Party. These included -
- The need throughout the one-year course to view theory through practice.
 - The importance of the training "triad" (student-lecturer-teacher), strong on all three fronts.
 - The pressing need for continuing involvement of colleges with young teachers in their year-one position, especially those from the one-year course.
 - The need for more formal and effective research on the one-year graduate course.
 - The general feeling of optimism towards this alternative form of teacher education; the type of student entering the course; and the quality of teacher being turned out.
- 6.3 Both Tutors stress the great value the week at Lopdell House had for them, and wish to express their warm appreciation for the special case made to have both attend.

7. Looking Ahead

7.1 The one-year course for university graduates has been in this College since 1966. Over the nine years it has been modified and changed in an effort to best meet the needs of a special group. Yet, provisions made have tended to be interim ones, and the Tutors believe that the time has arrived for this College to look ahead more positively and isolate areas of desired change which can be worked towards. Four such areas, which seem to warrant early attention, are now identified.

7.2 Selection and Early Contact with Students: The Tutors appreciated their involvement in the selection of students. They feel that, in the future, some consideration may be given to the possibility of earlier contact with successful applicants. By meeting students soon after selection, they would hope to better orient those able to come in to College briefly before the holidays, towards College and the one-year programme.

7.3 Continuing Association with College: The "McMillen Report" on Form 1-2 education in New Zealand (February 1974) expressed concern over the general weakness of one-year course trainees in class management and techniques of teaching, suggested that these should be strengthened in the College course and recommended that "the possibility of combining a proportion of Year One with further practical instruction in teaching techniques under College guidance should be investigated" (pp. 19-20). As already reported, these aspects of the course have been strengthened, but Tutors also feel this real need for continuing contact by College with Year One Teachers. With the Tutors' detailed knowledge of students, the expressed wishes of current Year One Teachers and in order for Tutors to gain a better understanding of young teachers' needs, such a continuing association would be of mutual benefit. It is hoped that 1975 will see Tutors, in collaboration with Inspectors, being able to meet ex 1974 course graduates in the Christchurch area on a regular basis.

7.4 Staffing

7.41 It is felt by one course Tutor that the responsibility for both one-year and two-year courses for university graduates and near graduates, and for continuing contact with Division 'S' students while they are at university, should be delegated to a Senior Lecturer appointed for this purpose. This would -

- Make for greater efficiency in the day-to-day running of the one-year Ag. course.
- Relate the needs of one-year and two-year students more closely and allow for some common course components to develop more easily.
- Enable closer continuing association with College of students on studentship.
- Give greater course unity (especially to Division 'S' students) by having one senior staff member responsible for all three groups, and would allow for more contact between these different groups, and thus make for better integration into the total College.

7. Looking Ahead (Cont'd)7.4 Staffing (Cont'd)

7.41

Lessen the day-to-day administrative load on the Dean (or his successor under the new College structure) and the Principal Lecturer in Education.

Working in a team with the Senior Lecturer would be Course Tutors who would maintain the quality of relationship with students which has been built up over the last two years with the Ag. group. A desirable staff (Senior Lecturer and Tutors) to student ratio is seen as approximately 1:12.

7.42 Alternatively, in the view of another Tutor, the present arrangement of two Lecturers working in co-operation has advantages which need to be recognised.

Particular viewpoints and ideas are discussed and modified on an equal footing with the worthwhile personal involvement of both Tutors.

The students do not necessarily look to a leader, but see the Tutors as but part of the total College team working together. This tends, it is argued, to reduce the possibility of an "in group" of graduates within the College.

Clearly administrative details would be tidier with a senior appointment, and any appointee to a position should be aware of the pitfalls in leading such a group. The present, rather cumbersome, arrangement would not be a good long term one. However, the strengths and advantages of two Tutors working together with a group need to be noted.

Both Tutors feel that, despite these reservations about a senior position, the possible solution suggested is a good one. That is, that a Senior Lecturer be appointed to take over-all charge of the short courses, being responsible to the Dean (or his new equivalent) on one hand and responsible for Tutors on the other.

7.5 Liaison with Schools

Of importance to the students is the quality of school experience. As in previous years, the Tutors see their role in working with teachers as vital. Appended to this report is a working framework for 1975 school practice, and of particular note is:

- The special provision made for Tutors "to spend more time in schools alongside students" in Term One.
- To group "home schools" and other posting schools in Term Two into two circuits, with one Tutor having a special liaison responsibility for each.

It is also hoped that, in 1975, provision may be made for group meetings of Associate Teachers and Principals who will have contact with graduate students.