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CHAPTER I

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Introduction

In 1964, it became evident that teacher education was under close scrutiny. James Conant (1964) identified areas of major concern in teacher education programs. One of these concerns was how to train student teachers in relevant programs which reflect the complexity of roles which teachers perform. Teachers internalize role expectations based on at least two value orientations: (1) duties and loyalties toward the bureaucratic organization; and (2) duties and loyalties toward the professional organization. Both dimensions of teacher roles demand compliance if the teacher is to be considered "professional." Role conflict may occur if such loyalties are simultaneously demanded and require opposing, contradicting actions.

The specific concerns of the study which related to role conflict were: (1) prospective teachers develop by the completion of their teacher education experience role expectations concerning their future role as teachers; (2) these role expectations, based on personal values, may be in conflict with the actual teaching roles they may encounter; (3) the teaching environment may reflect attitudes toward two value orientations, either to the school bureaucracy, to the teaching profession, or to both; and (4) after teachers experience an actual teaching situation,
their role expectations may change. This transitional process of change may lead to role conflict.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to systematically explore the potential for role conflict caused by bureaucratic and professional value orientation in prospective and first-year teachers. Specifically, the study attempted to discern role expectations in relationship to different levels of teacher education experiences. On the basis of this general problem, the following specific issues seemed relevant for study: (1) What are prospective and first-year teacher perceptions of bureaucratic and professional values? (2) Do teacher role expectations based on bureaucratic and professional orientations change during the teacher education experience? (3) Does role conflict occur when the prospective teacher enters the teaching field, due to incompatible value orientations toward the bureaucracy and the profession?

From the study of one selected teacher education population with the common experience of participating in the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University secondary teacher education program, a secondary purpose was derived. Specifically, assessing the indirect effects of coursework and student teaching upon values toward the bureaucracy and professionalism was explored.

Need for the Study

The quality of teachers a society possesses is of utmost concern. Through the behavior of teachers, society can influence what its children
learn (Gage, 1972). Therefore, understanding teachers’ perceived role expectations and determining if role conflicts occurred with actual teaching experience seemed significant. Secondly, an exploration of a secondary teacher education program and its possible link to teacher role conflict also seemed appropriate for study.

In summary, it was felt that teacher education programs, professional organizations, and school systems needed to be aware of the importance of the role expectations of teachers. Specifically, role conflict may be related to various problems confronting new teachers in the field.

**Teacher role expectations of secondary education students.**—The role expectations of students preparing to teach could be linked to their satisfaction level in teaching. When an eager new teacher takes over his first classroom, rude shocks may await him. One shock is the realization of how badly prepared he is for his job (Brenton, 1970). Determining whether or not prospective teachers were developing role expectations about teaching which the first-year teachers did not hold was a primary concern of the study. Did role expectations change when a secondary teacher, prepared for teaching by a secondary teacher education program, began teaching?

Determining whether or not a teacher’s teaching role expectation was congruent with the actual teaching role realities he encountered was another concern of the study. If these two were divergent, role conflict may have developed (Braga, 1972). Three results could have occurred:
1. The new teacher's frustration level was too high and therefore he may leave the teaching profession.

2. The new teacher accepted the role reality and abandoned his former role expectations.

3. The new teacher compromised both, trying to reach a suitable level of satisfaction.

Under these assumptions, it seemed clear that teacher role expectations play a central part in understanding teacher performance, both in preservice education courses and in real-life teaching situations.

In conclusion, the need for this study of prospective secondary teacher role expectations was fundamental because of the following:

1. Few studies have explored and compared the role expectations of prospective teachers with those expectations held by first-year teachers.

2. Role expectations were based upon two factors: (a) how the teacher perceived teacher roles in relationship to the teaching profession; and (b) how the teacher perceived teacher roles in relationship to the school bureaucracy. Unless this conceptual framework was determined, the role the teacher assumes may not be completely understood.

3. Little has been done about defining, redefining and demonstrating new teaching roles (Edelfelt, 1972).

4. There was a scarcity of information concerning explicitly defined teacher roles, especially those relating to the professional teacher.

5. The rapid turnover of teachers and teacher dropouts in the profession may be a result of a high anxiety level of role conflict.
caused by differences in role expectation to role reality (Gallegos, 1972).

6. The changing role of teachers was evidenced by the increased emphasis on change in schools, both from within and without the school community (Sukat, 1970; Joyce, 1972).

Limitations of the Study

The limitations of this study were: (1) the selection of the population limited to one higher education institution, therefore results found were not inferred to other populations, (2) the assumption that the four groups of secondary education students have had similar preteaching experiences; and (3) the assumption that characteristics of the teaching profession and the school bureaucracy were reflective of a secondary teacher's environment (see Table 3).

Delimitations of the Study

The delimitations of the study were: (1) the selection of only secondary education students and teachers; (2) the selection of only those students and teachers concentrating in the disciplines of mathematics, science, English and social studies; (3) limitation of value orientations only toward the school bureaucracy and the teaching profession; (4) the use of the Teacher Value Orientation Questionnaire. It was designed to assess a person's general perception about the school bureaucracy and the teaching profession. There was no attempt to be exhaustive in either the decision situations or the possible solutions offered by the instrument. This instrument must be used in conjunction with other devices to secure
an accurate understanding of a particular school situation; (5) the perceptual choices of the respondents on the instrument were limited to an either/or selection. A total of 178 subjects served in some capacity of making value choices toward the profession and the bureaucracy.

The judgments made were based on a subject's perception, interest, values, and educational experiences. It was not assumed that perception or value choices would remain constant. Both were relative to the moment and subject to change. The implication of this delimitation for the instrument was that much of the reliability testing normally associated with replication techniques was not applicable; and (6) the inability of the researcher to administer the instrument to all 178 subjects in the same manner. Some respondents received the instrument through the mail, while others were administered the instrument in their classrooms.

Operational Definitions of Constructs

1. **Value orientations**: those values held by the respondent toward the school bureaucracy (one direction) and the teaching profession (opposite direction) as measured by the Teacher Value Orientation Questionnaire.

2. **Teacher role expectations**: a respondent's choice of action toward hypothetical teaching situations described on the Teacher Value Orientation Questionnaire.

3. **Role conflict**: either an all-positive or an all-negative selection by a respondent to a set of items on the Teacher Value Orientation Questionnaire constructed to elicit opposing value orientations (school bureaucracy and teaching profession).
4. **Teaching profession:** those teaching values representative of organizations "outside" the local school system under the assumption of being "professional."

5. **School bureaucracy:** those teaching values representative of the administration and hierarchical organization of the local school system under the assumption of being "professional."

**Operational Hypotheses**

The operational hypothesis of the study was: Teacher role expectations of prospective and first-year secondary teachers in one teacher education program are related to their value orientations toward the school bureaucracy and the teaching profession as measured by the Teacher Value Orientation Questionnaire. Responses on the questionnaire are dependent upon the subjects' level of teacher education experience.

To simplify this hypothesis, the following subhypotheses were constructed:

**Subhypothesis I:** Prospective secondary teachers, upon entrance into a teacher education program, define their role expectations in relationship to that of the school bureaucracy.

**Subhypothesis II:** Prospective secondary teachers, prior to student teaching, define their role expectations in relationship to that of the teaching profession.

**Subhypothesis III:** Prospective secondary teachers, immediately after student teaching, define their role expectations in relationship to that of the teaching profession.

**Subhypothesis IV:** First-year secondary teachers, upon completion of the equivalent of one university quarter of actual teaching, define
their role expectations in relationship to that of the school bureaucracy.

**TABLE 1**

**PREDICTED NATURE OF PERCEIVED TEACHING ROLE EXPECTATIONS TO VALUE ORIENTATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beginning Student</th>
<th>Pre-Student Teaching</th>
<th>Student Teacher</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucracy</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The rationale for the above categorization was as follows:

(a) Secondary students who have had no education coursework and have been exposed to a minimal amount of educational theory perceived teacher roles in relationship to their own experience, as that of a student. They have not had any confrontation with teacher role diversity or the expansive nature of teacher roles. Therefore, they perceived teachers' roles more narrowly defined toward the bureaucracy.

(b) Secondary students, who have completed their education coursework, have been exposed for a considerable period of time to educational theory and the roles professional organizations play in defining the "professional" teacher. They were preparing to student teach and defined their expected teaching roles in terms of a professional orientation, irrespective of bureaucratic influences.

(c) Secondary students, who have completed their education coursework and the equivalent of one quarter's experience in student teaching,
have been exposed to educational theory and actual clinical experience. Because of the temporary nature of the experience, student teaching did not reflect an actual teacher's experience and the student still perceived his role expectations in relationship to the profession.

(d) New secondary teachers, after experiencing the equivalent of one quarter of actual teaching, changed their role expectations, taking into account the influence of the bureaucratic system in which they work. Therefore, they defined their role expectations in relationship to the bureaucracy with which they had the closest contact.

Subhypothesis V: Role conflict is found in persons who perceive their role expectations based on value orientations to both the bureaucracy and the profession. Of the four groups studied, teachers with actual teaching experience exhibit more role conflict than the other three groups.

Role conflict occurred when a person chose both a bureaucratic and a professional orientation toward a selected teaching situation on the Teacher Value Orientation Questionnaire.

TABLE 2
PREDICTED NATURE OF RESPONSES TO ROLE CONFLICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Beginning Student</th>
<th>Pre-Student Teacher</th>
<th>Student Teacher</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rationale for role conflict.--It was hypothesized that three of the four subgroups studied would indicate a lower role conflict response than the fourth group, the teachers. This was based on the fact that none of the first three groups had experienced actual teaching conditions, even those who had student taught. There were influences on the practicing teacher which a student teacher never received, such as hiring procedures, salary negotiations, etc.

Therefore, it was hypothesized that only the new teachers would exhibit a higher degree of role conflict in their response on the questionnaire.

Variables for analysis.--The independent variables in the study were (a) the groups, i.e., beginning students, pre-student teachers, student teachers and teachers, and (b) the subjects' demographic variables studied, i.e., QCA (quality credit average), sex, hometown type and discipline.

The dependent variables were: (a) teacher value orientations of the new entrees into the secondary teacher education program; (b) teacher value orientations of pre-student teachers; (c) teacher value orientations of student teachers; (d) teacher value orientations of first-year teachers after completing the equivalent of one university quarter teaching; (e) teacher role conflict experienced by any participant of the above described groups. All dependent variables were measured by the Teacher Value Orientation Questionnaire.

Methodology.--Methodological descriptions of design, data collection, analysis and interpretation are detailed in Chapter III. Particular attention was focused on development of a questionnaire to assess
bureaucratic and professional values in secondary education students and teachers. The developed instrument provided the basis for making judgments about the nature and extent of role conflict in the population studied.

Restatement of the Problem

This study investigated the role expectations of four specific subgroups of secondary teachers and prospective secondary teachers from one college of education. Each group represented different levels of teaching and preservice education experience.

The role expectations were centered on two definitional categories: (a) teacher roles relating to the school bureaucracy, and (b) teacher roles relating to the teaching profession.

Questions of relevance to the study were:

1. Do prospective secondary teachers enrolled in teacher education programs define their teacher role expectations in relationship to the bureaucracy or the profession?

2. Do first-year secondary teachers with one quarter teaching experience define their teacher role expectations in relationship to the bureaucracy or the profession?

3. Do prospective teachers change their role expectations after experiencing the realities of teaching?

4. Does role conflict develop in any of the four subgroups because of the influence exerted by secondary teacher education experiences?

Overview of the Organization of the Study

The study involved a systematic, exploratory inquiry into the role expectations of teachers held by four subgroups, each subgroup representing differing levels of teacher education experience.
As evidenced in Chapter II, "Review of Related Literature," much has been written concerning the concept of role and its development. Of major importance in this chapter was the significance roles and role expectations play in determining the characteristics of performance of that position. It was significant to note the disparity that occurred if role expectations were not met with accurate role reality.

Also reviewed in Chapter II are various theoretical concepts dealing with values. These values were specifically tied to those of the bureaucracy versus those of the profession. This section established the conceptual framework for the study.

This chapter, by its very nature, substantiated the need for this exploratory investigation into teacher role expectations in relationship to values based on the bureaucracy and/or the profession, and provided a theoretical framework for the study.

In Chapter III, "Design of the Study," a thorough, step-by-step plan is laid out for the investigative stage of the study.

Explicitly stated are the operational hypotheses which the study investigated, along with procedures for testing these hypotheses.

Included in Chapter III are discussions describing the development of the Value Orientation Matrix which provided the foundation for the development of the instrument used.

The procedural section describes the planned methodology for the collection and the analysis of data.

The development of the Teacher Value Orientation Questionnaire is described in detail along with the measures used to test its validity and reliability.
Chapter IV, "Analysis of Data," describes the methodology for the analysis of data; tables describing the data, and the results and findings from such analyses are included.

The last chapter, Chapter V, "Conclusions and Implications," contains a summary of the purposes and procedures of the study, conclusions based on the findings, implications of the study to the teacher education program at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, and implications of the study for future research in teacher education.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Role Concepts Defined

The first step in presenting the theoretical base for the study consists of a description of role, role expectations, and role conflict, as these terms are used in the study. The focus is on inter-role conflict (Kahn, 1964). This involves conflict resulting from pressures applied to teachers as a result of their membership in two different organizations—in this case, the school bureaucracy and professional organizations.

Elements ascribed to role. In considering the concept, role conflict as it applies to this study, it is necessary to specify certain elements ascribed to role: (1) a position; (2) its situational context; (3) its expectations; (4) the incumbent's behavior (Gross, 1958, pp. 48-67).

Braga (1972) defines a role as: (1) a behavioral repertoire characteristic of a person or position; (2) a set of standards, descriptions, norms, or concepts held by anyone for the behavior of a person or position; (3) a position.

Reitman (1971) defines the concept of role as generally meaning a set of evaluative standards, normative expectations, or rights and duties held by members of a social system regarding the behavior of
individuals who occupy various ascribed or achieved positions, or statuses, in that system.

All persons have various roles. It is determining these roles and becoming aware of roles and what to expect from each role that is difficult. Often role conflict develops if the reality of the role does not reflect the role expectation.

Lieberman (1956), in his study of factory workers, hypothesized that people who are placed in a role will tend to take on or develop attitudes that are congruent with the expectation associated with that role. His findings supported his hypotheses and further adds to the fundamental theory of the investigation. The role of a student and the role of a teacher leads to differences in expectation of teaching roles.

**Focal position: teacher.**—In the study, the focal position is the perceived role of a teacher held by prospective and first-year teachers from one teacher education program.

**Situational context: bureaucracy and profession.**—The situational context relates to change affecting the two subsystems in which the potential teacher is located, the school bureaucracy and the teaching profession.

**Role expectations: personal and perceived.**—The third element of role and the most significant for analyzing role conflict is role expectations—how an individual should behave in a given position. Expectations constitute appropriate evaluative norms applied to or held for the occupant of a focal position either by the person himself or by
other significant persons. These normative rights and duties define within limits what a person should or should not do so long as he is the incumbent of a particular institutional role (Lipham, 1965, p. 29).

Garland (1968) defines role expectations in terms of the behaviors expected of position incumbents, not in terms of observed behaviors. Soles (1964) similarly defines role expectations as a set of beliefs regarding appropriate behavior for a particular position in a social structure.

The study will consider the personal role expectations of prospective and first-year teachers.

Role Conflict Defined

Role conflict forms one of the dependent variables in the study. It is limited to a measure of perceived not actual conflict. Two questions, then, arise regarding role theory: First, what constitutes role conflict generally and, which type of role conflict is specific to the focal person in this study? Further, what is the significance of the qualification, "perceived" role conflict? Role conflict can arise from incompatibility of role expectations; or from simultaneous occupancy of two conflicting roles. Parson's definition of role conflict includes both situations: "the exposure of an actor to conflicting sets of legitimized role expectations such that complete fulfillment of both is realistically impossible" (1966, p. 257). Role conflict, he claims, is inherent in a situation involving a plurality of roles or role expectations.

In this study, the concept of role conflict is operationally defined in terms of responses by respondents to the questionnaire. The questionnaire
is designed to elicit responses in one of two directions: bureaucratic or professional. A respondent who perceives one situation in a bureaucratic orientation, and later responds in a professional orientation to the same or similar situation, is said to exhibit role conflict for that situation. This concept is later defined in more detail in Chapter IV.

Kahn's theoretical model.—For an adequate understanding of role conflict related to this study, Kahn's theoretical model of role conflict seems most appropriate (1966, p. 280). This paradigm depicts role conflict in terms of the experience and the response of role senders and a focal person in an actual conflict situation. Experience takes the form of expectations, perceptions, and evaluations. These combine to form role demands constituting objective role conflict and ambiguity. Pressure is then exerted on a focal person who experiences psychological conflict, ambiguity, and perception of role and role senders.

Braga's teaching role conflict.—Braga defines role conflict or role strain as: (1) inconsistent prescriptions (or other standards) held for a person by himself or by one or more others; (2) the attribution of inconsistent prescription (or standards) to others, applicable to oneself; (3) feelings of unease resulting from the existence or assumption of inconsistent prescriptions (or standards) (1972, p. 55).

He further emphasizes that the education student is prepared for a teaching role, and though he many be aware of the other demands that will be made upon him in an actual teaching situation, they create no
conflict for him while he is still a student. Classroom teachers, on the other hand, confront the conflict situation; and although some still maintain their earlier ideals and attempt to change the system, the approach of many is to work within it.

All these types of role conflict have in common one major characteristic: members of a role set exert role pressures to change the behavior or viewpoint of a focal person. When such pressures are generated and "sent," they do not enter an otherwise empty field; the focal person is already in role, already behaving, already maintaining some kind of balance among the disparate forces and motives which he experiences (Kahn, 1964).

It would seem apparent, then, that role conflict may develop because of the following: (1) unrealistic role expectations developed by the prospective teacher; (2) lack of awareness of roles to be experienced as a teacher; (3) change in roles in the system for which the beginning teacher is not prepared; (4) incongruency between the role expectations of the teacher and other significant perceivers of teacher roles.

Relationship to Teacher Education

Braga (1972) notes that students preparing for a career in teaching perceive their future roles in the most idealistic terms. Therefore, Stanley (1968) argues that the first task of modern teacher education institutions is to investigate and analyze the role expectations and contradictions currently confronting both beginning and experienced teachers.
Sorenson (1963) maintains that the first step in predicting teacher effectiveness, therefore, should be the development of a measure to identify and study different role expectations of teachers.

In a study of congruency of perceptions about teachers' roles held by teachers of teachers and classroom teachers, Drabick (1967) found a sufficient degree of dissimilarity to conclude that teacher education programs often operate to increase teacher role strain rather than prevent or decrease it—sometimes to the point of being a major cause of early departure from teaching.

**Focus of Study: "Received Role"**

Because this study regards the bureaucratic and professional role expectations from the vantage point of that perceived by potential role incumbents, it focuses not on the objective organization and environment, but on the representation of the objective social environment in the psychological environment. "The objective organization and psychological organization of a person may or may not be congruent, depending on his ability and opportunity to perceive organizational reality" (Kahn, 1964, p. 16). In other words, it is not the sent role consisting of the pressures that are communicated by members of the potential teacher's role set on which this study concentrates, but rather the received role which consists of perceptions and cognitions of what is sent.

**Perception: a significant concept.—**Perception is essential in the application of role theory (Blumer, 1969). In a given role, an individual tends to behave according to his perception of the expectations
of others. The way a person attempts to structure his social reality is influenced by his personal characteristics, experience, education, apprenticeship, and motivation (Levinson, 1963). Thus, a person "sees" what he is perceptually prepared to see. His perception of the expectations of others is influenced also by his own self-concept and his personal needs at the time.

**Personal role expectations.**—From the process of socialization, a person acquires values and expectations for his own role—an occupational self-identity (Kahn, 1964, p. 17). Each person, moreover, brings to a particular social situation his own set of value orientations. In the face of conflicting expectations, a person must choose between a limited set of incompatible alternatives. Parsons (1951, pp. 280-2) points out, however, that the individual must perceive the expectations as incompatible before the situation becomes problematic. Therefore, the place to begin analyzing social interaction is in the individual's orientation to a particular situation.

**Primary and secondary focus.**—Empirical evidence has been found (Stouffer, 1949; Prince, 1957; Merton, 1966; Foskett, 1967) to support the theory outlined above. This study concentrates on inter-role conflict as the primary source of role change and role conflict, comparing and contrasting the expectations of the bureaucratic and professional role sets.

**Values: A Theoretical Concept Defined**

At this point in the study, therefore, it seems necessary to turn to a theoretical consideration of the concept—values. This section intends to serve two purposes:
1. To define value and value orientation;
2. To delimit the study to a consideration of the bureaucratic and professional values as they relate to the secondary teacher's role in schools.

Within this theoretical framework, whether or not a conflict of values constitutes confusion in expectations of appropriate role is explored, along with the extent and force of this confusion in defining teacher roles.

Values defined.—The term "value" is multiple and complex in meaning. Morris (1956, pp. 9-12) makes three distinctions among values. He refers to operative, conceived and object values. The first limits values to preferential behavior; the second to preferential behavior based on conceptions of the desirable (Kluckhohn, 1951, p. 422); the third, to what is desirable whether or not it is preferred. This study limits itself to the middle position—values as conceptions of the desirable influencing selective behavior (Williams, 1968, p. 283). In this context, a value means that a potential teacher holds a persisting belief that a certain mode of conduct or end-state of existence is "better" than other modes of conduct or end-states or existence, both for himself and for society (Rokeach, 1968, p. 160).

Values as standards.—According to this definition, an internalized value becomes a criterion that guides behavior and the development of attitudes toward objects and situations relevant to that value. Thus, values as standards serve three purposes:
1. To justify one's attitudes and actions as well as those of others;

2. To make moral judgments about oneself and others and for comparing oneself to others;

3. To influence the values, attitudes, and activities of others who are susceptible to influence, e.g., students.

Values as means and ends.——This definition distinguishes between preferred modes of behavior and preferable end-states, that is, objects valued as means and those valued as ends (Rokeach, 1968, p. 160). Inconsistencies can exist between these two levels. As cultural shifts take place, some inconsistencies become evident. Inconsistency among end-states, however, can cause more serious problems for the individual in the form of identity confusion with subsequent role conflict. This study, therefore, measures consistency in the values of the potential and first-year teacher in relationship to their value orientations toward the local bureaucracy and the teaching profession.

Williams (1968) provides the definition which encompasses three essential elements of the evaluative system: (1) the cognitive—"conceptions"; (2) the affective—"desirable"; (3) the conative—"selective behavior." Throughout this paper, the last two terms are not considered as the affective and conative and are not an aspect of concern to this study. Of concern are those perceptions of teacher roles held by prospective teachers.

Cognitive: "what is".——The term "conceptions" designates a cognitive structure. A value is understood as a logical construct
distinct from the perceived objects from which it is inferred. It defines, in the mind of the person, the "desirable"—what is good, beautiful, or true. Based on the propositions about the nature of "what is," this kind of value is not only normative but existential as well. While not always verbalized, it must be expressable (Kluckhohn, 1951, pp. 397-8). A value must also be considered justifiable on moral, aesthetic, or rational grounds. Not strictly ideals, values are ideas formulating action commitments (Kluckhohn, 1951, p. 396).

Value orientations.—From an empirical standpoint, a constancy of response occurs among persons who interact in the same social system. Their evaluations of events and phenomena conform to a general pattern possessing a degree of consistency (Albert, 1968). This consistency is related primarily to self-esteem, that is, consistency with the group's historical past (Deutsch, Krauss, and Rosenau, 1962) and, secondarily, with logic or with reality (Rokeach, 1968, p. 164). The most comprehensive definition of this concept is provided by Florence Kluckhohn and Fred Strodtbeck:

Value orientations are complex but definitely patterned (rank-ordered) principles, resulting from the transactional interplay of three analytically distinguishable elements of the evaluative process—the cognitive, the affective, and the directive elements—which give order and direction to the overflowing stream of human acts and thoughts as these relate to the solution of "common human" problems (1961).

The concept of value system and value orientation emphasize direction as well as structure. Operationally, value system is conceived as a hierarchical organization of values in terms of their importance (Rokeach, 1968, p. 161). More abstractly, Albert (1968)
describes it as a "summative construct in which the diverse value sets of individuals and groups are related or complimentary elements of a single system" (p. 228). Although derived from observations of conduct, a value system does not refer to actual conduct. Rather, it is a "system of criteria by which conduct is judged and sanction applied" (Albert, 1968, p. 288).

**Bureaucratic Value Orientation**

The school system has certain vested interests in instilling in its teachers its own definition of "professional." Its unique political structure and bureaucratic structure allow it to be a restraining force upon teachers who may not meet its standards of "professional."

Often, these standards are in direct conflict with those of the professional organization; i.e., limits of decision-making power. Because of the closeness of the bureaucratic school organization to the teacher, the local system may often take precedence over the more distantly perceived professional organization. After all, it is the bureaucracy which controls hiring and firing of teachers, not the teaching profession.

The question again arises as to what role the teacher plays in this type of situation. It is important to note that such a situation does occur and may lead to teacher role conflict and/or change in teacher role expectations.

**Organization: defined.** Organizations, which Weber (1952) referred to as bureaucracies, set norms and needs to enforce them; they have rules and regulations and issue orders, which must be obeyed if the organization
is to function effectively. To a degree, an organization can rely on its power to make the participant obey. That is, it can use some of its resources to reward those who follow its rulings and penalize those who do not. Such discipline does not require that the recipient of the order agree with it, and certainly not that he accept it as morally justified. He may follow an order to avoid loss of money or prestige and to increase his income or status. To some extent, the organization can maintain discipline by manipulating various rewards and sanctions in order to ensure maximum contentment and minimize disappointment (Etzioni, 1964).

The bureaucratic structure.--Weber (1947) spells out detailed features of the bureaucratic structure.

1. A continuous organization of official functions bound by rules.
2. A specific sphere of competence.
3. The organization of offices follows the principle of hierarchy.
4. The rules which regulate the conduct of an office may be technical rules or norms.
5. It is a matter of principle that members of the administrative staff should be completely separated from ownership of the means of production or administration.
6. In order to enhance this organizational freedom, the resources of the organization have to be free of any outside control and the positions cannot be monopolized by any incumbent.
7. Administrative acts, decisions, and rules are formulated and recorded in writing.
Weber sees the high rationality of the bureaucratic structure as fragile; it needs to be constantly protected against external pressures to safeguard the autonomy required if it is to be kept closely geared to its goals.

Numbers (3) and (6) above point to a definite characterization of teaching relevant to this study. Not only are teachers hired into a hierarchical structure, but this structure must be free from any outside control, such as professional organizations, teacher unions, etc.

**Organizational control.**—The means of control applied to an organization can be classified into three analytical categories: (a) physical, (b) material, and (c) symbolic.

The threat to use physical sanctions on persons not obeying rules is the most obvious control.

Material rewards consist of goods and services, such as salaries.

The granting of symbols includes normative symbols, those of prestige and esteem; and social symbols, those of love and acceptance. Normative power is exercised by those in higher ranks to control the lower ranks directly and indirectly (Etzioni, 1964, p. 61).

The bureaucratically structured public secondary school systems rely on material and normative control mechanisms. This is evidenced in the determination of teacher salary and rank, and also teacher placement on school committees, department chairmanship, and so on.

**Bureaucratic versus professional authority.**—Bureaucratic control assumes a power hierarchy. Without a clear ordering of higher and lower ranks, in which the higher in rank have more power than the lower ones
and hence can control and coordinate the latter's activities, the basic principle of bureaucracy is violated. However, knowledge is individual; it can be transferred from one person to another. Creativity is basically individual and can only to a limited degree be ordered and coordinated by the superior in rank.

At the top of a bureaucracy's highly differentiated hierarchy is a group charged with the responsibility of coordinating the entire organization. In some cases, members of this group have backgrounds in the same field as those of the employed professional, though they ordinarily possess a different set of skills—the ability to plan and organize.

The managerial orientation stresses control. During his career, the administrator becomes "conditioned" to accepting a vertical authority structure and seeks to legitimize its existence by citing the need to control. The professionals as individuals, and because of the nature of their work, seem unreasonably resistant to administrative control (Abrahamson, 1967).

Students of the professions have pointed out that the autonomy granted to professionals who are basically responsible to their consciences is necessary for effective professional work. Only if immune from ordinary bureaucratic pressures and free to innovate, to experiment, to take risks without the usual social repercussions of failure, can a professional carry out his work effectively. It is this highly individualized principle which is diametrically opposed to the very essence of the organizational principle of control and coordination by superiors (Etzioni, 1964).
Professional authority in bureaucratic organizations.--When people with strong professional orientations take over managerial roles, a conflict between organizational goals and professional goals usually occurs (Homans, 1950).

In full-fledged professional organizations, bureaucrats are in charge of secondary activities. Final decisions are in the hands of the various professionals and their decision-making bodies. Unlike in the professional organization, a teacher who is professionally oriented may find conflict in his role in the bureaucratic organization.

Professional Value Orientation

Profession: defined. -- "A profession traditionally renders a public service in return for which the public gives the profession a mandate to control admission and expulsion from the profession" (Coleman, 1963, p. 20).

A profession, as defined by Lieberman (1956) has the following characteristics:

1. A unique, definite and essential social service;
2. An emphasis upon intellectual technique in performing its services;
3. A long period of specialized training;
4. A broad range of autonomy for both the individual practitioners and for the occupation as a whole;
5. Acceptance by practitioners of broad personal responsibilities for judgments made;
6. An emphasis upon the services to be rendered, rather than the economic gain to the practitioners;
Education as a profession.—Accordingly, teaching lacks specific qualities which would embody the entire list above. However, it is argued that enough of these characteristics are met in order to classify it as a profession, or semi-profession (Etzioni, 1964).

For example, some educators argue that teachers are not allowed entrance into the profession by a self-governing organization of practitioners. However, state superintendents of education are often practitioners who influence certification policies, thereby meeting the criteria questioned.

At the 111th Annual National Education Association Convention held in 1973, a new concept of professionalism was proposed by Helen D. Wise (1973). She charged that the:

- dedicated, quiescent, compliant teacher is no longer considered professional. He is no longer automatically a professional because he is a teacher. He is a professional because he commands the respect of his peers, his students, and his community. He has earned that respect because he is better prepared. He has more expert knowledge about the subject he teaches than the school board member who seeks to rule him. He is determined to be involved in policy decisions which affect his welfare as well as his teaching conditions, and most importantly, because he wants a career as a teacher, knowing that to work in the classroom with children is the most important factor of the educational profession.

- Teachers must be adamant about improving education for all children. They must convince the public that it is very right and very professional for teachers and teacher organizations to stand up for what is best for education and the children we teach. In fact, it is my conviction that to do otherwise is very unprofessional.

The professional organization appears to be arguing for a change in scope in relation to the teacher's outlook on teaching. The provincial
outlook of dedication to the local system needs to change to a more cosmopolitan orientation, encompassing the entire educational system. They are in essence asking teachers to structure their value orientations so as to allow the profession to be as valued as the bureaucratic organization within which the teacher more closely functions.

Responsibilities of professional teachers. — Dorros (1968, p. 3) lays out the ten professional responsibilities of teachers:

1. Cooperative determination of goals of education;
2. Adoption, observance and enforcement of a code of ethics;
3. Research and accumulation of professional procedures;
4. Education in professional procedures;
5. Accreditation of professional schools;
6. Recruitment, selection, and orientation of candidates for the profession;
7. Certification of members of the profession;
8. Maintenance of economic welfare;
9. Maintenance of a desirable work climate;
10. Maintenance of effective professional organizations.

Argumentative in nature, the above list is obtuse and ill-defined. Local school bureaucracies may perceive one set of characteristics for each responsibility, while professional organizations may perceive opposing characteristics.

It is this discrepancy which has caused education to be plagued with unspecificity in its role definition of a "professional teacher."
Teacher Education in Role Development

As explained by Conant (1964) programs in general education and teacher education assume the following pattern: (a) first two years academic required courses; (b) last two years entrance into specialty. Most teacher education programs have the following constants as prescribed by state certification boards: (1) educational psychology; (2) methods courses; (3) school and community courses; (4) practice teaching.

Edelfelt (1972) challenges the rationale of general education programs based on the following reasons.

(1) Most undergraduate and graduate professional study in education is in the context of the self-contained classroom, and largely oriented to standard academic subjects.

(2) Students preparing to teach and teachers in schools represent middle America. They tend to be conformists and are forced into being conservative, middle-class models for the young to emulate.

(3) Helping neophytes to learn to teach is undertaken largely through telling and showing how it should be done. Teacher education rarely includes a rigorous analysis of teaching.

(4) Little has been done about defining and demonstrating new teaching roles. The literature presents some models, most of which emphasize levels of a teaching hierarchy. Almost nothing exists on different orders of teaching; that is, roles that differ without necessarily being more or less difficult, responsible, or prestigious.

Turner (1971) raises the question concerning the amount of time a preservice teacher typically devotes to his pedagogical studies. He
estimates that about half their time is spent on theoretical materials. It is peculiar that so little research has been done to find out the utility of theoretical knowledge in the teacher's work.

Studies are lacking in which systematic observation is used to assess the effect of experience on attitudes and values. Yet, it is the behavioral component of an attitude that is of prime concern for many attitudinal objectives in teacher education.

Pyatte (1972) maintains that one of the most frustrating problems faced by teachers of teachers is that of communicating the concrete elements of teaching through the pallid abstractions commonly used in methods classes. Student teachers continue to express the feeling that the abstract experiences they have in methods courses bear little or no relation to the realities of teaching.

Bosco (1972) describes 300 interviews with students in 13 institutions and reports that the majority of students were greatly critical of their professional training.

In summary, this chapter theoretically established that values are an important aspect in the development of teacher role expectations. Lieberman's study (1956) pointed out how roles change dependent on the type of expectation associated with the role. Unfortunately, a thorough search of the literature did not produce any similar studies dealing with role expectations of teachers and their respective value orientations. Therefore, one of the purposes of this chapter was to present not only a general understanding of values and role expectations, but also their specific relationships to bureaucratic and professional value orientations of teachers. For this purpose, a search of the literature conceptually
established each of these orientations and substantiated present concerns about teacher education, supported the need for this study, and validated the second purpose of a review of the literature.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

This research study examined teacher value orientation toward the school bureaucracy and the teaching profession and its relationship to teacher education experience. Of the four groups studied, three represented prospective teachers in a teacher education program and the fourth represented first-year teacher graduates of that same program who had taught for ten weeks, or one university quarter. To examine the relationship, an instrument was designed and administered to the four groups listed below.

1. Beginning secondary education students enrolled in their first education course in the College of Education, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia. Only those students concentrating in science, mathematics, English and social studies education were considered. They were enrolled in either EDCI 3000, Social Foundations of Education, or EDCI 3001, Psychological Foundations of Education.

2. Pre-student teaching students enrolled at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University preparing to student teach in their major area of concentration: science, mathematics, English and social studies.

3. Student teachers preparing to graduate upon completion of student teaching. Only those students concentrating in science, mathematics,
English and social studies education in the College of Education, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University were considered.

4. Newly graduated first-year certified secondary teachers who had taught one quarter in either science, mathematics, English or social studies. Only those teachers who graduated from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University's College of Education, Blacksburg, Virginia, were considered.

These four established groups represented differing levels of teacher education experience. The assumption was made that all four groups would be exposed to generally the same broad teacher education experience by the time they actually taught in the classroom.

**Description of the Questionnaire**

The questionnaire was divided into four parts: (1) Part I, general background information of the respondent; (2) Part II, measurement of bureaucratic role expectations; (3) Part III, measurement of professional role expectations; and (4) Part IV, measurement of teacher role conflict.

**Part I, general background.**—Participants were asked to respond to a set of questions describing themselves in relationship to their education and background: (1) sex; (2) age; (3) marital status; (4) area of speciality; (5) teaching level or expected teaching level; (6) for the students, classification by year at the university; (7) QCA; (8) the type of community they were from, e.g., rural, urban or suburban.

**Parts II and III, measurement of bureaucratic and professional (non-bureaucratic) role expectations.**—From 66 items, developed from
constructs of bureaucratic and professional value orientations, a panel of 10 judges identified 26 items and categorized them as either bureaucratic or professional. Twenty of the items were paired as bureaucratic or professional. Four of the unpaired items were also bureaucratic, while the remaining two unpaired items were professional.

Based upon the judges' perceptions, the purest form of any subject's possible response toward a bureaucratic orientation would (a) respond to all 26 items, (b) respond so that the 20 paired items reflected 10 bureaucratic and 10 non-professional responses, and (c) respond so that the 6 unpaired items reflected 4 bureaucratic and 2 non-professional responses.

To refine and compute the data according to the actual population studied, a bureaucratic/non-bureaucratic scale was established. The degree of bureaucratic value orientation was thus the total number of items selected as bureaucratic by the subjects. Therefore, this study was confined to the actual range of demonstrated bureaucratic responses. Analysis of the data, Chapter IV, further explains the results of this refinement.

Part IV, measurement of teacher role conflict. -- A second analysis was run to determine the extent to which paired bureaucratic versus professional items, identified by the panel of judges, discriminated actual role conflict in the population under study. Role conflict occurred if the respondent answered the pair of opposite value orientations in the same manner, either positively or negatively, under a forced choice condition.
Development of the Questionnaire

Development of the questionnaire followed a systematic pattern of construction which would insure that the selected items represented situations that teachers perform in their classrooms.

Matrix development.—The first step in the development of the questionnaire was a thorough search of the literature, outlined in Chapter II, relating to bureaucratic and professional characteristics of systems and individuals. From this information, criteria for the Value Orientation Matrix were established which characterized opposing role orientations toward a bureaucracy and a profession. (See Table 3.) Role orientations relating to the bureaucracy were based upon value descriptions of institutional models and their corresponding role demands. Role orientations relating to the profession were based upon value descriptions of professional models and their corresponding role demands.

For each bureaucratic characteristic selected, an opposing professional characteristic was defined. Therefore, from the literature the characteristics of the two opposing value orientations were established.

This matrix formed the conceptual basis for development of the questionnaire.

Item development.—The second step in the development of the instrument was to devise items which represented both types of characteristics found on the Value Orientation Matrix. The items also had to represent roles and role situations faced by secondary classroom
### TABLE 3

**VALUE ORIENTATION MATRIX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bureaucratic Orientation</th>
<th>Professional Orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Follows the rules as set by the principal as official authority of the school (Weber, 1952)</td>
<td>1. Follows the ethical rules as set by the profession (Lieberman, 1956)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Obeys the line of organization in the school, e.g., administration (Weber, 1952)</td>
<td>2. Does not feel compelled to obey those in authority (Etzioni, 1964)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Wants rules and regulations impersonal and impartial (Weber, 1952)</td>
<td>3. Wants rules and regulations to fit the situation (Lieberman, 1956)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Realizes the expertise of the teacher cannot be challenged by outside individuals (Weber, 1952)</td>
<td>4. Realizes the expertise of the teacher can be challenged by outside individuals (Lieberman, 1956)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Feels responsibility to discuss client's concern with those in authority if asked (Etzioni, 1964)</td>
<td>5. Feels the client information is privileged information (Lieberman, 1956)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Understands that decisions concerning the school are made by a few (Michels, 1949)</td>
<td>6. Understands that decisions concerning the school are made by the most capable, including the teachers (Etzioni, 1964)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Accepts that decisions are permanent (Michels, 1949)</td>
<td>7. Accepts that decision arrangements may be challenged or changed (Etzioni, 1964)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Follows rules for the good of order even if intent of rules is questionable (Merton, 1966)</td>
<td>8. Follows rules unless the intent of rules is questionable (Abrahamson, 1967)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Concerns are centered mostly on internal problems (provincialism) (Selznick, 1964)</td>
<td>9. Concerns are centered mostly on external problems (cosmopolitanism) (Lieberman, 1956)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bureaucratic Orientation</th>
<th>Professional Orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Understands that the most knowledgeable are at the top of the organization (Etzioni, 1964)</td>
<td>10. Understands that the most knowledgeable are at the center of the organization, e.g., teachers (Etzioni, 1964)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

These 10 characteristics represent value orientations of bureaucracies and professions. They are applied from general theory to fit into a school characterization. Those orientations classified as "bureaucratic" are represented in diametrically opposing characteristics as "professional." This can be substantiated from the literature. Etzioni (1964, p. 134) states it clearly:

"It is this highly individualized principle (professionalism) which is diametrically opposed to the very essence of the organizational principle of control and coordination by superiors—i.e., the principle of administrative authority."
teachers. Five areas of concern for the secondary classroom teacher were identified as representative of teacher roles:

1. Responsibilities in dealing with school rules and regulations;
2. Responsibilities in dealing with curriculum;
3. Responsibilities in dealing with students;
4. Responsibilities in dealing with instructional methods; and
5. Responsibilities in dealing with parents.

For each characteristic on the Value Orientation Matrix, both professional and bureaucratic, an item was constructed based on the above five secondary teacher role situations. In some instances, development of an item that included both the role situation and the Matrix classification was not possible. Also, duplication of items often occurred. After elimination of duplications, a total of 66 items were developed. (See Appendix A.)

Initial item selection.—In order that content validity could be established, the 66 items were submitted to a panel of judges for classification. The judges were selected on the following criteria:

1. Previously taught in a public or private school classroom situation.
2. Having experience in other types of educational roles outside the classroom, such as administrator or supervisor.
3. Presently involved in some type of teacher education situation, such as professor, administrator, etc., in the College of Education, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia.

The judges were asked to select and categorize items which, in their opinions, reflected either bureaucratic orientation of secondary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority Number</th>
<th>Dept. in College of Education</th>
<th>Predominant Type of Previous Experience</th>
<th>Years of Experience in Public Schools (+/– 8 yr.)</th>
<th>Years of Age (+/– 35 yr.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>+35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Community College</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>+8</td>
<td>+35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Curriculum &amp; Instruction</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>+8</td>
<td>+35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Curriculum &amp; Instruction</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Curriculum &amp; Instruction</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>+8</td>
<td>+35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Curriculum &amp; Instruction</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>+8</td>
<td>+35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
teachers, a professional orientation of secondary teachers, or those items that seemed ambiguous, poorly constructed, or not to differentiate at all. Only those items which received an 80 percent agreement to one categorization by the judges were retained; those that failed to reach this criterion were eliminated along with those items which were not perceived as fitting into either a bureaucratic or professional classification. (See Table 5.)

**Results of Judges' Classification of Items**

Initially selected for the original Teacher Value Orientation Questionnaire were 10 paired items. (See Appendix B.) Unpaired items which met the 80 percent criterion mentioned above, but whose opposing paired item failed to meet the criterion, were also incorporated in the revised questionnaire. This raised the total number of items on the questionnaire to 26: 10 paired and 6 unpaired. (See Table 6.)

**Composition of the questionnaire.--**The 26 items selected for the questionnaire were placed so as not to influence any set type of response pattern. Response to the items demanded a forced choice, either agreement to the statement as indicated by a check in the "yes" box, or disagreement to the statement as indicated by a check in the "no" box. (See Appendix C.)

The questionnaire included an introductory information cover sheet containing the following information:

1. A short description of the study;

2. Specific instructions for filling out and returning the questionnaire;
### TABLE 5

**RESULTS OF JUDGES' CLASSIFICATION OF ITEMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Label</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>Item Label</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>NC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>BB</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>EE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>GG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**  
- B = Bureaucratic Classification;  
P = Professional Classification;  
NC = No Classification.
### Table 6

**SELECTED ITEM RELATIONSHIP TO VALUE ORIENTATION MATRIX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship to Construct Number on Matrix</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>% Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Bureaucratic Items

| E  | .80        | x | x | x | x |   |   |   |   | x   |
| I  | 1.00       |   |   |   |   | x |   |   |   |     |
| J  | .90        |   |   |   |   | x |   |   |   |     |
| K  | .90        |   |   |   |   |   | x |   |   |     |
| U  | 1.00       | x | x |   | x | x |   |   |   |     |
| V  | 1.00       | x | x | x | x |   |   |   |   |     |
| W  | 1.00       | x | x |   | x | x |   |   |   |     |
| X  | .90        |   |   |   |   |   | x |   |   |     |
| Y  | .80        |   |   |   |   |   |   | x |   |     |
| Z  | .80        |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | x |     |
| EE | .80        |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | x |     |
| N  | .90        |   |   |   |   |   |   | x |   |     |

#### Professional Items
3. Asking for assistance and thanking the participant for his/her cooperation.

Reliability and Validity of the Instrument

Validity.—Administering the questionnaire to one subgroup of the studied population and predetermining from behavioral observation the type of responses they would make on the questionnaire was used to measure the construct validity of the questionnaire. Those participants student teaching at the time they were administered the questionnaire were classified either bureaucratic or professional by their respective supervising graduate teaching assistants (GTAs) who had observed their teaching behavior for one university quarter. The selection of the validation process using graduate teaching assistants was based on the following:

(a) They had little relationship to the school system and would be more objective in their classification.

(b) They observed the student teachers often enough to know the kind of behavior the student teachers exhibited toward their cooperating teachers, students, and the administration of the school.

(c) They could give an independent judgment with little fear, bias or anxiety involved.

The weaknesses of such a validation process are as follows:

(a) Because of the nature of their visits to the student teachers, the supervising graduate teaching assistants could not totally observe each student teacher in all situations.

(b) The student teachers were given grades by the supervising graduate teaching assistants and may have changed their behavior when being observed.

In order to assure that the supervising graduate teaching assistants understood the types of value orientations involved and some of their corresponding characteristics, they were given a Characteristics to
Observe sheet which explained the study and what to look for in the student teachers' behaviors (see Appendix D). Each supervising graduate teaching assistant was responsible only for his/her own student teachers in the discipline that he/she had observed.

Results.—Table 7 represents a cross-tabulation between student teachers' responses on the questionnaire and how they were classified by the GTAs. A total of 35 student teachers were administered the questionnaire.

TABLE 7
CORRELATION OF GTA CLASSIFICATION TO TEACHER VALUE ORIENTATION QUESTIONNAIRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bureaucratic</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A phi coefficient of .493 was obtained which indicated a relationship between the two variables. Because of the nature of the investigation and the type of instrument developed, the correlation coefficient reached was considered adequate for substantiation of the construct validity of the instrument.
Correlation based on an external measure or predictor tends to yield coefficients lower than reliability coefficients (Downie and Heath, 1970). An examination of the research shows that they tend to fall within the band of .40—.60, with a median value of about .50. When ratings are used as criteria, they tend to be unreliable because of the nature of the trait being rated, lack of knowledge of the ratees by the judges, and other errors associated with ratings (Downie and Heath, 1970).

However, an attempt to establish concurrent validity through comparison of the questionnaire and Adorno's F-scale did not reveal the desired relationship. A possible reason for the lack of significance may be that authoritarian beliefs (personal) and bureaucratic characteristics (institutional) may not represent the same value structure. Although this conceptual issue remains, the methodological validity of this questionnaire must also take this result into account.

Reliability.--Since the Teacher Value Orientation Questionnaire was not constructed to yield a single numerical score, common approaches to reliability were questionable. Therefore, an indirect method using a Principal Components Factor Analysis was selected for deriving the reliability coefficient. In this analysis, four factors were identified and the cumulative proportion of the total variance that could be attributed to the four factors was determined. In this study, the multiple correlation coefficient, squared, between the items on the instrument, considered collectively, and the factors, produced a reliability coefficient of .61. In that reliability is defined as the proportion of attributable variance,
this methodology provided an indirect estimate of the reliability in a single observation case.

According to Downie and Heath (1970) there is no hard rule that says any reliability has to be of a certain size before any test or measuring instrument can be useful. The more homogeneous this group, the lower the reliability coefficient. Therefore, a reliability coefficient of .61 for the population studied exceeded a minimal level of acceptance.

**Selection of the Population**

The population under consideration for this study consisted of those persons who met the following criteria:

1. Persons enrolled or having been enrolled in a secondary teacher education program.
2. Persons preparing or having been prepared to become a secondary classroom teacher in a public secondary school system.
3. Persons preparing or having been prepared to become a secondary classroom teacher teaching either mathematics, science, English, or social studies, in a public secondary school system.
4. Persons presently enrolled or having been enrolled and successfully completed the teacher education program in the College of Education, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia.

**Administering the Questionnaire**

At the start of the Fall 1973 school quarter, secondary education students concentrating in science, mathematics, English and social studies,
who were beginning education students enrolled in their first education class, were administered the questionnaire to determine their teacher role expectations.

At the end of the same school quarter, pre-student teachers, student teachers, and first-year teachers from the same secondary education program were administered the questionnaire.

For those students in residence at the university, the questionnaires were administered in their education classes and collected the following class period. The percentage of those returning the questionnaires was dependent upon the type of group responding.

1. Students enrolled in their first education course: 79 percent response.
2. Students preparing to student teach: 87 percent response.

For those teachers not in residence at the university, the questionnaires were mailed to them with a self-addressed stamped envelope. Selection of participants was determined by a stratified randomly selected process based entirely on the teaching disciplines of the respondents. Each discipline was equally represented and all participants in each group had an equal chance of being selected. A total of 68 questionnaires were mailed.

After approximately three weeks, a follow-up letter was mailed to those teachers who had failed to return the questionnaire. Again, a self-addressed envelope was enclosed for the convenience of the respondent. Some of the respondents had to be eliminated because they indicated that since graduation they had not been teaching. Fortunately, this was
applicable in only 10 of the 68 questionnaires mailed. The percentage of return of each group according to the discipline was as follows:

- Mathematics: 59 percent; 10 out of 17
- Science: 41 percent; 7 out of 17
- English: 65 percent; 11 out of 17
- Social Studies: 53 percent; 9 out of 17

The percentage of those having taught one quarter returning the questionnaire was 64 percent. The total response percentage was 55 percent, or 37 out of 68. The response percentage was deemed to meet an acceptable level for data measurement in this type of exploratory research (Kerlinger, 1965).

**Data Analysis Techniques**

Baker's Numerical Taxonomy Package (1972) was selected to determine if the response patterns of the subjects in each of the four groups on the Teacher Value Orientation Questionnaire were similar. The package, originally developed for 64 subjects, was extended to handle 150 subjects. In this technique the subjects are clustered according to their response patterns. Initially, each subject is considered a group (weak clustering) and, through an iterative process, a hierarchical grouping of the subjects is established. This iterative hierarchical grouping is pictorially represented by a dendogram (Baker, 1972).

Crosstabulations were used to further analyze the responses of the four groups on the Teacher Value Orientation Questionnaire. Contingency (C) coefficients were computed and represent the degree of relationship between the responses on the Teacher Value Orientation Questionnaire and the other variables studied. Due to the fact that each of the four groups
was considered a population, testing the statistical significance of the C coefficients was deemed inappropriate. Rather, the observed value of the C coefficient was compared to the maximum value of C coefficient for the given contingency table. The maximum value of a C coefficient for a specific contingency table is given by:

$$\sqrt{\frac{k - 1}{k}}$$

where \( k \) is the smaller number of categories for either of the variables.

The interpretations of the C coefficients in terms of their maximum values was considered analogous to the interpretation of the Pearson \( r \) with the maximum value being \( |1| \). Ranges of values for C coefficients and their respective interpretations for a given maximum value are found in Appendix G.

A similar technique was selected for indicating conflict in responses to paired items on the questionnaire.

**Importance of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to explore data regarding the teacher role expectations of prospective and first-year secondary teachers toward the school bureaucracy and the teaching profession. Role change based on the participant's teacher education experience was investigated. If the study produced evidence of role change or role conflict based on divergent teacher value orientations, the College of Education, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University may want to further investigate teacher role expectations it develops in its secondary education students.
This study may result in raising pertinent questions concerning the development of teacher role expectations in teacher education programs which can be explored in greater depth in future research. From a methodological standpoint, techniques for collection and analysis of data were congruent with recent research developments. Their use might contribute to creation of more refined techniques to overcome the weakness of existing approaches (Erickson, 1967) and to assist in research into teacher education.
The main concern of this study was to investigate the relationship between teacher education experience and the development of role expectations based on value orientations toward the bureaucracy and the profession. The general hypothesis predicted a relationship between the value orientations of the secondary students in the teacher education program at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University and their level of teacher education experience.

Subhypotheses specifically predicted: (1) that beginning secondary education students in the teacher education program would respond more bureaucratically on the Teacher Value Orientation Questionnaire; (2) that pre—student teachers would respond more professionally on the Teacher Value Orientation Questionnaire; (3) that student teachers also would respond more professionally on the Teacher Value Orientation Questionnaire; (4) that teachers, having graduated from the same program and having taught for ten weeks, would respond more bureaucratically on the Teacher Value Orientation Questionnaire; and (5) that teachers would exhibit the highest level of conflict in their responses on the Teacher Value Orientation Questionnaire.

Both generalized and specific research questions, covered in the hypotheses of this study, were analyzed directly and indirectly through
a variety of techniques. Specifically, the process of analyzing the data fell into three stages: (1) determining commonalities found in the response patterns of the subjects; (2) determining the relationship between subject demographic variables and their value orientations; and (3) determining conflict in the responses of the subjects to 10 paired items on the questionnaire.

A dendogram graphically represented commonalities in groups' responses. A specific measure of association, a C coefficient, revealed the strengths of relationships found. The frequency of the conflict responses and their relationship to the various groups was determined.

**Measures of Teacher Education Experience**

The underlying concern of this study was the relationship between teacher education and the development of teacher values. Prediction of expected relationships between the type of subject and the type of value response were made from logical assumptions derived in reviewing the related literature. Related questions were: (1) Do respondents with different levels of teacher education experience in the teacher education program seem to hold teaching values different from beginning education students? (2) If so, do these teaching values tend to be more professional or bureaucratic? (3) Do the values obtained in the teacher education program sustain through the first 10 weeks of actual teaching experience? (4) Do respondents' demographic characteristics influence their teaching values? (5) Do these values seem to relate to role conflict in respect to bureaucratic and professional roles?
Baker's Numerical Taxonomy Package (1972) was used to determine if the subjects formed into four response groups when charted on the dendogram. (See Appendix E.) To accommodate the 150 subject limitation of the program, 28 subjects were randomly eliminated. It was anticipated that these groups would represent different levels of teacher education experience. The graph indicated group formations but not entirely based on the subjects' teacher education experience. Further data analysis as to the nature of these groupings was necessary. On the assumption that the instrument measured the degree of bureaucratic and professional values, further investigation of the relationship between teacher education experience and teacher values indicated a positive relationship.

A direct measure of the degree of professional and bureaucratic orientation was determined by summing the responses across all items on the questionnaire. A low score of 0 represented a professional orientation while a high score of 18 represented a bureaucratic orientation. This range was collapsed into the following response sets:

- 0-3 most professional,
- 4-6 professional,
- 7-9 mixed,
- 10-12 mixed,
- 13-15 bureaucratic,
- 16-18 most bureaucratic.

When interesting relationships occurred, these sets were collapsed further into three set distributions: 0-6 (professional), 7-12 (mixed), and 13-18 (bureaucratic); and two set distributions: 0-9 (professional) and 10-18 (bureaucratic). This gave added insight into response patterns and trends in relationships.
Table 8 presents the data crosstabulated with each type of subgroup. The responses were bureaucratically scaled for ease in computation. Percentages were included in all tables for assistance in examining trends and relationships. Cross-tabulation of the data found in Table 8 generated a C coefficient of .34 with a maximum C of .86, which indicated a moderate degree of association. A closer examination of each subgroup revealed that beginning students responded differently from the other three groups. Correlating the frequency responses of beginning students with the total frequency distribution of responses of the rest of the population generated a C coefficient of .27 with a maximum C of .71 and further substantiated a relationship present. The results of this computation revealed that beginning students were different, or more bureaucratic, in their response patterns than the other subgroups.

An investigation using three subgroups of the population, beginning education students, the remaining teacher education students, and teachers, with a three set frequency distribution (0-6, 7-12, and 13-18) produced a C coefficient of .32 with a maximum C of .81. Again, a positive association with the type of response to the level of teacher education experience was found. These results supported the basic contention of subhypothesis (1).

Although measures of frequency distribution give unusually high values with large populations, the results of this investigation indicated a moderately consistent and positive conclusion: Beginning students, upon entrance into the secondary teacher education program, had different teacher value orientations than those who experienced the teacher education program.
TABLE 8
CROSSTABULATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION SUBGROUPS
WITH THE FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES
ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>Beginning Students</th>
<th>Pre-Student Teachers</th>
<th>Student Teachers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>3(.05)</td>
<td>3(.08)</td>
<td>4(.11)</td>
<td>5(.13)</td>
<td>15(.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>16(.23)</td>
<td>8(.20)</td>
<td>12(.34)</td>
<td>8(.22)</td>
<td>44(.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>28(.39)</td>
<td>19(.49)</td>
<td>12(.34)</td>
<td>14(.38)</td>
<td>73(.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>9(.13)</td>
<td>7(.18)</td>
<td>7(.19)</td>
<td>10(.27)</td>
<td>33(.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-15</td>
<td>6(.09)</td>
<td>2(.05)</td>
<td>1(.02)</td>
<td>0(.00)</td>
<td>9(.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-18</td>
<td>4(.11)</td>
<td>0(.00)</td>
<td>0(.00)</td>
<td>0(.00)</td>
<td>4(.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An inspection of the percentages of the responses found in Table 8 revealed the direction of each subgroup's responses. From this type of indirect analysis, the following results were found:

1. Student teachers, with a 45 percent response in the 0-6 range, responded the most professionally on the questionnaire.

2. Beginning students, with a 10 percent response in the 13-18 range, responded the most bureaucratically on the questionnaire.

3. Teachers tended to respond more frequently in the middle or mixed range of responses with a 56 percent response frequency in the 7-12 range.

4. No teacher responded in the highly bureaucratic range (13-18).

5. The more teacher education experience and actual teaching experience, the less response in the highly bureaucratic range (13-18).

The results of the data analysis concerning teacher education in relationship to value orientations were further compared to the predictions stated in Chapter III. Subhypotheses (2) and (3) predicting that students with secondary teacher education experience would respond toward a more professional value orientation, was supported by the data on Table 8.

This led to the question of student teaching experience on the development of teaching values. Table 9 presents the data used for the examination of this question. A C coefficient of .19 with a maximum C of .71 indicated a moderately low relationship occurred between pre-student teacher responses and student teacher responses. Examination of the response pattern of the student teachers showed they were more professionally oriented (0-6) in their responses than the pre-student teacher subjects. This suggested that something experienced by the completion of student teaching increased respondents' professional responses.
TABLE 9
CROSSTABULATION OF PRE-STUDENT TEACHERS
AND STUDENT TEACHERS RESPONSES
ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>Pre-Student Teacher</th>
<th>Student Teacher</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-6</td>
<td>11 (.28)</td>
<td>17 (.47)</td>
<td>28 (.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>26 (.66)</td>
<td>18 (.50)</td>
<td>44 (.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-18</td>
<td>2 (.06)</td>
<td>1 (.03)</td>
<td>3 (.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final analysis, Table 10, crosstabulated beginning students with teachers to investigate whether or not a significant change occurred in their response patterns. A C coefficient of .31 with a C maximum of .71 indicated a moderately positive relationship existed. This revealed that a difference was present in the responses of teachers from those who had no teacher education experience. Therefore, it was assumed that the teacher education student changed the direction of his teaching values from the time he entered the program until he taught in the classroom.

Subhypothesis (4), predicting a high bureaucratic response by teachers on the questionnaire, was not supportable. There appeared no evidence to substantiate this hypothesis. In the 0-6 range of responses, teachers responded professionally (35 percent) on the Teacher Value Orientation Questionnaire, though not as high as the student teacher group (47 percent). However, it appeared that teachers reverted to a more mixed orientation. Teacher education seemed to have influenced
their value orientations toward professionalism which they partially retained after actual classroom teaching.

TABLE 10
CROSSTABULATION OF BEGINNING STUDENTS AND TEACHERS TO RESPONSE FREQUENCIES ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>Beginning Students</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-6</td>
<td>19 (.29)</td>
<td>13 (.35)</td>
<td>32 (.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>37 (.56)</td>
<td>24 (.65)</td>
<td>61 (.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-18</td>
<td>10 (.15)</td>
<td>0 (.00)</td>
<td>10 (.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measurement of the Relationship of Demographic Variables to Value Orientation

The responses of the subjects, as depicted on the dendogram, revealed a hierarchical grouping pattern. To determine if the relationships were based on the demographic characteristics of the respondents selected variables (sex, hometown type, discipline and QCA) were crosstabulated and measured for relationships.

Table 11 represents the crosstabulation of the frequency distribution of the responses on the questionnaire by the respondent's sex. A C coefficient of .16 with a C maximum of .71 indicated a low correlation.

Table 12 crosstabulated the subjects' QCA, quarterly cumulative average, with their frequency distributions on the questionnaire. A C coefficient of .23 with a C maximum of .86 indicated a low correlation.
TABLE 11
CROSSTABULATION OF FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION
OF RESPONSES TO RESPONDENT'S SEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>9(.12)</td>
<td>6(.06)</td>
<td>15(.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>19(.26)</td>
<td>25(.24)</td>
<td>44(.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>30(.41)</td>
<td>43(.41)</td>
<td>73(.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>10(.13)</td>
<td>23(.22)</td>
<td>33(.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-15</td>
<td>3(.04)</td>
<td>6(.06)</td>
<td>9(.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-18</td>
<td>2(.04)</td>
<td>2(.01)</td>
<td>4(.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73(.41)</td>
<td>105(.59)</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Responses</td>
<td>2.50 or Less</td>
<td>2.51- 3.00</td>
<td>3.01- 3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>6 (.09)</td>
<td>4 (.07)</td>
<td>4 (.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>13 (.20)</td>
<td>20 (.35)</td>
<td>9 (.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>28 (.43)</td>
<td>19 (.33)</td>
<td>19 (.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>11 (.17)</td>
<td>10 (.18)</td>
<td>9 (.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-15</td>
<td>4 (.07)</td>
<td>3 (.05)</td>
<td>2 (.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-18</td>
<td>3 (.04)</td>
<td>1 (.02)</td>
<td>0 (.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
between the variables. The QCA appeared to have a weak relationship with the type of response of the student.

By scanning the responses, an overall pattern was evidenced. Generally, the higher the QCA, the less the tendency to respond in a highly bureaucratic direction.

In Table 13 the subjects' responses on the questionnaire were crosstabulated with the type of community they indicated they were from. A measurement of this relationship resulted in a C coefficient of .28 with a C maximum of .81. This indicated only a low degree of association. The type of community appeared to little influence subjects' responses.

All three of these crosstabulations weaken any predictions or assumptions made about the relationship of the responses on the questionnaire to demographic characteristics of the respondents. In each case, a relatively low correlation coefficient was obtained.

When the responses were crosstabulated by discipline, the science group responded differently than the other three. A C coefficient of .24 with a maximum C of .71 indicated a moderate relationship existed. Table 14 presents the frequency distribution of responses by the disciplines of mathematics, science, English and social studies.

It appeared that the type of discipline of the subject did influence the direction of response on the questionnaire. A closer examination of the percentages of responses of the subgroups indicated that two patterns formed based on their value direction: (1) science and mathematics; and (2) English and social studies. The science and math
### TABLE 13

CROSSTABULATION OF FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION
OF RESPONSES TO RESPONDENT'S
HOMETOWN TYPE a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>4 (.08)</td>
<td>4 (.15)</td>
<td>7 (.07)</td>
<td>15 (.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>11 (.22)</td>
<td>7 (.26)</td>
<td>26 (.25)</td>
<td>44 (.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>20 (.40)</td>
<td>10 (.31)</td>
<td>43 (.42)</td>
<td>73 (.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>10 (.20)</td>
<td>3 (.11)</td>
<td>20 (.20)</td>
<td>33 (.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-15</td>
<td>4 (.08)</td>
<td>1 (.04)</td>
<td>4 (.04)</td>
<td>9 (.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-18</td>
<td>1 (.02)</td>
<td>2 (.07)</td>
<td>1 (.02)</td>
<td>4 (.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aDefinition of each type of community was left to the discretion of the respondent.
TABLE 15
CROSSTABULATION OF BUREAUCRATIC VS. PROFESSIONAL RESPONSES BY THE SUBJECTS' DISCIPLINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Social Studies</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>3 (.06)</td>
<td>0 (.00)</td>
<td>6 (.11)</td>
<td>6 (.13)</td>
<td>15 (.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>10 (.21)</td>
<td>7 (.21)</td>
<td>14 (.26)</td>
<td>13 (.30)</td>
<td>44 (.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>25 (.52)</td>
<td>14 (.42)</td>
<td>21 (.39)</td>
<td>13 (.30)</td>
<td>73 (.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>7 (.14)</td>
<td>10 (.33)</td>
<td>9 (.17)</td>
<td>7 (.15)</td>
<td>33 (.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-15</td>
<td>1 (.02)</td>
<td>0 (.00)</td>
<td>3 (.07)</td>
<td>5 (.12)</td>
<td>9 (.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-18</td>
<td>2 (.05)</td>
<td>2 (.04)</td>
<td>0 (.00)</td>
<td>0 (.00)</td>
<td>4 (.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
subjects generally responded less frequently in the professional range (0-6), while the English and social studies subjects responded more frequently in the professional range. No subject in either English or social studies responded in the highly bureaucratic range (16-18), while a low percentage of subjects in math (6 percent) and science (0 percent) responded in the highly professional range. This information added further insight into the question posed by the hierarchical grouping found on the dendogram: Were there certain demographic characteristics of the subjects which influenced their responses into certain patterns of commonalities?

Analysis of Sets of Items
Eliciting Conflict

Conflict, as defined in Chapter III, was measured by a subject's response to paired items on the questionnaire. One item in each pair represented bureaucratic orientation, the other professional. If both items were answered either positively or negatively, conflict occurred. In order to ascertain how the subjects responded to the paired items, the following information was obtained for each subgroup in teacher education: (a) the frequency of the responses to each paired item; (b) the direction of each paired item, either positive (bureaucratic), negative (professional), or both; and (c) the percentage of each subgroup's responses which were conflicting.

The following list presents the paired items with a value designation for each pair (B = bureaucratic; P = Professional):

(B) 1. A professional teacher follows the rules set by the administration for the good of the students in the school, even if the rules are questionable.
1a. A professional teacher challenges or tries to change rules set by the administration, if they are questionable.

2. A professional teacher uses those instructional methods suggested by the curriculum guide.

2a. A professional teacher decides upon his own instructional methods.

3. A professional teacher understands that school rules for students do not apply in all situations.

3a. A professional teacher enforces school rules concerning students because they apply to all students.

4. A professional teacher assumes that once a decision is made on student behavior by the administration, it will not be changed.

4a. A professional teacher assumes that decisions made by the administration on student behavior are changeable.

5. A professional teacher challenges or tries to change rules on student conduct set by the administration, if the rules are questionable.

5a. A professional teacher enforces rules on student conduct issued by the administration even if the rules are questionable.

6. A professional teacher understands that general school rules do not apply in all situations.

6a. A professional teacher obeys school rules because they apply to all teachers in the school.

7. A professional teacher assumes that decisions made by the administration on curriculum are subject to change.

7a. A professional teacher assumes that once a curriculum decision is made by the administration it will not be changed.

8. A professional teacher follows the rules set by the administration censoring certain books from classroom use, even if the rules are questionable.

8a. A professional teacher challenges or tries to change rules issued by the administration forbidding certain books from classroom use, if the rules are questionable.

9. A professional teacher assumes that decisions made by the administration on instructional methodology are subject to change.
9a. A professional teacher assumes that once a decision on instructional methodology is made by the administration, it will not be changed.

10. A professional teacher does not discuss student problems with parents unless first consulting the administration.

10a. A professional teacher discusses student problems with parents at his own discretion.

Table 15 illustrates how the items ranked according to the percentage of subjects that responded in a conflicting manner to each item.

The first four paired items in each subgroup, pairs 9, 7, 4 and 10, elicited the lowest percentage of conflict. Items 9, 7 and 4 dealt with the administration's role in effecting decision change in the school. Most of the subjects answered more professionally on these items. Item 10, relating to the necessity of the administration's approval of a teacher consulting with parents, also was answered professionally.

Paired item 5, the role of the teacher changing rules on student conduct, ranked fourth in all but the student teaching group. An analysis of each subgroup's responses indicated higher conflict responses than responses in a professional direction for this set. Student teachers and teachers had the highest conflict response of the four groups.

Items 1, 2 and 3 fell into the middle range of conflict frequency. These items measured the student's role concept of following school rules and using the curriculum guide.

The last two paired items, 6 and 8, showed the highest frequency of conflict. Both items also dealt with school rules. Item 6 specified rules concerning all individuals and situations. Item 8 posed the problem of book censorship. This item extracted not only the highest conflict
### Table 15

**Item Ranking Eliciting Low Conflict to High Conflict by Subgroups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Conflict Items</th>
<th>Beginning Student</th>
<th>Pre-Student Teacher</th>
<th>Student Teacher</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(9) (7)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(2) (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(6) (8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| High Conflict Items | | | |
|---------------------|---|---|
| (6)                 | (8) | (6) | (8) |
response but also a mixture of responses in both directions. The role situations which elicited the highest conflict appeared to specify the role situation less abstractly and mainly dealt with curriculum issues.

Analysis of Subject Conflict

The final step in analyzing the data was an investigation of the frequency of conflict to the type of subject responding. A percentage table, Table 16, was constructed which gave an indirect measure of relationship. Tables presenting the crosstabulation of the items with the subgroups, including the appropriate C coefficient, are found in Appendix F. Those paired items which were responded to in two directions, bureaucratically and professionally, and those in only one direction, conflict items, were crosstabulated with each subgroup. Student teachers ranked lowest in conflict response. The other three groups approximated each other. Table 16 shows the results of this crosstabulation by numbers and by percentages.

TABLE 16

CONFLICTING AND NONCONFLICTING RESPONSES TO PAIRED ITEMS ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE BY EACH SUBGROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>Beginning Student</th>
<th>Pre-Student Teacher</th>
<th>Student Teacher</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>295(.45)</td>
<td>177(.46)</td>
<td>127(.34)</td>
<td>162(.44)</td>
<td>761(.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Conflict</td>
<td>365(.55)</td>
<td>213(.54)</td>
<td>233(.66)</td>
<td>208(.56)</td>
<td>1,019(.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>1,780</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data in Table 16 showing the teacher subgroup with 44 percent conflicting responses did not substantiate subhypothesis (5) which predicted high conflict in responses by the teacher subgroups.

The data did, however, raise the question as to why there appeared such a distinct difference in the conflict response pattern by the student teachers. Student teachers showed a 12 percentage points difference in their conflict responses from the pre-student teacher subgroup. Teachers showed a 10 percentage points increase from the student teacher subgroup. Therefore, the differences suggested that student teaching experience may have assisted student teachers to differentiate their roles toward the value direction underlying each item. However, when actual teaching experience occurred, the percentage of conflict increased, suggesting less clarity in roles as "professional" teachers. The clear lines of value directions appeared hazy. The teacher's conflict response level was the same as beginning students. It seemed that teacher education decreased conflict until actual teaching occurred, then it increased to its previous pre-teacher education level.

**Summary of the Results of the Analysis of Data**

An attempt was made to determine whether or not the operational hypotheses of the study were substantiated by the data. The analysis investigated commonalities in response patterns, relationships of subject's demographic characteristics to their teaching values, and the relationships of the subject's teacher education program to conflict in response on the questionnaire.
Each paired item was examined as to its power to discriminate and elicit either two-directional responses or conflict responses. The paired items were ranked from high to low, based on the frequency with which they elicited conflict. Any similarities in the content or construction of the items which appeared to influence a type of response was described.

In the analysis of the relationships of the subjects to their responses, measures of relationships were explicitly and statistically stated and, in some cases, assumptions made. The results of the analysis substantiate the general hypothesis of the study: The secondary teacher education program at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University influenced the development of value orientations in its teacher education students. Subhypotheses (1), (2), and (3), concerning the value direction of the responses of the subgroups, tended to be supported. Subhypothesis (4), predicting a more highly bureaucratic response pattern in the teacher subgroup, was not supported.

The response conflict hypothesis, subhypothesis (5), was not supportable in the direction predicted. Teachers did not respond highest in conflict. However, the data did present interesting results in the comparison of conflict with the student teacher subgroup. Student teachers ranked lowest in their conflict response pattern. Teachers showed higher response when compared to the student teaching subgroup. They appeared to have the same degree of conflict response as beginning students. Under the assumption that the four groups had similar preteaching experiences, it appeared that teacher education decreased teacher role conflict, while actual teaching experience negated that decrease and conflict increased.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary of the Purposes and Procedures

The overall purpose of the study was to systematically explore the potential for role conflict based on bureaucratic and professional value orientations in prospective and first-year teachers. From this basic purpose, the following questions took on special relevance:

1. What were prospective and first-year teachers' perceptions of bureaucratic and professional values?
2. Did teacher role expectations based on bureaucratic and professional orientations reflect a change during the teacher education experience?
3. Did role conflict occur when the prospective teacher entered the teaching field?

The discipline divisions of mathematics, science, social studies, and English in the secondary teacher education program at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University provided the population for the study.

The Teacher Value Orientation Questionnaire was developed to assist in the data gathering procedures to support or reject the hypotheses of the study. The instrument was designed to produce bureaucratic and professional responses toward selected teaching situations.

The instrument was theoretically constructed from the Value Orientation Matrix, designed to define bureaucratic and professional
value orientation in education. The Value Orientation Matrix operationally defined each bureaucratic value and the corresponding, opposing professional value, within the educational context. Ultimately, the matrix formed a dichotomous list of 10 bureaucratic and 10 corresponding professional values.

From the matrix 66 items were developed. The items represented an integration of the matrix values with 5 selected teaching roles. The 66 items were given to a panel of 10 judges who classified each item as either bureaucratic, professional or neither. Every 2 corresponding items that reached the criteria level of 80 percent agreement by the judges were accepted. The methodology involved in the use of judges in item selection provided the questionnaire with a measure of content validity.

In order to establish a degree of construct validity, a pilot study was conducted to measure predetermined characteristics of the respondents to characteristics measured by the questionnaire. For this purpose, student teachers were labeled by supervising graduate teaching assistants as either bureaucratic or professional. In order to assist in the categorization, the graduate teaching assistants were given Characteristics to Observe sheets outlining bureaucratic and professional behaviors to observe. The results measured and supported the instrument’s construct validity. The reliability of the instrument was determined. A moderate reliability coefficient of .61 was found.

The instrument was then administered to four groups, each representing differing stages of secondary teacher education. Beginning
students in the teacher education program, pre-student teachers preparing
to student teach, student teachers, and first-year teachers of the same
program comprised the population. All subjects participated in the
secondary education program and concentrated in either mathematics,
science, English or social studies.

The process of analyzing the data diverged into three stages:
(1) determining commonalities found in the response patterns of the
subjects; (2) determining the relationship of subject demographic
variables to their value orientations; and (3) determining conflict in
the responses of the subject to 10 paired items on the questionnaire.

A dendogram graphically presented the pattern of clustering of
the subjects. It revealed clustering not totally based on the type of
teacher education subgroup of the subject. Further investigative
measures were necessary.

Contingency tables then were devised to illustrate the type of
association tested between variables (education experience, sex, QCA,
discipline, hometown type). Contingency coefficients (C coefficients)
determined if hypothesized relationships and conflict occurred.

The conflict items, 20 paired items from the total 26, were
analyzed to measure their discriminatory power in eliciting two-directional
responses. This provided the necessary technique for recognizing conflict
in the four subgroups studied.

The results of the analysis of data supported the general
hypothesis of the study: The type of value orientation of each subgroup
and the degree of conflict response reflected the amount of teacher education experienced by the subgroup.

Summary of Major Findings

Determining commonalities in response patterns of subjects.—The search for commonalities in response patterns was assisted graphically by a dendogram. Clustering of the subjects was revealed. Subjects did not appear to cluster relative to their membership in one type of teacher education subgroup. Other factors also influenced their responses. To further investigate and assess this pattern, possible intervening variables and response patterns were correlated.

Determining the relationship between demographic variables and value orientation: Teacher education.—When measured by a C coefficient, the subgroups' relationship to the frequency distribution of responses indicated a moderate relationship. Investigation of the data revealed certain response characteristics for each subgroup.

(1) Beginning students: Their total response pattern differed from the total population. They responded more frequently in a bureaucratic direction. On a professional direction, they responded similarly to pre-student teachers. When the frequency distribution of responses was divided into two sets (0-9, 10-18), beginning students and teachers reflected like patterns. When compared to the other subgroups, the data supported subhypothesis (1). Beginning students in the secondary teacher education program responded more bureaucratically on the Teacher Value Orientation Questionnaire than the other subgroups studied.
(2) Pre-student teachers: Their responses, in percentages, were similar to beginning students on a three set frequency distribution (0-6, 7-12, 13-18). The bulk of responses fell into the middle or mixed range, 7-12. They responded less frequently than beginning students in the "pure" professional range, and also less frequently in the "pure" bureaucratic range.

On a two set frequency distribution (0-9, 10-18), pre-student teachers had a higher percentage of responses in the professional direction than beginning students or teachers. Their percentage, .77, was nearly equal to that of student teachers, .78.

When compared to the other subgroups, the data supported sub-hypothesis (2): Pre-student teachers in the secondary teacher education program responded professionally on the Teacher Value Orientation Questionnaire.

(3) Student teachers: This subgroup produced the most interesting response patterns. Of the student teachers, 44 percent responded in the highly professional range (13-18). Compared with the other three subgroups, they ranked as the most professionally oriented. Even on the two set frequency division (0-9, 10-18), student teachers responded most frequently toward professionally oriented items. When compared to the pre-student teachers, a C coefficient of .19 revealed a relationship occurred. In the "pure" professional range (0-3), student teachers responded more frequently than pre-student teachers.

When compared to the other subgroups, the data supported sub-hypothesis (3): Student teachers in the secondary teacher education program responded more professionally than the other groups studied.
(4) Teachers: Teachers responded less bureaucratically than any of the other subgroups and less professionally than student teachers. Their responses tended to digress toward the center rather than toward the extreme ends of the scale, 0-3 and 16-18. Their responses indicated no important relationship to any type of response pattern. When compared to the other subgroups, the data did not support sub-hypothesis (4). Secondary teachers responded more professionally, not bureaucratically, on the Teacher Value Orientation Questionnaire.

Generally, the patterns of responses revealed interesting trends:

(a) From entry into the teacher education program until student teaching, professional responses increased and bureaucratic responses decreased.

(b) After teaching for 10 weeks, the percentage of highly professional responses dropped, "pure" bureaucratic responses disappeared, and responses digressed toward the center.

(c) From initial entrance into the teacher education program until 10 weeks experience as a teacher, groups tended to change orientations. Presumably, this pattern indicated that something influenced the change, possibly the teacher education program. However, a more thorough investigation was needed to substantiate that (1) a change did occur, (2) the teacher subgroup had previously held different values, and (3) teacher education was responsible for the assumed change.

(d) Therefore, the conclusions for this aspect of the study revealed that something influenced student value orientations between
entrance into the teacher education program and actual teaching in the classroom. This could have been the effect of the secondary teacher education program on value orientations.

The number of subjects which entered the program was not equal to the number who completed. The rate of attrition indicated that a certain percentage of students did not complete the program. Explanations for this were: (1) changes in student's career directions, and (2) the failure of students to meet the requirements of the program. However, this dropout rate did not distinguish which type of student, bureaucratic or professional, was more likely to leave. Therefore, the assumption that the attrition process did not discriminate and that both types of students left the teaching program was maintained.

Determining conflict in responses.—The findings indicated that only one subgroup, student teachers, responded significantly differently from the population in conflict response. Their responses indicated less confusion in distinguishing role situations and the actions necessary for each situation.

Student teachers were supervised from two bases, the university and the local school. However, the necessity of the student to obtain a "good" grade from university supervisors and supervising teachers may have had an effect on their responses. The student teachers may have responded as they perceived they "should" respond in the eyes of supervisory personnel.

The question of the nearness to reality of the student teaching experience again arose. The possibility existed that student teachers were
shielded and not exposed to bureaucratic influences to the degree of
the teachers. If this conjecture was at work, the highly professional
direction of their responses was predictable.

From the analysis of conflict responses by subgroups on the
questionnaire, subhypothesis (5) was rejected. Teachers, the subgroup
hypothesized to elicit the highest conflict response, failed to do so.
Teachers appeared to demonstrate conflict at the same level as pre-student
teachers. From the time of student teaching, actual teaching experience
appeared to increase conflict response. This was attributed to the
teacher's closer contact with the bureaucracy than during the student
teaching experience.

Sex, QCA, and hometown type.—Crosstabulations of the subjects'
demographic characteristics (sex, QCA, and hometown type) revealed little
association to their pattern of responses.

There did appear, by simple observation of the data on the tables,
certain trends in the responses. A higher percentage of males than females
responded in the "pure" professional range (0-3). Students with high QCAs,
3.01 to 4.00, failed to respond in the "pure" (16-18) bureaucratic range.
Also, the higher the QCA, the less likely the subject responded in the
highly bureaucratic (13-18) range. There was no significant pattern of
response found in the crosstabulation between responses and hometown type.

These findings were enlightening in themselves. They conveyed the
message that value orientations were not dependent or related to these
specified demographic characteristics, as may have been assumed.

Therefore, these three characteristics were not bases for deter-
mining or predicting value orientations in the form of role expectations
for teaching. Assumptions made about one of these characteristics' influence on value orientation should be questioned.

**Discipline**.—Relationships were found in crosstabulating the subjects' disciplines with the frequency responses on the questionnaire. One group, science, indicated a significantly different response pattern to the other discipline subgroups.

The science subgroup responded more bureaucratically than the other subgroups. Their response frequencies were similar to the mathematics subgroup, which also tended to respond bureaucratically. These two disciplines showed commonalities in their responses, as did the other two disciplines, English and social studies. Mathematics and science subjects together responded more bureaucratically and less professionally than the other two combined disciplines. Although the number of subjects in the discipline subgroups was low, the data presented important and informative trends.

In both the social studies and English subgroups, no responses were found in the "pure" bureaucratic frequency (16-18). Their patterns of response were similar. Social studies subjects reflected the highest percentage of professional responses. English subjects responded, on a percentage basis, less often in the bureaucratic range.

Even though the number of subjects in the subgroup was low, conclusions drawn from this analysis raised pertinent questions in relation to the programs offered in secondary education: (1) What was the nature of the philosophy of each discipline division in the program? Were there specific goals and objectives which accounted for these
differences? (2) Did the students enter into the program from other colleges with established value orientations, dependent on the discipline in which they concentrated? Did this affect the type of teacher role expectations they developed in the program? (3) Did the discipline divisions of the teacher education program influence the subjects' orientations or did the program itself change to accommodate the students?

The general conclusion drawn from this data was clear: The type of discipline in which the student concentrated had an effect on the type of response elicited on the Teacher Value Orientation Questionnaire.

**Methodological Implications**

The use of the dendogram (Baker, 1972) presented a clear and relatively simple way to show response commonalities and clustering of subjects. This technique has the potential for explaining implications of value similarities and differences to practitioners or teacher education students whose research background is weak.

The C coefficient (Siegel, 1956) provided an easy means of using actual frequency distributions of responses to determine a gross measure of relationship and strength of association. Again, basic strengths may lie in its inherent unsophistication which allows its use with students and teachers.

The final implication is that methodological analysis in studies based on perceptions and values is usually limited to description rather than true empirical tests of statistical inference. In exploratory analyses such as this, the methodological sophistication related to the type of data collected and the purposes of the study must be continually weighed.
Conceptual Implications

Interrole conflict (Kahn, 1964) takes place as a result of membership in two organizations with competing value systems. In this study, potential interrole conflict for the population may have been caused by the formal training and actual teaching expectations of education students. Specifically, role conflict may have occurred between competing values of beginning teacher education students and teacher education students or students in teacher training and graduated students actually teaching. Each subgroup has its own set of expectations, incumbent behaviors, and situational contexts (Gross, 1958) for defining the teacher on a professional-bureaucratic continuum.

This study reveals the potential of interrole conflict for students entering the training program and the prevailing observed values of the program itself. Generally, the teacher education program may be inferred to promote a trend toward a professional value orientation.

An interesting result of the study indicates that values of teacher training seem to remain with actual teachers for their first ten weeks. Considering the formal and informal socialization of new teachers in their beginning jobs (Braga, 1972), the lack of interrole conflict indicates that the schools under study do not demand adherence to bureaucratic values or that the teachers are successfully resisting values conflicting with their tendency toward professionalism. In any case, these findings contradict Braga's (1972) hypothesis that students have no teacher role conflicts and teachers do.
A second conceptual implication for the study of teacher value orientations is the predominant identification of professionalism as the internalized criterion which may guide behavior and attitudes toward objects and situations (Rokeach, 1968; Kluckholm, 1951). When presented with a defined, limited choice, both students and teachers from the teacher education program expressed a justification for the professional value stance (Kluckholm, 1951, pp. 396-8) and exhibited a general pattern of conformity to that value with moderate consistency (Albert, 1968).

Specific aspects of the VPI&SU teacher education program that may tend to promote the retention of professional values in students is beyond the scope of this study. However, these findings indicate that the ambiguities of professionalism (Dorros, 1968), particularly those conflicting with the bureaucratic orientation, were more pronounced in certain academic disciplines. Social studies and English students exhibited a higher percentage of "extreme" professional responses than students in mathematics and science. This may indicate that mathematics and science students were more ambiguous (less clear distinction from the bureaucracy) in their operational definitions of professionalism than their counterparts in social studies and English. If this is true, Etzioni's (1964) distinction of professional, semi-professional and non-professional may be distinguishable between disciplines in teacher education.

Third, the results of this study seem to challenge several definitions of the relationship between teacher education and student role development. The tendency toward professionalism by members and
The ability of subjects to distinguish value positions at the operational level and register a value preference may indicate a challenge to the assumption that methods and theories of teaching are presented at such a level of abstraction that they are meaningless (Braga, 1972). If negative criticism of teacher education (Bosco, 1972; Conant, 1964) is related to the lack of practical realities and explorations of actual value utilities, the VPI&SU program may well provide an alternative.

Operational Implications

The following list summarizes the pertinent issues and questions raised by the study and the implications of these questions to the secondary teacher education program at VPI&SU.

1. This investigation substantiated the need for the continual assessment of the secondary teacher education program in order to further ascertain the type of values and expectations being developed. Related to this, the question arises as to what specific components of the program develop generalized perceptions of the "professional" teacher? What type of teacher roles does the program expect graduates to perform and how? What type of values does the program try to instill?

2. Coordination between the discipline divisions may yield a greater degree of consistency in the type of values emerging from graduates. Each division should become aware of the type of student entering the
program and how far that student must "move" to attain professional standards established for students. The desired organization of the total program determines if the term "professional" needs to be agreed upon as to its definition and related characteristics. This study revealed a discrepancy in the definition of "professional" by students in the secondary teacher education program and teachers of that same program.

(3) With respect to role conflict, it seems appropriate to assume that certain values instilled in the teacher education program may be met with conflicting values in the field. Therefore, the college should investigate the relative balance between "theory" and practical realities beneficial in developing values in students. As the program may help change value orientations toward professionalism, does this help or hinder the new teacher? Does the value change mean a more difficult adjustment once teaching? Whichever operational directions the college takes in defining "professional" and its related values, it should be aware of what it is producing and the consequences involved.

(4) Follow-up studies of teacher graduate opinions assessing their "success" in teaching would assist in developing the program goals and objectives. Adjustment and satisfaction of teachers in the field provides one means to test substantiation and support for present programs.

(5) The screening process for students entering the program could provide an initial vehicle for value assessment. Upon entrance, students could be measured for attitudes, value orientations and teacher role perceptions. Throughout the program, assessment would occur. The values
a teacher possesses are important to the program. However, this point presents a basic philosophical problem to the college. Should students, upon graduation, hold specific kinds of role perceptions and values of teaching as opposed to other kinds?

**Implications for Future Studies**

An inferred goal of the study was to provide guidelines for future assessment of teacher value orientations and role conflict. This study recognized many pertinent questions that are in need of future study and research.

One of the most critical areas is the continued study and revision of instruments used to assess teaching values and attitudes. The need for valid instruments measuring teacher attitudes is unquestionable. This study notes the particular problems of perceptual analysis and points to future refinement of value matrices which can provide fixed standards of judgment.

Another area of needed research is the operational specification of "professional" as it relates to teachers. The term is so ambiguous that almost any definition becomes appropriate as to interpretations of control, compliance and goal setting. Establishment of specific educational criteria, as found in other professions such as medicine and law, may help provide a framework from which to draw a more solid definition for future study.

Another future direction of research is the empirical study of other demographic characteristics in relationship to teacher value orientations. Similar studies and analyses, such as this study, need
to be made to assess types of associations related to value development in students and teachers.

A final area of future study is to continue this initial effort to analyze the effects of teacher education programs in developing teacher role conflict based on teacher value orientations toward the bureaucracy and the profession. This exploratory study provided an initial conceptual and methodological direction and points to several questions needed to be resolved or researched. Perhaps the major outcome of this type of study is to raise doubts and to stimulate future inquiries into the secondary teacher education program at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University and other colleges of education. If this investigation has accomplished this outcome, its final significance must be measured in light of future research endeavors into teacher preparation.
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APPENDIX A

ORIGINAL ITEMS

Items: Bureaucratic Orientation

The professional teacher:

1. should carry out the rules for a teacher dress code issued by the administration.

2. should carry out the rules for student dress codes issued by the administration.

3. should carry out the rules concerning use/nonuse of certain books in planning curriculum as issued by the principal.

4. should not use certain instructional methods in his class if objectionable to the administration.

5. should not discuss student problems with the parents unless first consulting the administration.

6. should try to carry out general school rules issued by the administration.

7. should take all discipline problems to the administration as requested.

8. should follow the teacher's guide as developed by the superintendent's office.

9. should use those instructional methods suggested by the curriculum guide.

10. should obey school rules because they apply to every teacher.

11. should enforce student school rules because they apply to all students.

12. feels the administration should stand by the teacher if challenged over the teacher's methods of teaching by outside sources.

13. feels the students should not question the teacher in his area of expertise.
14. feels that the curriculum used in his class should not be questioned by parents.

15. feels that the instructional methods used in his class should not be questioned by parents.

16. feels that parents should not question the teacher in his area of expertise.

17. should discuss a student who has problems doing homework with other students, as they might help.

18. should discuss problems in curriculum development for his courses with the administration.

19. should discuss problems in instructional methods for his classes with the administration.

20. should discuss problems he is having with the parents of his students with the administration.

21. assumes that once a decision on student behavior is made by the administration, it will not be changed.

22. assumes that once a decision on curriculum is made by the administration, it will not be changed.

23. assumes that once a decision on instructional methods is made by the administration, it will not be changed.

24. should follow the rules set by the administration for the good of the school, even if the rules are questionable.

25. should enforce the rules on student conduct set by the administration, even if the rules are questionable.

26. should follow the rules censoring certain books from classroom use as set by the administration, even if the rules are questionable.

27. should be concerned mainly with the problems of his own students.

28. should be concerned mainly with the problems of his own curriculum.

29. should be concerned mainly with the problems of his own instructional methods.

30. believes the administration is the most knowledgeable concerning the students in the school.

31. believes the administration is the most knowledgeable concerning the curriculum which should be used in the school.
32. believes the administration is the most knowledgeable concerning the instructional methodology which should be used in the school.

33. believes the principal is the most knowledgeable person concerning parents of students in the school.

Items: Professional Orientation

The professional teacher:

A. should decide upon his own dress code irrespective of the administration's.

B. should allow the students to develop their own dress code.

C. should alone decide upon which books to use in planning curriculum for his classes.

D. should alone decide upon which instructional methods to use in his classes.

E. should discuss students problems with parents at his own discretion.

F. should try to carry out general school rules developed by the faculty.

G. should handle all discipline problems at his own discretion.

H. should develop his own curriculum.

I. should decide upon his own instructional methods.

J. understands that school rules do not apply in all situations.

K. understands that student school rules do not apply in all situations.

L. should take total responsibility for his teaching methods if challenged by outside sources.

M. feels that students should question the teacher in his area of expertise.

N. feels that parents have a right to question curriculum used.

O. feels that parents have a right to question instructional methods used.

P. feels that parents have a right to question the teacher in his area of expertise.
Q. should not discuss a student with other students.

R. should discuss curriculum problems with curriculum experts.

S. should discuss problems in instructional methods for his classes with an instructional methods expert.

T. should discuss problems he is having with the parents of his students with an expert in counseling.

U. assumes that decisions made by the administration on student behavior are subject to change.

V. assumes that decisions made by the administration on curriculum are subject to change.

W. assumes that decisions made by the administration on instructional methodology are subject to change.

X. should challenge or try to change rules set by the administration if they are questionable.

Y. should challenge or try to change rules on student conduct set by the administration if the rules are questionable.

Z. should challenge or try to change rules censoring certain books from classroom use set by the administration if the rules are objectionable.

AA. should be concerned mainly with problems confronting teachers about students in general.

BB. should be concerned mainly with problems confronting teachers about curriculum in general.

CC. should be concerned mainly with problems confronting teachers about instructional methods in general.

DD. believes the teachers are the most knowledgeable persons concerning the students in the school.

EE. believes the teachers are the most knowledgeable persons concerning curriculum in the school.

FF. believes the teachers are the most knowledgeable persons concerning instructional methods in the school.

GG. believes the teachers are the most knowledgeable persons concerning the parents of the students in the school.
APPENDIX B

ORIGINAL TEACHER VALUE ORIENTATION

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Male_____ Female_____
2. Age_____
3. Marital Status ____________________
4. Year at university: sophomore____ junior____ senior____
5. Teaching level: primary____ middle school____
   junior high____ senior high____
6. If secondary, your major teaching area ____________________

In the following questions please check the appropriate column which best describes your feelings toward the situations presented.

a. strongly agree
b. agree
c. disagree
e. strongly disagree

1. A professional teacher follows the rules set by the administration for the good of the students in the school, even if the rules are questionable.

2. A professional teacher uses those instructional methods suggested by the curriculum guide.

3. A professional teacher understands that school rules for students do not apply in all situations.
4. A professional teacher assumes that once a decision on student behavior is made by the administration, it will not be changed.

5. A professional teacher challenges or tries to change rules on student conduct set by the administration, if the rules are questionable.

6. A professional teacher understands that general school rules do not apply in all situations.

7. A professional teacher assumes that decisions made by the administration on curriculum are subject to change.

8. A professional teacher follows the rules set by the administration censoring certain books from classroom use, even if the rules are questionable.

9. A professional teacher assumes that decisions made by the administration on instructional methodology are subject to change.

10. A professional teacher does not discuss student problems with parents unless first consulting the administration.

11. A professional teacher challenges or tries to change rules set by the administration, if they are questionable.

12. A professional teacher decides upon his own instructional methods.

13. A professional teacher enforces school rules concerning students because they apply to all the students.

14. A professional teacher assumes that decisions made by the administration on student behavior are changeable.
15. A professional teacher enforces rules on student conduct issued by the administration even if the rules are questionable.

16. A professional teacher obeys school rules because they apply to all the teachers in the school.

17. A professional teacher assumes that once a curriculum decision is made by the administration it will not be changed.

18. A professional teacher challenges or tries to change rules issued by the administration forbidding certain books from classroom use, if the rules are questionable.

19. A professional teacher assumes that once a decision on instructional methodology is made by the administration, it will not be changed.

20. A professional teacher discusses student problems with parents at his own discretion.
APPENDIX C

TEACHER VALUE ORIENTATION QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Male _____ Female _____

2. Age _____

3. Marital Status ________________

4. Are you teaching in your certified area? ________________

5. Teaching level: primary _____ middle school _____
   junior high _____ senior _____

6. If secondary, your major subject area ________________

7. Your QCA ______

8. Hometown type: rural _____ urban _____ suburban _____

In the following questions please check the appropriate response which BEST describes your feeling toward the situations presented. Please answer ALL questions.

*administration—principal, vice principal; not classroom teachers

1. A professional teacher follows the rules set by the administration for the good of the students in the school, even if the rules are questionable.

2. A professional teacher uses those instructional methods suggested by the curriculum guide.

3. A professional teacher understands that school rules for students do not apply in all situations.

4. A professional teacher assumes that once a decision is made on student behavior by the administration, it will not be changed.
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5. A professional teacher challenges or tries to change rules on student conduct set by the administration, if the rules are questionable.

6. A professional teacher understands that general school rules do not apply in all situations.

7. A professional teacher assumes that decisions made by the administration on curriculum are subject to change.

8. A professional teacher follows the rules set by the administration censoring certain books from classroom use, even if the rules are questionable.

9. A professional teacher assumes that decisions made by the administration on instructional methodology are subject to change.

10. A professional teacher does not discuss student problems with parents unless first consulting the administration.

11. A professional teacher challenges or tries to change rules set by the administration, if they are questionable.

12. A professional teacher decides upon his own instructional methods.

13. A professional teacher enforces school rules concerning students because they apply to all students.

14. A professional teacher assumes that decisions made by the administration on student behavior are changeable.

15. A professional teacher enforces rules on student conduct issued by the administration even if the rules are questionable.

16. A professional teacher obeys school rules because they apply to all the teachers in the school.

17. A professional teacher assumes that once a curriculum decision is made by the administration it will not be changed.
18. A professional teacher challenges or tries to change rules issued by the administration forbidding certain books from classroom use, if the rules are questionable.

19. A professional teacher assumes that once a decision on instructional methodology is made by the administration, it will not be changed.

20. A professional teacher discusses student problems with parents at his own discretion.

21. A professional teacher believes that teachers are the most knowledgeable persons concerning the curriculum used in the school.

22. A professional teacher does not use those instructional methods in his classes that are objected to by the principal.

23. A professional teacher takes discipline problems to the administration as requested.

24. A professional teacher believes the principal is the most knowledgeable concerning the students in the school.

25. A professional teacher feels that parents have a right to question the teacher in his area of expertise.

26. A professional teacher believes the principal is most knowledgeable concerning the curriculum used in the school.
The following list of characteristics is related to the type of orientation teachers may assume. These characteristics in no way represent all types of roles teachers play. Please keep these characteristics in mind when observing your respective student teachers. Decide which characteristics best describe each student teacher. Then, at the end of the quarter, you will be asked to determine which type of orientation each student teacher would represent. Orientations are based on (a) loyalties or adherence to bureaucratic rules; and (b) loyalties or adherence to professional conduct.

**Bureaucratic Orientation**

1. Follows the rules as set by the directing teacher, even if the student teacher disagrees.

2. Obey the line of organization in the school—principal at the top, students at the bottom.

3. Makes rules and regulations impersonal in dealing with the students. All students treated alike.

4. Realizes the expertise of the teacher cannot be challenged by the students or the parents.

5. Usually discusses problems he is having (with students) with the directing teacher before discussing it with the students themselves.

6. Accepts that decisions made by the directing teacher are final and unquestionable.

7. Concerns are centered mostly on his classrooms only. Little concern expressed about other classes, school curriculum in general, school services, etc.

8. Understands that the most knowledgeable in the school is the principal, then the teacher, then the student teacher, then the brighter students, then the average students, and lastly the slower students.
9. Very seldom questions the expertise of the directing teacher.

10. Expresses little frustration over the limitations involved in his student teaching experience.

**Profession or Nonbureaucratic Orientation**

1. Does not always follow the directions of the directing teacher because he disagrees with her ideas.

2. Makes rules and regulations of the students fit the situation and treats each situation differently.

3. Often questions the expertise of the directing teacher.

4. Seldom consults the directing teacher before discussing a problem with a student.

5. Expresses concern about problems in the school, as well as those in his classroom.

6. Doesn't feel the chain of command in the school is related to knowledge of children and teaching. Most knowledgeable not necessarily at the top.

7. Allows students to challenge his expertise in his discipline without punishing the students for it.
APPENDIX E

DENDOGRAM REPRESENTING GROUPING PATTERNS

OF 150 SUBJECTS

(see pocket at end of dissertation)
APPENDIX F

CONTINGENCY TABLES MEASURING THE RELATIONSHIP
BETWEEN CONFLICT RESPONSES OF EACH ITEM
SET WITH THE FOUR SUBGROUPS
### Confront Responses of the Four Groups to Paired Items A1 and B1\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>No Conflict</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Students</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Student Teachers</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teachers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^aC = .18;\) maximum C .71.

### Confront Responses of the Four Groups to Paired Items A2 and B2\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>No Conflict</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Students</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Student Teachers</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teachers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^aC = .16;\) maximum C .71.

### Confront Responses of the Four Groups to Paired Items A3 and B3\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>No Conflict</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Students</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Student Teachers</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teachers</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^aC = .17;\) maximum C .71.
### CONFLICT RESPONSES OF THE FOUR GROUPS TO PAIRED ITEMS A6 AND B6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>No Conflict</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Students</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Student Teachers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teachers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ aC = .08; \text{ maximum } C = .71. \]

### CONFLICT RESPONSES OF THE FOUR GROUPS TO PAIRED ITEMS A5 AND B5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>No Conflict</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Students</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Student Teachers</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teachers</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ aC = .04; \text{ maximum } C = .71. \]

### CONFLICT RESPONSES OF THE FOUR GROUPS TO PAIRED ITEMS A6 AND B6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>No Conflict</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Students</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Student Teachers</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teachers</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>129</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ aC = .11; \text{ maximum } C = .71. \]
### CONFLICT RESPONSES OF THE FOUR GROUPS TO PAIRED ITEMS A7 AND B7a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>No Conflict</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Students</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Student Teachers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ a_C = .21; \text{ maximum } C = .71. \]

### CONFLICT RESPONSES OF THE FOUR GROUPS TO PAIRED ITEMS A8 AND B8a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>No Conflict</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Students</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Student Teachers</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teachers</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ a_C = .09; \text{ maximum } C = .71. \]

### CONFLICT RESPONSES OF THE FOUR GROUPS TO PAIRED ITEMS A9 AND B9a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>No Conflict</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Students</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Student Teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teachers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ a_C = .14; \text{ maximum } C = .71. \]
CONFLICT RESPONSES OF THE FOUR GROUPS
TO PAIRED ITEMS A10 AND B10a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>No Conflict</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Students</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Student Teachers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teachers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*C = .03; maximum C .71.
APPENDIX G

INTERPRETATION OF THE C COEFFICIENTS IN TERMS OF THEIR MAXIMUM VALUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Contingency Table</th>
<th>Maximum C Value</th>
<th>Descriptive Category</th>
<th>Numerical Range for C Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 by 3</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>.01-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>moderately low</td>
<td>.18-.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>moderately high</td>
<td>.36-.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>high</td>
<td>.57-.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 by 4</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>.01-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>moderately low</td>
<td>.21-.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>moderately high</td>
<td>.41-.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>high</td>
<td>.61-.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 by 6</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>.01-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>moderately low</td>
<td>.22-.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>moderately high</td>
<td>.44-.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>high</td>
<td>.65-.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 by 6</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>.01-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>moderately low</td>
<td>.18-.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>moderately high</td>
<td>.36-.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>high</td>
<td>.54-.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(ABSTRACT)

The purpose of this study was to systematically explore the potential for role conflict based on bureaucratic and professional value orientations in prospective and first-year teachers. The hypotheses of the study were: (1) Beginning students in the secondary teacher education program define their role expectations in relationship to that of the school bureaucracy; (2) Pre-student teachers in the secondary teacher education program define their role expectations in relationship to that of the teaching profession; (3) Student teachers in the secondary teacher education program define their role expectations in relationship to that of the teaching profession; (4) First-year secondary teachers, upon completion of the equivalent of one university quarter of actual teaching, define their role expectations in relationship to that of the school bureaucracy; and (5) Role conflict is found in persons who perceive their role expectations based on value orientations to both the bureaucracy and the profession. Of the four groups studied, teachers with actual teaching experience exhibit more role conflict than the other three groups.
The discipline divisions of mathematics, science, social studies, and English in the secondary teacher education program at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University provided the population for the study. Four groups in the secondary teacher education program were studied: (1) beginning teacher education students; (2) pre-student teachers preparing to student teach; (3) student teachers; and (4) teachers of the same teacher education program who had completed their first 10 weeks of actual teaching. Each group represented different levels of teacher education experience.

The Teacher Value Orientation Questionnaire was developed to assist in the data gathering procedures to support or reject the hypotheses of the study. The instrument was designed to produce bureaucratic and professional responses toward selected teaching situations. The instrument was also designed to determine conflict in expected teaching roles by the inclusion of paired items, one item bureaucratically oriented and the corresponding item professionally oriented.

The process of analyzing the data diverged into three stages: (1) determining commonalities found in the response patterns of the subjects; (2) determining the relationship of subject demographic variables to their value orientations; and (3) determining conflict in the responses of the subjects to 10 paired items on the questionnaire.

The results of the analysis of data supported the general hypothesis of the study: The type of value orientation of each subgroup and the degree of conflict response reflected the amount of teacher education experienced by the subgroup.