A COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CLIMATES IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
North Texas State University in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

By

Joe C. Bean, B. A., M. Ed.
Denton, Texas

May, 1977

Bean, Joe C., A Comparison of Environmental Climates in Elementary Schools. Doctor of Education (Administrative Leadership), May, 1977, 117 pp., 9 tables, bibliography, 92 titles.

The problem of this study was to compare schools that utilize individualized instruction with schools that utilize a traditional or group-oriented approach to instruction. Comparisons were made relative to student perceptions of the schools' environmental climates, expectancy for school success, and promotion and nonpromotion practices. The sources of data included a review of the literature related to traditional elementary education, the history and development of individualized instruction, humanistic aspects of individualized instruction, and the role of school personnel expectancy in individualized instruction. The Elementary School Environment Survey was used to collect the perceptions of 1,600 fifth-grade students about their school environments. A teacher self-report questionnaire, as well as a principal self-report questionnaire, provided data pertaining to expectancy for school success and nonpromotion practices. Sixty-two fifth-grade teachers and twenty elementary principals responded to the questionnaire.

The development of this study and its findings are presented in five chapters. Chapter I presents an introduction to the study. In Chapter II a survey of the literature is reported. Chapter III contains details of the procedures

employed in collecting data for the study. Chapter IV presents the data gathered through the use of the survey instruments and a discussion of the findings. Chapter V presents the summary, findings, conclusions, and recommendations for further study.

In the comparison of environmental climates in elementary schools nine hypotheses were tested. The first six hypotheses utilized data gathered by the Elementary School Environment Survey of students' perceptions of involvement, humanism, independence, morale, equity, and resources in their schools. Hypothesis seven was used to test teacher expectancy for school success. Hypotheses eight and nine examined nonpromotion practices and the principal's expectancy for student success. Significant findings of the study were revealed by hypotheses two and eight. Analysis of variance revealed a significant difference between the mean scores at the .05 level for hypothesis two (humanism). The differences between mean scores for hypothesis eight, nonpromotion practices, were statistically significant at the .01 level. The differences between mean scores for the remaining comparisons did not reach significance.

The data gathered in this study indicated that fifth-grade students have similar perceptions of their school climate related to involvement, independence, morale, equity, and resources. Students in the traditional or group-oriented schools perceived their schools as being more humanistic.

Elementary principals and teachers in individualized instruction schools and in traditional group-oriented schools do not differ in their expectations for school success. Schools utilizing individualized instruction nonpromote a much lower percentage of their students.

The following recommendations are derived from analysis of the data collected in this study and the findings of related research:

(1) It is recommended that as schools implement individualized instruction or make any major curricular or organizational changes, the humanistic climate should be assessed by pre- and post-tests.

(2) It is recommended that students who have not been promoted at any point in their elementary school years should be identified and a longitudinal humanistic study should be made.

(3) It is recommended that students who have not been promoted should be identified and research done to determine if they perceive their school climate any differently from promoted students.

(4) It is recommended that a similar study be conducted in a school where a conscious effort is being made to improve the humanistic climate and school achievement.

(5) It is recommended that a study be conducted to investigate the relationship of the self-concept to the humanistic school climate.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Success in school is important for every child and should be potentially attainable for every child. Efforts are being made today, possibly more than ever before, to give all children successful experiences in school. Teachers and principals are more aware of individual learning styles, learning disabilities, the value of positive self-concepts, and the results of school failure. Buildings now are being constructed to aid in individualization and nongradedness. The curriculum organization is being modified. In Texas a comprehensive special education program has been initiated to meet individual needs more fully, to reduce school failure, and to insure success for children. Yet with all the known ill effects caused by lack of school success, many children are not promoted at the end of each school year. Nonpromotion does not always produce the expected result of future success by the student. Instead, students who fail usually do not improve their achievement the following year. Furthermore, failure often produces unfortunate effects on personality and happiness. The nonpromoted student frequently reacts to the situation with apathy, classroom misbehavior, truancy, delinquency, or with dread for school and a tendency to react against the school situation (14).

Failure is a major problem in schools (5); for example, an estimated one million school children failed in 1972 in the United States (7). Texas schools alone failed 31,855 students in kindergarten through fifth grade in 1973-74 (4). If nonpromotion does not accomplish improved academic achievement and if it does have the detrimental effects on children that research indicates (6, 8, 14), then more efforts are urgently needed to reduce the number of school failures.

School personnel can do little to change the home environment from which children come. Teachers and principals, however, can do much to create an appropriate environmental climate at school. An examination of school climates and the personnel responsible for developing them is important in order to determine environmental climates most conducive to students' success in school.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to compare schools that utilize individualized instruction with schools that utilize a traditional or group-oriented approach to instruction. Comparisons were made relative to student perceptions of the school's environmental climates, expectancy for school success, and promotion and nonpromotion practices.

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of the study of environmental climates in elementary schools are as follows: (1) to assess the

environmental climate of the school through the perception of its pupils, (2) to survey teachers in the identified environmental climates with special reference to teacher expectation for school success and nonpromotion, (3) to assess the role of the principal in the identified environmental climates with special reference to nonpromotion, and (4) to compare and interpret findings and to make recommendations.

Hypotheses

Through the investigation of elementary school environments, the following hypotheses were tested:

Hypothesis 1.--There will be no significant difference related to involvement in the mean scores of students in individualized instruction schools and in traditional or group-oriented schools, as measured by the Elementary School Environment Survey.

Hypothesis 2.--There will be no significant difference related to humanism in the mean scores of students in individualized instruction schools and in traditional or group-oriented schools, as measured by the Elementary School Environment Survey.

Hypothesis 3.--There will be no significant difference related to autonomy in the mean scores of students in individualized instruction schools and in traditional or

group-oriented schools, as measured by the Elementary School Environment Survey.

Hypothesis 4.--There will be no significant difference related to morale in the mean scores of students in individualized instruction schools and in traditional or group-oriented schools, as measured by the Elementary School Environment Survey.

Hypothesis 5.--There will be no significant difference related to equity in the mean scores of students in individualized instruction schools and in traditional or group-oriented schools, as measured by the Elementary School Environment Survey.

Hypothesis 6.--There will be no significant difference related to resources in the mean scores of students in individualized instruction schools and in traditional or group-oriented schools, as measured by the Elementary School Environment Survey.

Hypothesis 7.--There will be no significant difference related to teacher expectancy for success in the mean scores of teachers in individualized instruction schools and in traditional or group-oriented schools, as measured by a Teacher Self-Report Questionnaire.

Hypothesis 8.--There will be no significant difference in the percentage of students not promoted in individualized instruction schools and in traditional or group-oriented schools, as measured by a Principals' Self-Report Questionnaire.

Hypothesis 9.--There will be no significant difference in the percentage of students that principals expect to fail or experience only marginal success in individualized instruction schools and in traditional or group-oriented schools, as measured by the Principals' Self-Report Questionnaire.

Background and Significance

There is a growing interest in individualized instruction in elementary schools throughout Texas. Current practices of implementing open education, early childhood education, and a comprehensive special education program indicate a conscious desire to provide a base for success for all students. The increased attention given to the individual student is creating a new environmental climate in the schools. The change is evidenced by modifications in school design and in curriculum changes. This climate is not necessarily limited to any particular physical environment. It may, however, include altered curriculum, teacher attitudes, and school philosophy. Schools whose personnel espouse a philosophy that recognizes that each student is unique and needs different experiences to reach his maximum potential have been

studied, and in Texas the School Curriculum Design for the 1980's calls for further study and implementation of new approaches to meet student needs, including multiage grouping, open education, individualization, flexible scheduling, and team teaching (20).

Comparative studies of students who attended either nongraded schools or traditional schools have been made in relation to achievement, self-concept, and mental health. Vogel and Bowers (22) found that nongraded students did not do as well as their graded counterparts on the Stanford Achievement Test. However, in other studies by Brody (2); Morris, Pronger, and Morrell (12); Ward (23); and Case (3), the nongraded group achieved more, while McLaughlin (11), Otto (15) and Bowman (1) found no difference in achievement between the groups. Purkey (17) found that students in the nongraded school have a more favorable self-esteem.

Research studies, which included a mental health component conducted by Ward (23), McLaughlin (11), Saunders (19), and Meyers (13), favored the nongraded group. The mental health of nongraded students in these studies was significantly superior to that of their graded counterparts (16). Other studied completed under the direction of Wilt (25), Case (3), and Bowman (1) found no significant difference in relation to mental health (16).

The importance of environment in learning has long been recognized by educators including Dewey, Montessori,

Froebel, and Pestalozzi. More recently Sadker wrote, "Since learning is often a result of the interaction between the pupil and his environment, it is readily apparent that we must know more about educational environments to better understand the learning process" (18, p. 295). And Glasser has declared,

> The major problem of schools is a problem of failure. Therefore, ways must be discovered so that more children can succeed. To discover these ways, we must examine the reasons why children are failing and develop an educational philosophy that leads to an atmosphere in which success is much more possible (7, p. 7).

Authorities in elementary education, such as Wiles (24), Goodlad (10), and Frymier (5), have stressed the need for a school environment that will provide the right combination of circumstances for the development of the individual. The principal, primarily, with the assistance of teachers, creates the environmental climate and sets the pace for the success of the school.

The Texas Education Agency has identified eighty-five schools as demonstration schools for individualized instruction. The purpose of the network of demonstration schools is to disseminate information pertaining to individualization from school to school. The participating schools were selected because they have effective programs in individualized instruction and have validated their effectiveness through ongoing evaluation. The scope and pacing of individualized instruction differentiate it from traditional instruction.

Texas will continue to have innovative schools and school personnel who make diligent efforts to individualize instruction. This is evidenced by the number of demonstration schools for individualized instruction in Texas and by the Right to Read Program, sponsored by the United States Office of Education. There is, however, a personal loss to students and to society when students are not given opportunities for more success. No investigation has been made to determine what personnel factors cause the innovative schools to produce an environmental climate more conducive to success. Purkey (17) has stated that the most important variable in a school is people. This study will compare administrators' practices related to nonpromotion, teacher expectations, and student perceptions of their schools across environmental climates of the innovative school and the traditional, group-oriented school.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following definitions were formulated:

Individualized instruction.--A system of organization that provides for learning experiences based upon individual needs and that provides experiences compatible with each student's particular learning style. The ultimate consideration is what happens to the individual learner (2).

Traditional instruction.--A school program oriented toward the class as a group and paced for the class as a group (21).

Nonpromotion.--The practice of keeping a student in the same grade for a second year.

Regional Education Service Center.--Centers established by the Texas State Board of Education which provide media services to the school districts within each of the twenty regions in Texas. In 1967 the concept was changed to education service centers to include additional services in all areas of education, including curriculum development, technical assistance to school districts in program planning and evaluation, and educational data processing.

Limitations

This study was limited to students in the fifth grade, their teachers, and the principals in ten schools that utilize individualized instruction and in ten traditionally taught schools. The schools were limited to the geographic area of Region XI Educational Service Center.

Basic Assumptions

It is assumed that the ten schools utilizing individualized instruction and the ten traditional or group-oriented schools were appropriately classified by the panel of experts. The

criteria for classifying the individualized instruction schools followed the criteria established by the Texas Education Agency in selecting Demonstration Schools in Individualized Instruction (DSII). The schools selected were required to have a successful program in which (1) instruction was individualized, (2) planned evaluation procedures indicated effectiveness of the program, (3) the individualized program had existed for at least one year, and (4) school personnel who espoused the philosophy of individualized instruction and the community were supportive of the program. The traditional or group-oriented schools were identified according to their organization of instruction. An effort was made to identify productive traditional schools.

The panel consisted of Region XI Education Service Center personnel. It is further assumed that the students, teachers, and principals responded honestly to the survey instruments.

Procedures for Collection of Data

Twenty schools were selected for this study by a panel of personnel from Region XI Education Service Center. Each principal was contacted personally to request his assistance in the study. When agreement to cooperate was obtained, the principal was given a written explanation of the nature and purpose of the study. He also received a principal's questionnaire and instructions for responding to it.

A second packet for teachers and students was given to the principal for distribution. The packet included the Self-Report Questionnaire for each fifth-grade teacher and the Elementary School Environment Survey for the fifth-grade students. Instructions for responding to the questionnaires and instructions for returning them were included. Questionnaires were returned directly to the investigator by each school secretary.

Procedures for Analysis of Data

The data from the survey instruments were compiled, tabulated, and reported to show the statistical significance of the differences found in environmental climates between traditional or group-oriented schools and schools with individualized instruction, as related to students' perception of their school, teachers' expectations for their students' success, and the principals' role in nonpromotion practice. A comparison of the two groups was made using t tests and chi square tests by the North Texas State University Computer Center. The data collected and a review of the literature on individual instruction, humanistic school climates, and teacher expectation for school success, as related to the elementary school, were used to draw conclusions and to make recommendations.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bowman, Betty L., "A Comparison of Pupil Achievement and Attitude in a Graded School with Pupil Achievement and Attitude in a Nongraded School," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, 1971.

2. Brody, Ernest B., "Achievement of First and Second-Year Pupils in Graded and Nongraded Classrooms," The Elementary School Journal, 71 (April, 1970), 391-394.

3. Case, David A., "A Comparative Study of Fifth Graders in a New Middle School with Fifth Graders in Elementary Self Contained Classrooms," Dissertation Abstracts, 32 (1971), 86A.

4. French, Glenn, "Elementary School Retentions in Texas," unpublished report, Texas Education Agency, Austin, Texas, 1974.

5. Frymier, Jack R. and Horace C. Hawn, Curriculum Improvement for Better Schools, Worthington, Ohio, Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1970.

6. Glasser, William, Effect of School Failure on the Life of a Child, Washington, D.C., National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1971.

7. _____, Schools Without Failure, New York, Harper and Row, 1969.

8. Godfrey, Ernestine, "The Tragedy of Failure," North Carolina Education, 2 (October, 1971), 10-11, 29.

9. Good, Thomas L. and Myron H. Dembo, "Teacher Expectations: Self-Report Data," University of Missouri, Columbia, technical report No. 64, Center for Research in Social Behavior, 1973.

10. Goodlad, John I. and Robert H. Anderson, The Nongraded Elementary School, New York, Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1963.

11. McLaughlin, William P., "Continuous Pupil Progress in the Nongraded School: Hope or Hoax?" The Elementary School Journal, 71 (November, 1970), 90-96.

12. Morris, Vernon R., Barton B. Proger, and James E. Morrell, "Pupil Achievement in a Nongraded Primary Plan after Three and Five Years of Instruction," Educational Leadership, 4 (March, 1971), 621-625.

13. Myers, R. E., "A Comparison of the Perceptions of Elementary School Children in Open Area and Self-Contained Classrooms in British Columbia," Journal of Research and Development in Education, 4 (Spring, 1971), 100-106.

14. National Education Association, NEA Research Memo, NEA Research Division, May, 1962, pp. 1-13.

15. Otto, Henry J. and others, Nongradedness: An Elementary School Evaluation, Bureau of Laboratory Schools, Monograph No. 21, Austin, University of Texas Press, 1969.

16. Pavan, Barbara Nelson, "Good News, Research on the Nongraded Elementary School," Elementary School Journal, 74 (March, 1973), 333-343.

17. Purkey, William W., William Graves, and Mary Zellner, "Self-Perceptions of Pupils in an Experimental Elementary School," Elementary School Journal, 71 (December, 1970), 166-171.

18. Sadker, David, Myra Sadker, and James M. Cooper, "Elementary School Through Children's Eyes," The Elementary School Journal, 74 (March, 1973), 289-296.

19. Saunders, Bruce Thomas, "Emotional Disturbance and Social Position within the Nongraded Classroom," Psychology in the Schools, 7 (July, 1970), 269-271.

20. Texas Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, School Curriculum Design for the 1980's, The TASCD Task Force to Study Needed Improvements in Texas Public Education, 1974.

21. Texas Education Agency, A Plan for a Network of Demonstration Schools, Austin, Texas, 1973.

22. Vogel, Francis X. and Norman D. Bowers, Pupil Attitudes, Achievement and Behavior in a Multi-Age Nongraded School, unpublished report, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, 1968.

23. Ward, Dayton N., "An Evaluation of a Nongraded School Program in Grades One and Two," Dissertation Abstracts, 30 (1970), 2786A.

24. Wiles, Kimball, Teaching for Better Schools, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1952.

25. Wilt, Hiram J., "A Comparison of Student Attitudes toward School, Academic Achievement, Internal Structures and Procedures: The Nongraded School vs. the Graded School," Dissertation Abstracts, 31 (1971), 5105A.

CHAPTER II

SURVEY OF RELATED LITERATURE

Before comparison of contemporary environmental climates in elementary schools can be made, a review of the traditional schools of the 1800's and a study of the history and development of individualized instruction should be conducted. It is important to understand how educational leaders and American society have influenced the climate in elementary schools.

Four sections have, therefore, been included in this chapter: (1) A Review of Traditional Elementary Education, (2) The History and Development of Individualized Instruction, (3) Humanistic Aspects of Individualized Instruction, and (4) The Role of School Personnel Expectancy in Individualized Instruction.

A Review of Traditional Elementary Education

In colonial America the schools, which were much like the ones the colonists had left in Europe, taught reading, writing, arithmetic, spelling, and religion. The philosophy of the schools was theocracy, which stressed obedience, conformity, and authoritarianism. The major purposes of the elementary school were to develop reading skills in order to read and understand the Bible, to do simple sums, and to produce good

penmanship. Later the First Amendment set the precedent for the separation of church and state, and thereafter religion was not taught in the public schools (33).

Traditional education in America attempted to develop character and intellect through the acquisition of knowledge. Schools were not intended to be happy places. Memorization and punishment were frequent methods of instruction. Mastery of subject matter was expected to be lengthy, difficult, and disagreeable. The same material was presented to all pupils, without regard for individual differences. Pupils were perceived as passive recipients of information (59).

Since all children were considered to be basically alike in needs and abilities, their curriculum could be the same. Student's rate of progress supposedly depended upon the amount of effort expended. Differences in the ultimate achievement was attributed to the length of time spent in the school (59). Since most children were expected to begin working in factories or on farms at an early age, in the colonies these children attended school only two or three years. Only about 10 percent of the children attended any school at all (15).

When a limited number of subjects were taught and only a fraction of the population attended school, the one-room schoolhouse with teachers and students of varying ages sufficed. But with an increase in the school population and a broader curriculum, the task of the school became more

complex. The traditional graded structure was one attempt to respond to an increased population by providing a greater division of labor. Students were divided into manageable groups to facilitate teaching and learning (7).

The Essentialist movement, represented in education in the past by Bagley (4) and Judd (32) and more recently by Rickover (48) and Bestor (6), also emphasizes subject matter. This movement declares that there is a definite place in education for exact and exacting studies. It also agrees on a fixed curriculum of fundamentals--English, history, mathematics, foreign language, and science--for all youth. The task of the school is primarily to teach basic knowledge (33). The effects of this philosophy are present in many elementary schools today.

The Essentialist sees the school as a follower of society. Its chief purpose is to pass on the cultural heritage and not to become an active part of the affairs of the modern world. Rickover, a spokesman for the Essentialists' position, favors a tightening or toughening of standards at all levels of education, a return to basic education with the so-called frills eliminated, and special instruction for the academically talented (33). A contemporary cry for a return to the basics is a desire to return to the past, to the common or traditional schools of the last century. It is a misdirected criticism of open education (62).

A description of a "traditional" school of today was presented in the October 28, 1974, U. S. News and World Report:

> At Meyers Park, children are taught good manners and patriotism along with such things as arithmetic and penmanship. Rules of deportment are posted in classrooms. The children must have a pass to leave the room. Running about the corridors, noisy conduct, speaking without first raising a hand are not permitted. Grades are strictly defined. Report cards evaluate work habits, efforts and achievement (61, p. 37).

The current call for a "back to the basics" resulted from the past fifteen years of difficult times in America--civil rights marches, assassinations, the drug culture, sexual freedom, desegregation, busing, reactions to authority, Vietnam, Watergate, recession, and inflation. Parents now want their children socialized into a value system similar to their own (62). This modern, conservative view of education leads parents to expect the schools to provide intellectual and moral training. The conservative citizen views the disciplined mind as fashioned through hard work at demanding tasks originated by the teacher. Each task mastered by a student is a preparation for something beyond itself (38). Traditional education has placed the major emphasis on subject matter and the acquisition of knowledge. Subjects have remained the same year after year. Few, if any, attempts have been made to correlate the subjects. Generally students have not been recognized as individuals (23). The

practice of keeping students in the same grade level until they master the subject matter has resulted in unsuccessful students remaining at the same grade level for several years (30).

The practice of grouping students on the basis of age is almost literally medieval. The first graded school was established in Strassburg, Germany, in 1537 by John Sturum. This practice was introduced in America by John Philbrick of Boston in 1848 at the Quincy School. By 1870 American education, which had been a flexible enterprise, became lockstepped into grades (45). A description of the first American graded school was recently printed in a brochure of the Educational Facilities Laboratories of the Ford Foundation:

> In 1848 the epochal Quincy School was built in Boston. For a century to come it set the designs for American schools. It sorted the children into grades, and every grade has its own private meeting place--a classroom--where a teacher and fifty-five children of about the same age sat together for a solid year. This schoolhouse consisted of twelve rooms, each the same as the next, four to a floor piled one atop the other for three floors. Curriculum materials were divided in such a way that each grade had a specific study supposedly appropriate to the level of the physical and mental maturity of the students in that grade. The basic assumptions of this organizational structure were that students had relatively uniform learning rates and styles if they were of the same age and that they would show the same uniformity in learning in various subject areas. Students moved through a succession of grades, learning the designated material for each grade level, until they completed the set. Successful completion of the material in one grade was rewarded by promotion to the next higher level. Failure to master the material was punished by non promotion. Non promotion was seen as providing a motivation for self-improvement (45, pp. 52-53).

Soon after the graded structure was introduced, reservations were expressed about its efficacy (27, p. 49). Criticism revolved around the high percentage of student failures produced by grading and the lack of concern for the individual student. This discontent culminated in a serious questioning of grading in the first part of the twentieth century. A growing body of literature at that time and since indicates several undesirable consequences of failure for the student emotionally, behaviorally, and academically. These factors, along with developments in the philosophy of education, changes in areas of child development, and psychological research, have provided major sources of disenchantment with the graded structure (45, p. 53). Yet this organizational structure has dominated American schools since 1848. Although the graded structure for grouping students is almost a universal practice, the need for a re-examination of the traditional approach is obvious, especially when viewed in the light of individual differences (39, p. 79).

The History and Development of Individualized Instruction

The origins of concern for the individual learner can be traced back to individual teachers and philosophers of the sixteenth century and followed through the twentieth century. At the present time educators are displaying a genuine concern for individual students, as evidenced by special programs

such as reality therapy, career education, the National Right to Read Program, and a more humanistic approach to teaching. Some educators of the sixteenth century shared this concern.

Comenius (1592-1670) viewed the child as a growing plant and education as a nonrestrictive force. The stirring of imagination was more important to him than learning facts. He saw education as an unending process, not something completed in school. Comenius definitely recognized the variance in individual development. He stated, "Whatever is taught should be taught as being of practical application in everyday life and of some definite use" (33, p. 28). He further states, "Everyone should learn the principle ideas in every subject at his own level of development" (33, p. 29). Comenius described the schools of his day as terrors of boys and slaughterhouses of minds, places where a hatred of literature and books is contracted (33, p. 28). He was concerned for the education of all children.

Rousseau (1712-1778) was concerned about individualism, pupil growth, and pupil activity. He believed in the natural goodness of man, and he also believed that the child learns through experience (33).

Pestolozzi (1746-1827) was greatly aware of variances in the ability of children. He believed in not only adapting the subject matter to the student's own ability level, but also the adaptation of materials to fit the student. His

instruction was based on success. He said, "Each branch of instruction must start from a point which is within the reach of the child's earliest power" (33, p. 30). The basic element in education for Pestalozzi was not discipline, but love. His schools were visited by thousands of Europeans and officially adopted by Prussia. Herbart and Froebel were followers of Pestalozzi (33).

Mann (1796-1859), in America, believed that all children should have a free public education, free from sectarian religious influence. He was influential in introducing the subjects of hygiene, music, and art into the curriculum. He did not advocate physical punishment by the teacher. He believed in individual potential and in the innate goodness of humanity (33). Mann, with his faith in universal education to equalize human conditions, recognized the problems of teaching children in groups. In the pre-Civil War days, he recommended that students' lessons be adapted to their differences in temperament, ability, and interest (12, p. 18).

Dewey (1859-1952) is credited with being the father of progressive education. However, the roots of progressive education were largely of European origin, stemming from Rousseau and other Enlightenment thinkers (59, p. 193). Dewey believed that education was the most important means of correcting social problems (14).

The salient concepts of John Dewey's philosophy include the following: (1) destiny and society can be planned by

reflective thinking; (2) the child is of utmost importance, and he learns by doing; (3) all individuals are of value, and the democratic way of life allows for the full development of all individuals; and (4) the school should become a miniature community to aid children in social, moral, and intellectual development (33).

The progressive education movement was active between 1876 and 1957. It was a protest against the overemphasis of subject matter, the diversion of theory and practice, the regimentation of the individual, and the standardization of the curriculum. The progressive educators declared that "the child rather than what he studies should be the center of all educational effort" (59, p. 41). Progressive education, which attracted notice during the decades following the Civil War, was being discussed, advocated, and practiced by a few by the beginning of the twentieth century. The movement gained its greatest momentum during the decade between 1910 and 1920. It was most popular just prior to World War II. Following that war and the Soviet Union's success in space technology, it fell from favor (59).

Progressive education became somewhat established in the United States because of the attempt to educate all children. The United States is a nation of immigrants; between 1890 and 1960 forty-three million immigrants came to America. This is the largest immigration during a similar period in the history

of the world. The school had the problem of integrating many of those children into American society (13). It also addressed itself to the problem of how to cope with high industrialism and scientific technology and how to keep ahead of the social problems of a generation hence (58).

Progressive education was not effectively implemented in the public schools of America because some underlying principles of philosophy were distorted when the philosophy was implemented by classroom teachers. Teachers did not understand the importance of the learning environment and their role in time, space, and the management of materials (39, p. 25). Progressive education has not disappeared, however, from American public schools. Educators are still concerned about the physical well-being of students as well as their psychological well-being. Individualized instruction utilizes the primary progressive principle of allowing every student to advance at his own rate (59). Materials now being developed resemble the self-teaching materials developed by the San Francisco State Normal School prior to World War I. The teaching of math and science, with emphasis on general concepts rather than on specific facts, is reminiscent of Parker's approach to the math instruction of 1870 (59).

Montessori (1870-1952) developed methods of instruction and materials to teach preschool children, which have continued to influence elementary education. She provided a

stimulating environment for learning, with self-selection of materials. The materials, which were manipulative, were developed for children to use, with or without the teacher. Her materials were a forerunner of teaching machines. Freedom was granted to children with the goal of developing initiative. The Montessori curriculum consisted of four basic areas: practical living, sensory living, mathematics, and language. The teacher served as a guide to help when needed. Children followed their own interests at their own pace without interference with each other (21).

Piaget (1896-) is concerned with the process of learning to reason. His theory calls for reflection and further inquiry on the part of the child. This eliminates much of the traditional type of instruction of telling the child. His theories also emphasize the interaction of children with other children and with materials in the environment. This interaction permits children to confront the beliefs of others who see things differently and to adapt their wishes to the wishes of others, in ongoing sociodramatic play (1). Piaget believes that children have true understanding only of that which they invent themselves. A classroom which makes provision for the variant ways children think and which takes into account each child's concerns and interests would utilize some of his theories.

Individualization

The thread of concern for the individual student has long run through education and its practice from Comenius, Dewey, and Montessori and, more recently, Goodlad, Anderson, Combs, Rogers, and many others. The concept of individualized instruction is not new; it has been engrained in the educational philosophy of democratic societies. This concept recognizes and values the uniqueness of the individual in regard to his personality, attitudes, values, learning style, and his needs. Individualization of instruction can be observed in progressive education, the nongraded school, and, recently, in open education. Good (26) describes open education today as individualized instruction. The current interest in individualized instruction is evidenced by the formation of organizations devoted to advocating individualized instruction. Examples of such organizations are the National Right to Read effort; I.G.E. (Individually Guided Education), originally sponsored by the Charles F. Kettering Foundation in the Institute for the Development of Educational Activities; Project PLAN (Program for Learning in Accordance with Needs); I.P.I. (Individually Prescribed Instruction); and P.E.P. (Primary Education Project) (54, pp. 1-22).

Right to Read programs individualize reading through multiage grouping for the teaching of reading skills. Students are taught skills that they need--not what they have

already learned. Materials are adapted to individual student needs and interest.

I.G.E. places emphasis upon helping students develop self-direction and socially responsible behavior. Direct teacher instruction, stressed as a legitimate activity, aims to allow students to learn at their own pace. I.G.E. utilizes criterion-referenced tests to determine if students are making satisfactory progress. Basic skills are emphasized. I.G.E. provides opportunity for individual goal setting and self-direction; yet the existing curriculum structure sets some limits (26, p. 171).

Project PLAN individualizes language arts, math, social sciences, and science. In this effort instructional objectives are made with corresponding teaching units and materials. Schedules for meeting the objectives are made, and students are gradually taught to plan activities independent of adult supervision (26, p. 171).

Two other models for individualization are Individually Prescribed Instruction (I.P.I.) and Primary Education Project (P.E.P.). I.P.I. was designed at the University of Pittsburgh by the Learning Research and Development Center. This system sets a minimum set of goals for all students, but it allows them to progress through the curriculum at their own rate. The role of the teacher is to evaluate, diagnose, and guide individual students. P.E.P. is very similar; however, it includes some teaching of the class as a whole (26, p. 172).

Individualized instruction bases commitment to it upon the following twelve hypotheses about children and learning:

1. There are many patterns of learning and no one teaching method meets the varied needs of all children. It is vitally important to provide alternatives in the educational program.

2. The teacher cannot tell a child how to think, but must provide him with the freedom, the encouragement, and the opportunity to do so.

3. Learning is an active, not passive, process and must involve participation in a task rather than mere absorption of information. As a result of learning, there should be a change in pupil behavior or no learning has taken place.

4. Children are consistent in their need for success experiences, but vary greatly in their levels and rates of achievement.

5. Discovery and developing uniqueness in individuals is a major goal not to be thwarted by ignoring or minimizing differences.

6. Children bring to each new experience varying amounts of information and misinformation, which may clarify or distort concept formation.

7. Setting goals and evaluating progress are the privilege and the responsibility of the child, and are essential to long-term learning. Teachers must not let a marking system distort evaluation.

8. The unstructured and inductive experiences which occur in a child's life are often the most profound and influential activities of childhood.

9. Children learn from each other, through observation, imitation, and cooperative consideration of mutually challenging tasks.

10. Learning is both positive and negative. When the activities do not fit the child's unique personal need, negative learning is certain to occur.

11. It is more important for children to appreciate and practice self-control than to be controlled by an adult authority figure.

12. Intrinsic motivation makes children capable of meaningful self-selection and self-correction of appropriate learning activities (57, pp. 23-24).

Individualized instruction aims to produce a self-directed learner. The teacher, utilizing individualized instruction, becomes a diagnostician, a materials specialist, and a learning consultant. Teachers must have a comprehensive knowledge of their students. This requires a lower pupil-teacher ratio (63, p. 89).

The mortality rate of the graded structure has been of great concern to parents, educators, and child welfare workers because it has inflicted considerable harm on the students who have not met its requirements. Nonpromotion in individualized-instruction schools is no longer an applicable concept because of the absence of the time requirements (41, p. 55). By allowing students to progress at their own rate, individualization holds promise of promoting better social and emotional health among its students and also of stimulating better academic achievement (27, pp. 217-218).

The psychological basis for individualized instruction lies in the fact that students are different. They differ in learning rates and learning styles. In most classrooms there are students who learn whatever is being taught quickly and others who labor to learn anything at all. Some students learn best visually, others auditorally, while other students may learn best kinesthetically. The classroom of today

usually has some students who have learning disabilities in some modes. Students also vary in their level of motivation or their achievement motive. Their activity levels as well as their anxiety levels are different. The frustration level is not the same for any one age group or class. The background of experiences students bring to class with them varies greatly. Self concepts vary. Interests are different. Students are different in a myriad of ways; yet they are alike also. Consideration is given to these factors in attempts to individualize instruction (46, 57, 53).

Nongraded Organization

The first nongraded structure appeared during the 1930's. Pavan (42) has termed nongradedness one of the most significant arrangements on the world educational scene. Nongradedness is an attempt to deal with individual differences. Traces can be seen in the dame schools of the colonial era, the reading and writing schools between 1650 and 1825, and the Lancastrian schools of 1806-1830, followed by various efforts observed in the Pueblo Plan, the Dalton Plan, and the Winnetka Plan (40). Goodlad and Anderson (27) made a significant contribution to nongradedness in their book on The Nongraded Elementary School, first published in 1959.

Nongradedness and the move toward openness evolved during the past century. This structure pertains to a vertical organization of the school. It places emphasis on

students as individuals who are due dignity and respect. Focusing on the progress of a child through a body of knowledge, it is based on the principle of continuous development. Students are allowed to progress through various subject areas at their own speed, as opposed to the lock-step orientation of a graded structure under which students are required to master a given body of knowledge within a specific period of time or suffer the penalty of failure. Nongrading recognizes the variance in learning styles, rates, interests, and abilities. A basic assumption of nongrading is that unequal and uneven intellectual, social, and psychological development occurs among students and within any one student. Consequently, within students of a given age, there will be much variety collectively and individually. Individualization is a necessary component of a nongraded structure (27).

In a nongraded classroom, students learn through interaction with people and the environment. There is a need to explore, to manipulate, to play, and to have freedom to choose. Since experiences are success-based, the fear of failure is reduced or eliminated. Emphasis is placed more on the student rather than on academic performance alone.

The nongraded structure has been attempted in many schools throughout the United States; yet it has not become a standard practice. Research comparing nongraded and graded schools has not produced conclusive results. One of the

primary reasons for this has been the lack of a standard description of both nongraded and graded schools. Researchers Otto, McLaughton, and Johnson (40) have found that no clearcut conclusions can be drawn from the comparisons. Some research has shown a tendency to favor the nongraded practice in relation to achievement and mental health and to spending fewer years in elementary school. Boys, blacks, and underachievers tend to benefit from nongraded schools more than from graded schools (42).

Open Education

The open classroom system was inspired by the British primary schools. It is an extension of the theories of such educators as Montessori and Piaget (17). Its tenets were also found in the progressive movement in American education. The nongraded school has many of the same concepts as open education.

To a great extent, open education has emancipated students from group instruction as a primary method of teaching. The student becomes an active agent in his learning as he interacts with fellow students, adults, and his environment in the open classroom (56).

General characteristics of the open-education system enumerated by Chamberlin (10), Goss (29) and Nyquist (39) include the acknowledgment that there is no set amount of information that must be learned by a certain age or level.

The teaching of process competencies and skills used to further learning--such as information storage and retrieval, decision-making skills, communication processes, and planning--are emphasized. Individualization is the keynote to the open classroom.

Various grouping patterns are utilized in the open-education classroom. The flexibility of the time schedule is an asset. The total environment of the student becomes the classroom. Open education breaks down the distinction between work and play; it emphasizes human relations. The British schools use family or vertical grouping of students. In this organization children of different ages are placed together in the same classroom.

Time scheduling is flexible in open schools. It is used with human discretion and is not necessarily intended to direct human behavior. This flexibility allows students and teachers to plan together for both long-range and short-range activities. It provides for a time for reflection, enjoyment, learning, dialogue, and planning.

Open education is accepting of students as they are: inexperienced, inquisitive, and developing persons (21). The idea that man is in a perpetual state of development throughout life is compatible to the concept of open education (47, pp. 262-263). A new teacher-child relationship emerges in the open-education system when the teacher-class relationship

gives way to individual emphasis. Two fundamental principles underlie these changes. One principle is that a real appreciation and a deep understanding of the uniqueness of each child develops. The second principle is that students learn from experience, from exploration, and from active participation and discovery (33).

Some major features of open education, according to Silberman, are the following:

1. Stationary desks or chairs are not used. Interest areas are utilized.
2. The children work in small groups or individually.
3. Students are not physically confined to the classroom. They may use halls, corridors, play areas, etc.
4. Silence is not maintained. The students may talk purposefully to anyone.
5. An abundance of materials is utilized.
6. Flexibility of time prevails for students and teacher. All students are not required to attend the same hours.
7. There is considerable self-discipline and self-direction (55, pp. 402-407).

Open education takes into account the variance of developmental age to chronological age and then matches the methods and materials to each child's unique developmental profile.

An abundance of materials is made available to all students who have a need or desire to utilize them. Materials can be added periodically to give students variety and a feeling of ownership for school equipment, books, art materials, musical instruments, and physical education equipment. Since adequate materials contribute significantly to the success of individualized instruction, teachers and aides

need sufficient time to develop materials. An open school plant is conducive to, but not necessary for, a program that places emphasis upon children. Open education offers opportunities for individualizing and humanizing learning, for making education relevant, and for satisfying students.

There is no set hierarchy of subject matter. Each student's needs, interests, and readiness are considered in adjusting a curriculum to fit the student. Learning frequently occurs through a "hands-on" approach of participation, problem solving, doing, and experiencing. Students are progressively involved in deciding what they want to learn, where they want to learn, how they will learn, and how fast they will progress.

This drive for openness in curriculum, based on meaningfulness, in general, and on personal and social relevance, specifically, provides support for open education. This rebirth of progressive education indicates a movement away from authoritarianism; the student becomes an active agent in his own learning (21).

Chamberlin (10) observes that the open-education system requires teachers who can guide students without dominating them and teachers who are capable of assessing individual needs and learning styles. The staff needs to have regard for the individual human dignity of each student, a talent for creating a positive self-image in each child, and

especially an expectation that everyone can learn. There is no abdication of adult authority or responsibility. Teachers still expect responsible behavior from students (39).

Volunteers and paraprofessionals are important components of the open-education system. They are most valuable in assisting teachers and staff members, in tutoring students, or in providing friendship for a child. An organized effort to obtain parent volunteers, educational interns, or student teachers is most worthwhile.

Nyquist offers six goals for open education which give a further description of open education as well:

1. Happy children who feel successful and confident.
2. Self-disciplined children who have wholesome attitudes toward life and learning.
3. Independent thinkers who are self-propelled and continuing learners.
4. Readers who are increasingly fluent and who enjoy reading.
5. Children who write because they want to record and convey thoughts.
6. Competent students who are able to cope with fundamental math, science, and social science concepts because they are necessary to answer important questions and solve problems (39, pp. 25-28).

In summary, Traub (26) utilized ten characteristics which determine the openness of schools. They include the following: (1) the setting of instructional objectives by individual students, (2) diverse materials and activities, (3) flexible use of space, (4) freedom of students to choose teacher they want to work with and freedom to move from activity to activity, (5) flexible use of time depending upon student

motivation, (6) individualized instruction, (7) interest grouping, (8) the assuming of the teacher's role as helper, (9) student evaluation for benefit of student, and (1) participation by students in rule making and evaluation.

Humanistic Aspects of Individualized Instruction

There is a growing necessity for a positive and humane school environment. Despite the progress made in the past decade, schools have not yet reached their potential to serve students. The writings of Combs (11), Purkey (44), Glasser (25), Goodlad (27), Dale (13), and Jackson (31) attest to the need for providing humanistic schools for students. Accepting students as individuals with unique abilities, interests, and values is the first step toward providing a positive and humane environment.

Researchers of organizational climates suggest that there is better integration between the accomplishment of organizational purposes and the meeting of individual needs when the climate of the organization is characterized by openness. Openness is dependent upon effective communication practices and participation in decision making with freedom and support. There is evidence to suggest that where the climate is open productivity is higher (23, 35). In such a climate, teachers and students feel free to try new ideas and are aware that if they are not successful they will not

suffer recrimination. Indeed, even failure can be a learning experience.

In describing a humane school, Fox includes the following features: respect for all; a feeling of trust or confidence in others; high morale; a freedom to contribute personal ideas and suggestions; opportunities for continuous academic and social growth; a sense of belonging; a renewal process for growing, developing, and changing; and a caring environment (20, pp. 7-9). Similarly, Sadker used six dimensions in evaluating a school's environment: involvement, humanism, independence, equity, morale, and learning resources (52, pp. 7-10). Purkey also lists six dimensions: challenge, freedom, respect, warmth, control, and success (44, p. 50).

Purkey states that "perhaps the single most important step that teachers can take is to provide an educational atmosphere of success rather than failure" (44, p. 55). Students who are reminded of their failures consistently lower their expectations and their level of learning. Students learn that they are capable from success, not from failure. Failure only teaches students how to fail (44, p. 5). Thus, the humane teacher bases instruction on a success philosophy for each student.

McGregor observes that as a result of the ways of viewing man, organizations develop what he calls the "self-fulfilling prophecy." People tend to become what others

expect them to be. People in some organizational settings become what he calls "X-minded" and view people as inferior, lazy, materialistic, dependent, and irresponsible. People in a different organizational setting become "Y-minded" and view people as responsible, independent, understanding, goal-achieving, developing, and creative (37).

Goodlad also describes what he calls the "X-minded" and the "Y-minded" school environmental climates: one is traditional and group-centered, while the other is open and individualistic. The school staffed by X-minded people shows the following characteristics:

> The promotion of the dependency of children upon adults for direction and the dependency of teachers upon administrators for direction. The utilization of extrinsic rewards and punishments such as grades for students and promotion or firing for teachers.
>
> The emphasis upon telling, showing, and training in how to do it and in proper methods of work for both children and teachers.
>
> The reliance upon teachers who watch children closely enough to praise good work and reprimand errors and upon supervisors who do the same to teachers.
>
> The advancement of the belief that work, with learning as a form of work, is somehow separated from the leisure activities of both children and teachers.
>
> The fostering of the idea that jobs and learnings are primary and must be done and that teachers and children are selected, trained, and fitted to predefined jobs and learnings. The feeling that children and teachers need to be inspired or pushed or driven to accomplish goals external to themselves and their settings.
>
> The assumption that children and teachers prefer familiar routines; they thrive on the "tried and true."

The school staffed by Y-minded people shows the following characteristics:

> The promotion of the independence, self-fulfillment, and responsibility of children by teachers and of teachers by administrators.
>
> The reliance upon intrinsic reward systems for children and teachers, such as pride in achievement, enjoyment of process, sense of contribution, pleasure of association, and stimulation of new challenges.
>
> An emphasis upon children and teachers devising their own methods of work and gaining ever-increasing understanding of the activities in which they engage.
>
> The building of an atmosphere in which children and teachers sense that they are respected as capable of assuming responsibility and self-direction.
>
> The advancement of the belief that work, with learning as a form of work, is a lifelong pursuit and is inextricably interwoven with the leisure activities of both children and teachers.
>
> The fostering of the idea that teachers and children are primary and seek self-realization; jobs and learnings must be designed, modified, and fitted to people.
>
> The feeling that children and teachers need to be released and encouraged and assisted as they set about accomplishing their own goals.
>
> The assumption that children and teachers naturally tire of monotonous routine and enjoy new experiences; to some degree everyone is creative (28, pp. 22-23).

According to the "self-fulfilling prophecy," the two types of schools will produce a different kind of person (28, p. 23). The idea that students are not worthwhile individuals must give way to the idea that they are in a state of development which can be molded and shaped by the school, home, and community. The school should recognize the needs of the individuals who comprise that school. If the individual is to transcend himself and contribute to his personal goals and those of mankind, his own needs must be met (2).

Maslow (36) suggests that man is a wanting animal. As soon as one need is satisfied, another appears. Man is seen

as moving through the satisfaction of human needs. The lowest psychological needs of food, rest, shelter, exercise, and health must be met before the high psychological needs become directive. After the psychological needs are met, social needs become operative--the need for belonging, for association, for acceptance, for friendship and love. At a higher level, there are ego needs which relate to self-esteem: the need for independence, achievement, knowledge, recognition, status, appreciation, and respect. These needs are rarely met in the typical school. In an open and humanistic school, however, meeting such needs is paramount. Maslow calls the highest level in the hierarchy of needs "self-actualizing." These are the needs for realizing one's own potential, or self-fulfillment. Schools that seek to individualize instruction will take into account students' individual needs. A climate will be created in which students are able to meet these social, ego, and self-fulfillment needs. A climate in which teachers encourage students to be creative in their activities and to solve real problems and in which teachers are allowed to be creative in their approach to problems and decision-making encourages individual self-fulfillment.

To maintain an open, humanistic climate, the school has to give support to its members by providing human, physical, and fiscal resources in addition to indicating to them that they are valued persons (3). Adequate space, personnel, and

funds are needed in order for students to reach their maximum potential.

Thomas (60), in writing "Five Clues to a Good School," suggests humanistic concepts for evaluation criteria, without using the word "humanistic." He suggests that good schools develop positive self-concepts in students. Open communication between school, parents, and the community is constantly maintained. Learning opportunities, which are varied and multisensory, utilize multimedia. Students are respected for their uniqueness as well as for their sameness. They are encouraged to develop their own talents and abilities rather than to achieve standard goals. A good school, he continues, is a happy place to be. It is a place where people care, where individuals are respected, and where alternative learning experiences are available.

When the interaction between the student and teacher begins, the student's needs, values, feelings, and the way he perceives situations cause him to have a vested interest in the outcome and in the objectives to be achieved. In turn, the teacher also has certain objectives for the interaction derived from his own needs, feelings, values, his perception of the situation, and his perception of the student. During their interaction, the student and teacher influence what occurs. In the end, however, it is the student who determines whether change or learning really takes place. Thus in a high-quality,

humanistic teaching-learning situation, the basic needs of both the student and the teacher permit mutual growth to occur. The climate can produce a productive student and staff who find satisfaction in their learning experiences at school.

A teacher with a humanistic view of students sees them as capable of goodness and further sees them as self-actualizing individuals. Such a teacher wants students to succeed. Rogers (50) and Goodlad (27) provide some further characteristics of the humanistic teacher. In the beginning, the student must see the teacher as trustworthy and dependable. The teacher's external behavior must be congruent with his internal thoughts and feelings. The teacher should be sincere; the child needs to see the teacher as one who truly cares and is interested in his endeavor. The humanistic teacher needs to be perceived as accepting of divergent points of view and as not demanding conformity, allowing the student the freedom to question and to keep his own individuality. Humanistic teachers have empathy for students and sincerely attempt to view situations from the student's point of view. Finally, the humanistic teacher removes the student from external threat and fear which includes the negative aspects of evaluation and grading. This also involves helping students deal with internal fears and conflicts. The teacher views the student as a person in the process of becoming (49, p. 40).

Combs' research at the University of Florida found that effective helpers were sensitive to the feelings of students and were more concerned with people than with things. They viewed behavior as caused by current perceptions and environments rather than by historical facts, seeing others and themselves as able, worthy, and dependable. Furthermore, they viewed their task as freeing rather than controlling and as an involved and encouraging process (11).

Freedom from fear, anxiety, and pain along with sincere concern for the student appears to affect radically, in a positive way, the teaching-learning situation. The prospect for learning is enhanced when even some of these elements characterize the interaction in the classroom.

Teachers, as a whole, have not been taught to cultivate relationships with students. Certification standards stress competency in academic disciplines, but the way a teacher interacts with students also is important (28, pp. 56-58). Every student should have a chance to reach his full potential as a person, to become a thinking, choosing, valuing, emphathizing individual. This necessitates an individualized and personalized curriculum, which is capable of producing students who will instruct themselves long after the formal learning situation has passed. It takes into account continuous learning over a life span wherein talents and interests will be developed. This goal for each student can only be accomplished within a positive and humane environment.

The Role of School Personnel Expectancy in Individualized Instruction

The teacher is the most important person in the school for the child. In fact, the teacher is the personification of the school. The school's structure is reflected through him; its directives are translated by him. His attitudes and behavior are imitated by the young charges. His skills are important and the way he perceives his students and, in turn, the way he is perceived is vital. This places him in a critical role.

The interaction of student and teacher and the perception each has of the other determine what can be attempted in the classroom. The perceptions relate to the judgments teachers make and to what teachers expect from students. Teachers have a tremendous opportunity to influence the lives of children in a positive manner. Teachers who have high expectations for students and want what is best for them help to set the goals for education (49). Schools have not, however, reached their potential in providing the most productive and satisfying environments despite the progress made in the past decade (34).

Attempts to create optimum learning environments through individualizing instruction and humanizing the school should also investigate the role of teacher expectancy in the success of students. The concept of teacher expectancy is often referred to as the "self-fulfilling prophecy" by Glasser (24),

Bloom (8), and Brophy (9), as the Pgymalion effect by Rosenthal and Jacobson (51), and as the expectancy set by Finn (18). By whatever term used, teacher expectancy can influence the learning environment.

The research study by Rosenthal and Jacobson in 1966 and their book Pgymalion in the Classroom (51) has received much attention. It stimulated public discussion as well as policy decisions by some school boards. Furthermore, it has greatly stimulated research in the areas of teacher expectancy. The phenomenon of teacher expectation is a matter of vital importance in the improvement of educational climates. Positive teacher expectations can be of considerable help to disadvantaged students and to students with low self-concepts.

In Rosenthal and Jacobson's research on the "self-fulfilling prophecy," elementary teachers were given bogus information concerning students to cause them to expect a spurt of progress in selected students. Actually, the students had been selected randomly and had no more potential for progress than any other group of students. At the end of the year, the designated students had, in fact, made remarkable intellectual gains, both on an absolute basis and in comparison with other students. The conclusion was that teacher attitude or expectation had caused the prediction to be fulfilled since nothing else had changed.

The Pgymalion study has been severely criticized as research, owing to incomplete descriptions of design, basic data, and analysis. The sampling plan was not specified in detail, and there were technical inaccuracies. Another criticism was that the book strongly presumed that teacher expectations have an effect; therefore, contrary evidence was discounted (4, pp. 8-10).

Nine studies representing attempts to replicate the Rosenthal and Jacobson research were reported by Baker and Crist (5). Among them were studies by Claiborn, Jose, Evans, Cones, and Goldsmith, none of which were actually replications. None of the studies found I.Q. to be significantly altered by teacher expectancy, nor did any note any significant effects on pupil performance. One difficult problem in all nine studies was that of determining whether expectations had actually altered. The fact that a teacher is told to expect a certain student to make considerable gains may not be adequate to raise teacher expectation (5, p. 52). To assist in clarifying research on the phenomenon of teacher expectation, three categories are proposed by Finn: (1) effects of expectation with the teacher as perceiver, (2) effects of either manipulated or existing teacher expectations upon student achievement or sociometric ratings, and (3) teacher-student interaction as a measure of expectancy effects (18). In the first category, a study by Haberman (18) using

127 student teachers and their supervisory teachers found no significance related to expectancy in the ratings that the student teachers and cooperating teachers gave each other. Cahen (18), however, found a significant expectancy effect on scores given by 256 teachers in training on a learning-readiness test when fictitious information was given about pupil's I.Q. and placement in the reading group. The allegedly intelligent students were given higher scores than the supposedly less intelligent ones.

Simon (18) found that college students who were told their twelve-year-old students were above-average students gave significantly higher scores on a section of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC) than scorers who were told their subjects were below average. All subjects were actually in the average range of ability, but the ability levels were assigned randomly for the research.

In the second category of research studies, two of the four studies using bogus expectancies showed expectancy effects on student achievement. Meichenbaum, Bowers, and Ross (5) found, in a study of adolescent female juvenile offenders, that their teachers saw intellectual potential in "poor" students following experimentally induced expectation. This study also found a significant decrease in negative teacher behavior toward the "poor" students who had begun to improve.

Other studies using existing or natural expectancies were also significant. For example, a study by Palardy (41), which compared existing teacher expectations for probable success of boys in learning to read as compared to girls noted the possibility of differential reading achievement according to expectancies developed naturally by teachers. For teachers who held differential expectations, there were large reading differences among students in favor of the girls.

Seaver (5) used archival data to study the effects of natural expectancy inductions in the elementary school when a teacher had taught a student's older sibling. He found that younger siblings of good students made higher scores on achievement tests if assigned to the same teacher whom the older sibling had than if assigned to a different teacher. Younger siblings of poor students did better if assigned to a different teacher.

An earlier study by Pitt (18) in 1956 found no expectancy effects on school grades, achievement tests, or teacher ratings. Significant results were found, however, on pupil self-ratings. Jacobs (18), in studying sociometric factors in expectancy, found a positive correlation between teacher's post hoc ratings of sociometric change in the class and in the actual measured change.

Schrank's (5) research on teacher expectancy at the college level found significance in one study and results

deserving further investigation in the second study. His first study in 1968 related to ability grouping in math classes. One hundred students were assigned randomly to five sections, and the instructors were told they had been grouped according to ability. The sections were nearly perfectly ordered according to criterion averages and ability, from highest to lowest. In the second study students were grouped according to ability, and instructors were led to believe they were assigned randomly. Few significant differences were found in the two experiments.

In the category of studies focused on teacher-student interaction, seven experiments were reviewed. Beez (18) studied results of sixty graduate students who tutored sixty preschool children for a fifteen-minute session. Teachers were given fictitious ability levels for each student. Criterion measures were the number of symbols learned during the tutoring session, the number of symbols that tutors attempted to teach, and the rating the tutors gave their tutee. Beez found that the high-labeled students learned more symbols and were given better ratings than the low-labeled group. A question arose concerning the difference between classroom teaching and tutoring and the time for interaction between the student and the tutor necessary for effectiveness.

Brown (5) investigated the effects on teacher expectancy of bogus psychological reports and cumulative-record information. Ten teacher trainees tutored eighty first graders on a paired-associate list of states and capital cities. He found that the fake I.Q. information was significantly related to the amount of material which the teachers attempted.

A study by Rubovits and Maehr (5) and another study by Rothbart (5), using microteaching situations and bogus information given to the instructor, found teachers asked more questions and gave more praise to the gifted students. Rothbart's subjects described bright students as more prone to future success and as needing less approval.

In an interesting study by Willis (5) concerning teacher-student interaction, he found that teachers in his study ignored the least efficient learners' comments more frequently than comments from the most efficient learners. He concluded that teachers bring about extinction of social competence in the least efficient learners. A study by Good (22) supports the Willis research. In his study Good found that teachers interacted with high achievers consistently more than with low achievers.

In another study by Brophy and Good (9) it found that high achievers initiate significantly more contacts with teachers than do the low achievers. Teachers consistently

favored the high achievers over the low achievers in demanding and reinforcing quality performance. Furthermore, they praised the high achievers more and criticized less. Teachers failed to give feedback only 3.33 percent of the time to the high achievers but failed to give feedback 14.75 percent of the time to the low achievers.

Rist (5), in studying black ghetto children by anthropological observations, reported differential treatment of differently judged children. Based on the information available about the student's home, family, socioeconomic status, appearance, and performance during the first few days of school, the teacher clearly discriminated between groups of favored and nonfavored students.

Finn found in his study of expectancy set evidence "that in certain settings teachers do hold differential expectations for the achievement of student groups having common non-achievement characteristics" (18, p. 241). In a setting where teacher expectancy was generally low, expectation for specific students was detrimental to them even when their work was identical to that of other students. The ability level of the student was the most critical factor in forming the teacher's expectation. Teachers had differential expectations for white boys and girls but no sex distinctions were made for blacks.

These studies in teacher-student interaction included three that illustrated a planning effect in tutoring situations resulting from experimentally induced teacher expectations, one illustrating that the self-fulfilling prophecy on student behavior, and three indicating that the teacher rating of students according to achievement or ability influenced his treatment of the student.

Summary

The efforts to replicate the Rosenthal and Jacobson research have largely been unsuccessful. However, their research has served to stimulate other researchers in the field. From the review of research studies and other readings, the following generalizations are made:

1. The general climate of the school, the vigor, purpose, tempo of the work, and the quality of interaction between teachers and students is predictive of school success. The expectations teachers have for their students function as a self-fulfilling prophecy (9, 51, 43).

2. Teachers demand a better performance from students for whom they have higher expectations. They are also more likely to praise good performance when it occurs. By contrast, teachers accept poor performance from students held in low expectations. They are less likely to praise good performance in low-expectation students, even though it occurs less frequently (6, 26, 43).

3. Teachers systematically discriminate in favor of high achievers over low achievers in demanding and reinforcing quality performance (9).

4. Boys have more interaction with teachers than girls. Teachers direct more evaluative comments toward boys. They receive far more criticism and disapproval, especially for behavior (9).

5. Teachers communicate different performance expectations to individual students, through their classroom behavior. This encourages students to respond in ways which conform with the teachers' expectations (9, 55).

6. Teachers are usually unaware that they are subtly communicating different expectations to individual students (9).

7. Curriculum materials and textbooks provided tend to set the pace for both the teacher and the student by fixing expectations (9, 12, 26).

8. Students who are able to achieve but are not doing so suffer most from a teacher's low expectancy. The most severe loss is for expectancy to be based on sex, race, or docility rather than on ability (19).

9. The number of years of teaching experience was not significant in determining teacher expectancy (19).

10. Class expectations were not affected by race (19).

11. Verbal skills greatly influence teacher expectation. Routine information in cumulative folders provides expectancy-setting data (19).

12. Teacher expectation for class performance depends upon the situation, the setting, the estimate of abilities of the students, and the resources available to the teacher. Adequate preparation of students in the previous grade and adequate facilities and curriculum resources contribute to a high expectancy for success of a class (19, 26).

13. Tracking and ability grouping has a destructive effect on teacher expectation for the low group (20).

14. Teacher expectation probably does not affect pupil I.Q. (16).

15. Teacher-expectancy behavior observed includes eliciting and reinforcing student responses, grading and scoring subjectively, and judging student ability and probable success. Teacher expectancy also determines the kind of attention given to pupils as well as the amount of teaching attempted (16).

16. Teacher expectation is a major force in motivating student performance (41, 43).

A student's home environment and the abilities he brings to school can seldom be altered radically to benefit the student. However, a school climate conducive to learning and self-actualization can be provided. It is in this area that

schools and teachers can make a difference. Teacher expectations for school success play a vital role in creating the school's environmental climate and in determining the success of students. Individualized instruction should contain naturally the component of high teacher expectancy for success (39, 54).

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Almy, Millie, "Piaget in Action," Young Children, 31 (January, 1976), 93-96.

2. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Yearbook, Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming, Washington, D.C., National Education Association, 1962.

3. _____, Humanizing Education, edited by Robert R. Leeper, Washington, D.C., Department of National Education Association, 1967.

4. Bagley, William Chandler, The Educative Process, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1917.

5. Baker, J. P. and J. L. Christ, "Teacher Expectations: A Review of the Literature," in Pygmalion Reconsidered, Worthington, Ohio, Charles A. Jones, 1971.

6. Bestor, Arthur E., Educational Wastelands, Urbana, The University of Illinois Press, 1953.

7. Bidwell, Charles E., "The School as a Formal Organization," Handbook of Organizations, Chicago, Rand McNally, 1964, pp. 972-1022.

8. Bloom, Benjamin S., "Learning for Mastery," Evaluation Comment, 1 (May, 1968), 1.

9. Brophy, Jere E. and Thomas L. Good, "Teacher's Communication of Differential Expectations for Children's Classroom Performance: Some Behavioral Data," Journal of Educational Psychology, 61 (1970), 365-374.

10. Chamberlain, Leslie J., "What to Do When the Walls Come Down!" The Clearing House, 59 (October, 1975), 71-74.

11. Combs, Arthur W., "Florida Studies in the Helping Professions," Social Science Monograph, 37, Gainesville, Florida, University of Florida Press, 1969.

12. Cremin, Lawrence A., The Transformation of the School, New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1961.

13. Dale, Edgar, Building a Learning Environment, Bloomington, Indiana, Phi Delta Kappa, 1972.

14. Dewey, John, Individualism Old and New, New York, Minton, Balch and Company, 1930.

15. Drake, William E., The American Schools in Transition, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1955.

16. Elashoff, Janet D. and Richard E. Snow, Pygmalion Reconsidered, Worthington, Ohio, Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1971.

17. Featherstone, Joseph, Informal Schools in Britain Today, New York, Citation Press, 1971.

18. Finn, Jeremy D., "Expectations and the Educational Environment," Review of Educational Research, 42 (1972), 387-407.

19. _____, Eugene L. Gaier, Samuel S. Peng, and Ronald E. Banks, "Teacher Expectations and Pupil Achievement: A Naturalistic Study," Urban Education, 10 (July, 1975), 175-197.

20. Fox, Robert S., School Climate Improvement: A Challenge to the School Administrator, Bloomington, Indiana, Phi Delta Kappa, 1975.

21. Frazier, Alexander, Open Schools for Children, Washington, D.C., ASCD Publication, 1972.

22. Frymier, Jack R., A School for Tomorrow, Berkeley, California, McCutchan Publishing Company, 1973.

23. Gigliotti, Richard J. and Wilbar B. Brookover, "The Learning Environment of High and Low Achieving Elementary Schools," Urban Education, 10 (October, 1975), 245-258.

24. Glasser, William, The Effect of School Failure on the Life of a Child, Washington, D.C., National Association of Elementary Principals, 1971.

25. _____, Schools Without Failure, New York, Harper and Row, 1969.

26. Good, Thomas L., Bruce J. Bibble, and Jere E. Brophy, Teachers Make a Difference, New York, Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1975.

27. Goodlad, John I., and Robert Anderson, The Nongraded Elementary School, New York, Harcourt, Brace and World, 1973.

28. Goodlad, John I., and Robert Anderson, Toward a Mankind School, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1974.

29. Goss, Beatrice and Ronald Goss, "A Little Bit of Chaos," Saturday Review, May 16, 1970, p. 14.

30. Hurrvitz, Emanuel J. and Robert Mailment, "The Grade Dilemma," Criticism, Conflict and Change: Readings in American Education, New York, Dodd, Mead and Company, 1970.

31. Jackson, Philip W., Life in Classroom, New York, Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

32. Judd, Charles H., Problems of Education in the United States, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1933.

33. Keith, Lowell, Paul Blake, and Sidney Tiedt, Contemporary Curriculum in the Elementary School, New York, Harper and Row, 1968.

34. Lawler, Marcella R., Strategies for Planned Curriculum Innovation, New York, Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1970.

35. Likert, Rensia, New Patterns of Management, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1961.

36. Maslow, Abraham H., Motivation and Personality, New York, Harper and Row, Publishers, 1970.

37. McGregor, Douglas, The Human Side of Enterprise, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1960.

38. Morshead, Richard W., "The Clash of Hidden Ideologies in Contemporary Education," The Education Digest, 41 (November, 1975), 16-19.

39. Nyquist, Ewald B., "The Concept of Open Education," The Science Teacher, 38 (September, 1971), 25-28.

40. Otto, Henry J., Nongradedness, Austin, Texas, University of Texas Press, 1969.

41. Palardy, J. M., "What Teachers Believe--What Children Achieve," Elementary School Journal, 69 (April 1969), 370-374.

42. Pavan, Barbara N., "Nongradedness, One View," Educational Leadership, 30 (February, 1973), 401-403.

43. Pidgeon, Douglas A., Expectation and Pupil Performance, London, National Foundation for Educational Research in England and Wales, 1970.

44. Purkey, William W., Self Concept and School Achievement, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

45. Queenley, Mary A., "Nongrading in an Urban Slum School," Innovations in Mass Education, New York, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1969.

46. Raubinger, Fredrick and Harold G. Rowe, The Individual and Education, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1968.

47. Reich, Charles A., The Greening of America, New York, Random House, 1970.

48. Rickover, Hyman G., American Education--A National Failure, New York, E. P. Dutton and Co., Inc., 1963.

49. Rogers, Carl, On Becoming a Person, Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1961.

50. Rogers, Vincent R., Teaching in the British Primary School, London, The Macmillan Company, 1970.

51. Rosenthal, Robert and Lenore F. Jacobson, "Teacher Expectations for the Disadvantaged," Scientific American (April, 1968), pp. 19-23.

52. Sadker, David, "An Investigation of Environments Through the Factor Analysis of Beta Press," unpublished paper presented at American Education Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, February, 1973.

53. Shipman, David A., Carmen N. Calver, and Ann Lieberman, Teachers on Individualization: The Way We Do It, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1974.

54. Siegel, Ernest, Teaching One Child, New York, Educational Activities, Inc., 1972.

55. Silberman, Melvin L., "Behavioral Expressions of Teachers' Attitudes Toward Elementary School Students," Journal of Educational Psychology 60 (1969), 402-407.

56. Sizer, Theodore R., Places for Learning--Places for Joy, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1973.

57. Stahl, Donna K. and Patricia M. Anzalove, Individualized Teaching in the Elementary School, West Nyack, N.Y., Parker Publishing Company, 1970.

58. Street, David, Innovation in Mass Education, New York, John Wiley and Sons, 1969.

59. Swift, David W., Ideology and Change in the Public Schools, Columbus, Ohio, Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1971.

60. Thomas, Donald, "Five Clues to a Good School," The Education Digest (February, 1971), pp. 29-31.

61. U. S. News and World Report, October 28, 1974, p. 37.

62. Van Til, William, William E. Brounson, and Russell L. Hamm, "Back to Basics--With a Difference," Educational Leadership, 33 (October, 1975), 8-13.

63. Wilson, L. Craig, The Open Access Curriculum, Boston, Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

The purpose of this study was to compare schools that utilize individualized instruction with schools that utilize the traditional or group-oriented approach to instruction in relation to (1) environmental climates as perceived by students, (2) teacher expectation for school success, and (3) nonpromotion practices.

Identification and Selection of Schools

A total of twenty schools was involved in the study. Ten schools that had an ongoing program utilizing individualized instruction and ten schools using traditional or group-oriented instruction were identified. Individualized instruction schools were selected from schools exemplifying individualized instruction programs that had existed for at least one year. The selection of traditional or group-oriented schools was based upon their traditional organization of instruction.

A committee of Region XI Education Service Center personnel supplied the names of schools in each category. An effort was made by the committee to name schools that were performing well in their setting. Service Center personnel

were qualified to make these recommendations based upon their interaction with principals and teachers concerning curriculum matters, staff development, and special projects on a continuing basis.

After the schools were selected, each principal was contacted personally and asked to participate in the study. Two school systems required permission from the central administration in order to participate. In those cases permission was secured, and the principals were contacted again. Each principal was given a letter explaining the study and the procedures for participation in the study (see Appendix A).

Twenty principals, 62 teachers, and 1,600 students were requested to respond to the survey instruments. All fifth-grade students were surveyed to insure that results would reflect the total population at that level. Fifth graders were chosen for the study because they had been in the school environment over a period of years and could more nearly reflect that environment than younger children.

Design of the Study

The problem of this study was to make a comparison of factors indicative of students' perceptions of their school climates related to involvement, humanism, autonomy, morale, equity, and resources. Further comparisons were made between teacher expectation for success and nonpromotion practices.

The comparisons were made across the environmental climates of individualized instruction and the traditional or group-oriented schools. The Static Group Comparison was chosen for the design of this study.

The Static Group Comparison design is used to compare a group which has experienced a particular treatment with another group which has not, for the purpose of establishing the effect. It is represented by the diagram $X - - \frac{O_1}{O_2}$. In this study, X represents individualized instruction, O_1 the group that experienced individualized instruction, and O_2 the control group. Campbell and Stanley indicate that in Design 3 instances there would have been "no formal means of certifying that the groups would not have been equivalent had it not been for the X" (2, p. 12). They further state that the selection factor needs to be controlled, since if O_1 and O_2 differ, the difference could be the result of differential recruitment of members of the groups. Experimental mortality, another variable caused by differences in the two groups determined by differential drop-out of members of the group, was discussed (2, p. 12). This study, however, had no drop-out of members of each group.

Description of the Instruments

A review of the literature was used to clarify the development of individualized instruction and the recent

trend toward open, humanistic approaches to instruction. The role of teacher expectancy for student success was explored. Since the practice of nonpromotion is continued in some schools, principals and teachers were surveyed in order to make a comparison between the two school climates. Elementary students were surveyed concerning their perceptions of their school environmental climate. In all, three instruments were utilized in this study. They were a student questionnaire, a teacher questionnaire, and a principal questionnaire.

Student Questionnaire

In order to study the students' perceptions of their schools, the Elementary School Environment Survey was administered. The ESES assessed the school environment in relation to six dimensions, which included involvement, humanism, autonomy, morale, equity, and resource. Under the 1971 copyright of the ESES, the interpretation of the six dimensions are as follows:

1. Involvement

   Environments which score high on this factor reflect the presence of a student body which feels involved in classroom activities. A sense of belonging is emphasized in this environment, and this sense of belonging is buttressed by a concern for students. Students demonstrate their involvement by internalizing class objectives in such areas as academic pursuits and obedience to classroom rules and regulations. The atmosphere is congenial, and there is a cohesiveness and a sense of togetherness in this climate.

A low score on this factor demonstrates a feeling of estrangement in the environment. This feeling of alienation could, in fact, lead to destructive acts against the classroom itself.

2. Humanism

The items in this factor reflect a concern for the value of the individual. It is a supportive climate and is marked by courtesy.

In addition, this value placed on the individual is carried over to his personal acts of expression, specifically aesthetic expression. This climate demonstrates a concern for creativity, and it is supportive of poetry, music, painting, and theater.

A classroom characterized by this atmosphere is concerned with the integrity of the individual and a concern for his cultural and aesthetic expression.

3. Autonomy

A high score on this factor suggests an environment which supports and encourages student independence. This climate suggests student initiative as well as autonomy. Emphasis on procedures and supervision are minimized. Self-direction rather than the obedience to the rules of protocol is important. Individual differences, both in opinion and academic interests, are stressed. Another aspect of this environment is that the lines of communication between learners and teachers are open and candid.

This environment affords the student the opportunity to share in the responsibility for his own learning.

4. Morale

The statements in this factor relate to student attitudes toward the classroom. A high score on this factor indicates a friendly and cheerful classroom environment. This environment may be described as a happy one in which learners and teachers have a warm relationship.

A low score on this factor indicates a negative student attitude toward the class and suggests poor relations between learners and teachers as well as disruptive student behavior.

This factor is concerned with student attitudes toward the classroom and the cooperating behavior which relates to such attitudes.

5. Equity

The items in this factor reflect the degree of equity versus opportunism in the environment. A high score on this factor suggests a climate in which individuals are treated equally and do not gain socially or academically through preferred treatment.

A low score on this factor suggests a climate in which one gains social capital and academic status by behaving in an appropriate manner with important and powerful people. Informal political procedures and the importance of personal relationships are emphasized.

This environment seems to be categorized by an absence of entrepreneural behavior and political maneuvering.

6. Resource

The items in this factor reflect the number of optional learning opportunities available to and initiated for the students. The emphasis here is on the availability of in-class as well as extra-class resources. Included in this category are such resources as written materials, field trips, television, exhibits and music. The availability of the teacher as a supporting service for learning is also included in this dimension. Classrooms which score high on this factor offer a wide variety of learning opportunities (6, pp. 7-10).

The variability and reliability of the Elementary School Environment Survey was verified through an extensive study in Massachusetts. Three approaches were used to assess the validity of the Elementary School Environment Survey. First, content validity was considered by examining the reactions and comments of students regarding specific items on the questionnaire. The instrument was administered to students in fifty-four Massachusetts elementary schools. The

data-collecting team reviewed the items which seemed to generate frequent misunderstandings among students. Consequently, four items were deleted from the survey in order to remove the threat of content validity.

Construct validity of ESES was assessed by conducting a factor analysis of the data obtained in a study by McKay (4) and a second study by Sadker (7). Sufficient agreement between the two analyses was found to indicate adequate construct validity.

A third approach to validity was to determine the degree of relationship between a defined construct and measures of other identifiable features of sampled schools. Scores for each school were available for the Halpin-Croft Organization Climate Description Questionnaire and the ESES. Thus, the relationships between the ESES variables and the OCDQ variables were considered to bear on the predictive validity of the ESES.

According to Pace and Stern (5), it may not be appropriate to obtain conventional reliability estimates for instruments such as ESES. Pace reported,

> The usual formulas for estimating reliability--test-retest, split-haves, KR formulas, and so forth--are all based on the variance of scores and are not applicable to estimating the reliability of a score at a single school. . . . College University Environment Survey (CUES) scores . . . are based on the logic of consensus, not the logic of variance. Consensus is the opposite of variance (5, pp. 42-43).

Teacher Questionnaire

An eighteen-item multiple-choice questionnaire, which measured teachers' expectations for school success, was administered (see Appendix D). A questionnaire constructed by Good and Dembo (3) was used for the survey. The authors constructed the original questionnaire to examine Bloom's statement that teachers do not expect a majority of their pupils to learn adequately what they have to teach. Bloom (1) contended that teachers expect limited student performance and that grading practices and teacher behavior, based upon their low expectations, serve to guarantee that many students will not realize their potential. Six questions were embedded in the questionnaire to measure teacher expectation:

> Question 1 asks teachers what percentage of their students will fail or experience only marginal success.
>
> Question 2 asks what percentage of students will really master the material presented.
>
> Question 3 seeks to determine what percentage of the class can be depended upon to provide model responses which accomplish the teachers' purpose in terms of achievement.
>
> Question 4 attempts to determine the questioning strategy of teachers related to students of low-academic ability in comparison with other class members.
>
> Question 5 relates to the time of year that leadership opportunities are introduced for low-achieving students by teachers.
>
> Question 6 requests the teachers to predict which students will present most of the discipline problems. Do teachers expect more discipline problems from students of high- and moderate-achievement records, or do they expect no difference in behavior problems between more-able and less-able students?

Principal Questionnaire

Principals were asked to respond to a twenty-six-item multiple-choice self report questionnaire concerning their schools (see Appendix C). The questionnaire was developed by the investigator to survey the role of the principal in promotion or nonpromotion of students. The questionnaire was developed in conjunction with a college professor, elementary principals, a superintendent, and a director of research and evaluation. A survey instrument developed by Wakeland (8) in a similar study in 1972 was helpful in the development of the present instrument. This questionnaire also provided demographic data concerning the size of the school, socio-economic level of the students, organizational structure of the school, and the school plant design. An attempt was made to determine if external forces such as parental pressure or school policies influenced the number of nonpromotions.

Testing Procedures

At the time each principal agreed to participate in the study, the number of fifth-grade students and teachers in the school was obtained. A packet of materials was prepared for each teacher. It included the instruments and instructions for having the students complete the Elementary School Environment Survey. The material was organized to make it an activity that fifth-grade students could do independently. A cassette tape, which gave verbal instructions to the

students and which read the questions on the survey sheet, was provided. This was a further effort to make the survey an activity that would not require the teacher's time, to reduce teacher bias on the survey, and to insure that each student understood the survey questions.

After each teacher had received a letter explaining the nature of the study and had been asked for assistance (see Appendix F), a packet of materials was delivered to each teacher. The packet included a questionnaire for the teacher and one Elementary School Environment Survey for each student. The teacher was provided an envelope in which to place the teacher questionnaire when completed. The student questionnaires and cassette tape were to be sealed in the large clear envelope provided. The envelopes for teacher and student responses were provided to encourage forthright answers.

The completed data were collected from each school within ten days after the first delivery date. These procedures resulted in the completion of the surveys by all twenty principals, all fifth-grade teachers, and all fifth-grade students.

Procedures for Analysis of the Data

After the data were collected, the principals' questionnaire was transcribed on to data sheets for key punch. The teachers' questionnaires and the Elementary School Environment Surveys were keypunched. A comparison of the

two groups was made using t tests and chi square tests by the North Texas State University Computer Center.

Each hypothesis was stated in the null form. The appropriate t-ratios, chi square values, and probability levels were calculated by the computer. A probability level of $p < .05$ was selected as necessary to reject the null hypotheses.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bloom, Benjamin S., "Learning for Mastery," Evaluation Comment (May, 1968), pp. 3-11.

2. Campbell, Donald and Julian Stanley, Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research, Chicago, Rand-McNally and Company, 1963.

3. Good, Thomas L. and Myron H. Dembo, Teacher Expectations: Self Report Data, Technical Report No. 64, Center for Research in Social Behavior, University of Missouri, Columbia, 1973.

4. McKay, A. Bruce, "Principals, Teachers, and Elementary Youth: A Study of the Relationships Between Selected Variables of Teacher-Principal Social Interaction and Six Features of the Educational Environment," unpublished paper distributed at the American Education Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, February, 1973.

5. Pace, C. Robert, College and University Environment Scales: Technical Manual, 2nd ed., Princeton, Educational Testing Service, 1969.

6. Sadker, David, Elementary School Environment Survey, Kenosha, University of Wisconsin--Parkside, 1971.

7. _____, "Dimensions of the Elementary School Environment: A Factor Analytic Study," The Journal of Educational Research, 66 (July-August, 1973), 441-442.

8. Wakeland, Justin, "The Role of the Principal in Open Plan Elementary Schools in Texas," unpublished doctoral dissertation, School of Education, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas, 1972.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to compare schools that utilize individualized instruction with schools that utilize the traditional or group-oriented approach to instruction in relation to (1) the environmental climate as perceived by students, (2) teacher expectation for school success, and (3) nonpromotion practices.

The underlying assumptions were that schools that individualize instruction affect the perception of students and that teacher expectation and nonpromotion practices in the two environmental climates differ. The data gathered in this study are presented under three sections: (1) student perception of environmental climate (Hypotheses 1-6), (2) teacher expectation for school success (Hypothesis 7), and (3) nonpromotion practices (Hypotheses 8 and 9).

This chapter is an exposition of the findings resulting from the procedures previously described. The findings relevant to each hypothesis are presented in order.

Student Perception of Environmental Climate

Hypothesis 1

There will be no significant difference related to involvement in the mean scores of students in individualized

instruction schools and in traditional or group-oriented schools, as measured by the Elementary School Environment Survey (ESES). Data relative to the hypothesis are presented in Table I. The t-value of 0.9292 was not significant at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis was retained.

TABLE I

SUMMARY OF DATA FOR THE INVOLVEMENT FACTOR OF THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT SURVEY

Source of Variation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number of Observations	LS T
Individualized Schools	4.97	1.36	866	0.92
Traditional Schools	4.90	1.29	736	NS*

*NS = Not Significant.

Hypothesis 2

There will be no significant difference related to humanism in the mean scores of students in individualized instruction schools and in traditional or group-oriented schools, as measured by the Elementary School Environment Survey (ESES). The data relative to the hypothesis are presented in Table II. The t value of -2.3255 was significant at the .05 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

TABLE II

SUMMARY DATA FOR THE HUMANISM FACTOR OF THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT SURVEY

Source of Variation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number of Observations	t value	Level of Significance
Individualized Schools	3.50	1.53	844	-2.3255	.05
Traditional Schools	3.68	1.43	724	-	

Hypothesis 3

There will be no significant difference related to independence in the mean scores of students in individualized instruction schools and in traditional or group-oriented schools, as measured by the Elementary School Environment Survey (ESES). The data relative to the hypothesis are presented in Table III. The t value of -1.6892 was not significant at the .05 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained.

Hypothesis 4

There will be no significant difference related to morale in the mean scores of students in individualized instruction schools and in traditional or group-oriented schools, as measured by the Elementary School Environment Survey (ESES). The data relative to the hypothesis are

TABLE III

SUMMARY DATA FOR THE INDEPENDENCE FACTOR OF THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT SURVEY

Source of Variation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number of Observations	t value	Level of Significance
Individualized Schools	3.53	1.37	858	-1.6892	NS*
Traditional Schools	3.64	1.31	734	-	

*NS = Not Significant.

presented in Table IV. The t value of 1.5926 was not significant at the .05 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained.

TABLE IV

SUMMARY DATA FOR THE MORALE FACTOR OF THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT SURVEY

Source of Variation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number of Observations	t value	Level of Significance
Individualized Schools	3.50	1.70	839	1.5926	NS*
Traditional Schools	3.36	1.55	718	-	

*NS = Not Significant.

Hypothesis 5

There will be no significant difference related to equity in the mean scores of students in individualized instruction schools and in traditional or group-oriented schools, as measured by the Elementary School Environment Survey (ESES). The data relative to the hypothesis are presented in Table V. The *t* value of -1.5837 was not significant at the .05 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained.

TABLE V

SUMMARY DATA FOR THE EQUITY FACTOR OF THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT SURVEY

Source of Variation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number of Observations	*t* value	Level of Significance
Individualized Schools	4.51	1.33	864	-1.5837	NS*
Traditional Schools	4.62	1.30	738	-	

*NS = Not Significant.

Hypothesis 6

There will be no significant difference related to resources in the mean scores of students in individualized instruction schools and in traditional or group-oriented schools, as measured by the Elementary School Environment

Survey (ESES). The data relative to the hypothesis are presented in Table VI. The t value of -0.0689 was not significant at the .05 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained.

TABLE VI

SUMMARY DATA FOR THE RESOURCE FACTOR OF THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT SURVEY

Source of Variation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number of Observations	t value	Level of Significance
Individualized Schools	4.16	1.44	862	-0.0689	NS*
Traditional Schools	4.16	1.37	736	-	

*NS = Not Significant.

Teacher Expectation for School Success

Hypothesis 7

There will be no significant difference related to teacher expectancy for school success in the mean scores of teachers in individualized instruction schools and in traditional or group-oriented schools, as measured by a teacher self-report questionnaire. The data relative to the hypothesis are presented in Table VII. The t value of .92239 was not significant at the .05 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained.

TABLE VII

SUMMARY DATA FOR THE TEACHER EXPECTANCY FOR SCHOOL SUCCESS RESULTING FROM A TEACHER SELF-REPORT QUESTIONNAIRE

Source of Variation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number of Observations	t value	Level of Significance
Individualized Schools	11.24	8.50	33	.92239	NS*
Traditional Schools	11.93	8.71	29	-	

*NS = Not Significant.

Nonpromotion Practices

Hypothesis 8

There will be no significant difference in the percentage of students not promoted in individualized instruction schools and in traditional or group-oriented schools, as measured by a principal's self-report questionnaire. The data relative to the hypothesis are presented in Table VIII. The chi square value of 94.93 was significant at the .01 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 9

There will be no significant difference in the percentage of students that principals expect to fail or experience only marginal success in individualized instruction schools and in traditional or group-oriented schools, as measured by

TABLE VIII

SUMMARY DATA FOR THE PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS NOT PROMOTED IN INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION SCHOOLS AND IN TRADITIONAL OR GROUP-ORIENTED SCHOOLS

Source of Variation	Number of Observations	Number Non-promoted	Percent Non-promoted	Chi square	Level of Significance
Individualized Schools	862	33	4%	94.93	
Traditional Schools	736	140	20%		.01

a principal's self-report questionnaire. The data relative to the hypothesis are presented in Table IX. The chi square value of 5.0 was not significant at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained.

TABLE IX

SUMMARY DATA FOR PRINCIPAL EXPECTANCY FOR SCHOOL SUCCESS RESULTING FROM A PRINCIPAL SELF-REPORT QUESTIONNAIRE

Source of Variation	Number of Observations	1-4%	5-9%	10-15%	16-25%	Chi square	Level of Significance
Individualized Schools	10	10	0	0	0	5.0	NS*
Traditional Schools	10	6	3	0	1	-	

*NS = Not Significant.

Discussion of the Findings

The data indicated that the fifth-grade students enrolled in schools utilizing individualized instruction and students enrolled in traditional or group-oriented schools have similar perceptions of their school environmental climate. In the hypotheses which examined involvement, independence, morale, equity, and school resources, no significant differences were found between the students' perceptions in the two groups.

One significant finding of the study was that the students enrolled in traditional or group-oriented schools perceived their schools as more humanistic than the individualized instruction schools. The humanism dimension of the Elementary School Environment Survey assessed the school's value for the individual on one end of the scale and a lack of concern or respect for the individual on the opposite end of the scale. There are several possible reasons for this finding. Students in traditional or group-oriented schools do not usually come into contact with as many teachers each school day. In traditional classrooms where a teacher has the group for most or all of the school day, he may develop very close positive humanistic relationships with the students. This longer period of time with elementary students may be a significant factor. Schools and teachers who are individualizing instruction are relatively new at the job. For many teachers the philosophy of meeting individual needs has been introduced to them recently in staff development sessions. Many have made a

transition from the traditional to an individualized approach. This new approach has required new materials, new and more audio visual equipment, and much more teacher effort. Due to the additional effort required, the teachers may have had less time to interact in a humanistic way with students. Their efforts may have been expended primarily on materials.

Some individualized instruction methods meet individual academic needs of students without meeting social or humanistic needs. The contract method of individualizing, whereby a student contracts to complete a specified amount of work, has been widely used. It does not necessarily promote teacher-student interaction. If much contract teaching was done, it could have been a factor in students perceiving the individualized instruction school as less humanistic. Independent study which is used to some extent in the individualized schools can also decrease contact with other students and teachers if provisions are not made for meaningful involvement.

Schools utilizing individualized instruction need to go beyond the surface needs of students. It should proceed to the next step and personalize instruction. The student is a whole person and his physical, social, emotional, as well as his academic needs must be met. Schools and teachers in individualized instruction schools may have worked so diligently on meeting academic needs that the humanistic needs have been slighted.

Many traditional schools have provided well for more than just the academic needs of students. Students have found teachers who have caused them to feel worthy and valuable. The traditional school can emphasize subject matter and yet convey a humanistic climate to many of its students.

Hypotheses number 7 and 9 were retained. The data indicated that teachers and principals in each group of schools did not differ significantly in regard to expectancy for school success.

Hypothesis number 8 examined nonpromotion practices. Thus the second significant finding of the study was that individualized instruction schools nonpromote a lower percentage of their students. Some possible reasons for this finding are that individualized instruction schools are making an effort to adjust the curriculum to fit the needs of the student. The student becomes the center of value rather than the material to be learned. When this happens, the chances for success of the student is improved. The total student is taken into account in making evaluations of his school experience. The student's work is not compared to a norm, a group, or a class. A success-based curriculum is designed for the student. Standards are made for individuals. Consequently, a gifted student is required to achieve more than an average student, and a weaker student may be required to learn only survival skills. This philosophy increases the likelihood that students will be promoted.

Another reason for this finding is that some individualized instruction schools are nongraded. Therefore, nonpromotions are not as likely to occur as they are in the traditional schools. Traditional schools may fail students each year, whereas a nongraded or continuous progress school may have certain blocks or levels when a student may be nonpromoted.

The study of elementary school environmental climates is relatively new. Few instruments are available at the present time to measure environmental differences. The Elementary School Environment Survey was copyrighted in 1973. Due to its recent development, no published research findings have been found. Therefore, comparison of studies using the same instrument cannot be made. The instrument used in this study to assess teacher expectation for student success correlated with similar research by Good (1). In both studies teacher expectation for success was relatively low. The findings obtained from the principals' self-report questionnaire related to the number of nonpromotions correlated with research done by McLaughlin (2). A lower percentage of students was nonpromoted in individualized instruction schools compared to traditional or group-oriented schools.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Good, Thomas L. and Myron H. Dembo, Teacher Expectation: Self Report Data, Technical Report No. 64, Columbia, Center for Research in Social Behavior, University of Missouri, 1973.

2. McLaughlin, William P., "Continuous Pupil Progress in the Nongraded School: Hope or Hoax?" Elementary School Journal, 71 (November, 1970), 90-96.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

Summary

Purpose of the Study

Increasing emphasis is being placed on the individual student as a person of inherent worth and dignity. This has been reflected by the revised Goals for Public School Education in Texas. Since 1974, demonstration schools for individualized instruction have attracted the attention of educators throughout the state. The purpose of this study was to compare schools that utilize individualized instruction with schools that utilize a traditional or group-oriented approach to instruction in relation to (1) the environmental climate as perceived by students, (2) teacher expectation for school success, and (3) nonpromotion practices.

Hypotheses

Nine hypotheses, stated in the null form, were tested to carry out the purposes of the study. The first six hypotheses related to the perceptions of fifth-grade students in two different environments. The seventh hypothesis related to teacher expectancy for school success. The eighth and

ninth hypotheses examined nonpromotion practices and the principals' expectancy for school success.

Related Literature

The related literature was subdivided into four sections: (1) a review of traditional elementary education, (2) the history and development of individualized instruction, (3) humanistic aspects of individualized instruction, and (4) the role of teacher expectancy in individualized instruction. In the review of related literature, the history of individualized instruction was traced from sixteenth-century educators to the present concerns to meet the educational needs of all students.

Design of the Research

This study first investigated students' perceptions of their school environmental climate. A panel of Region XI Education Service Center personnel was instrumental in selecting the schools. Schools that had been identified as individualized instruction schools composed the experimental group. The control group was composed of schools that used a traditional or group-oriented approach to instruction. Sixteen hundred fifth-grade students from twenty different schools answered the forty-two-item Elementary School Environment Survey (ESES).

Second, this study investigated teachers' expectations for school success across the two environmental climates of individualized instruction schools and a traditional or group-oriented approach to instruction. Thirty-three teachers were included in the experimental group, and twenty-nine were included in the control group. Each teacher answered an eighteen-item multiple-choice self-report questionnaire.

Finally, the study investigated nonpromotion through a principals' self-report questionnaire regarding nonpromotion practices and the principals' expectations for students' success or failure in school. Twenty principals answered a twenty-six-item multiple-choice self-report questionnaire. Ten principals were represented from each school environmental climate.

In January, 1976, each principal involved in the study was contacted personally and asked to participate. A letter to principals and teachers was also provided to explain the study and to provide procedures for participation in the study (see Appendixes A and B). A packet containing the survey instruments and instructions was delivered to each participating teacher and principal. All packets were completed and returned within two weeks.

The nine hypotheses formulated in the study were tested, with the following statistical treatment: hypotheses one

through seven were tested by a comparison of the mean scores of the experimental group and the control group utilizing the t test. Hypotheses eight and nine were tested by a comparison of percentages, utilizing chi square.

Findings

In regard to fifth-grade students' perceptions of their school environmental climate, the following data from the survey instrument were revealed:

(1) Fifth-grade students enrolled in schools utilizing individualized instruction and students enrolled in traditional or group-oriented schools have similar perceptions of their school's environmental climate.

(2) Fifth-grade students enrolled in schools utilizing individualized instruction and fifth-grade students enrolled in traditional or group-oriented schools do not differ significantly in their perception of involvement in their schools. The group means for each group indicated a congenial, caring environment.

(3) A comparison of group means for the experimental and the control groups indicated a significant difference at the .05 level of significance in regard to humanism. Students in traditional or group-oriented schools perceived their school climate as being more humanistic than the students enrolled in schools utilizing individualized instruction.

(4) Fifth-grade students enrolled in schools utilizing individualized instruction and fifth-grade students enrolled in traditional or group-oriented schools do not differ significantly in their perception of independence in their schools.

(5) Fifth-grade students enrolled in schools utilizing individualized instruction and fifth-grade students enrolled in traditional or group-oriented schools do not differ significantly in their perception of morale in their schools.

(6) Fifth-grade students enrolled in schools utilizing individualized instruction and fifth-grade students enrolled in traditional or group-oriented schools do not differ significantly in their perception of equity in their schools.

(7) Fifth-grade students enrolled in schools utilizing individualized instruction and fifth-grade students enrolled in traditional or group-oriented schools do not differ significantly in their perception of resources in their schools.

(8) There was no significant difference between teachers who teach fifth-grade students in individualized instruction schools and those who teach fifth-grade students in traditional or group-oriented schools in regard to expectation for student success.

(9) In regard to nonpromotion practices, the data obtained from the survey instrument indicated a significant

difference at the .01 level of significance in the percentage of students not promoted. The individualized instruction schools failed to promote 4 percent of their students whereas the traditional or group-oriented schools failed to promote 20 percent of their students.

(10) There was no significant difference between principals in individualized instruction schools and principals in traditional or group-oriented schools in regard to expectation for student success.

Conclusions

Based on the data presented in this study and within the limitations of this study, the following conclusions have been formulated:

(1) Students enrolled in individualized instruction schools do not differ significantly in their perception from students in traditional or group-oriented schools in relation to involvement, independence, morale, equity, and school resources.

(2) Students enrolled in traditional or group-oriented instruction schools perceive their schools to be more humanistic than students in individualized instruction schools.

(3) Elementary teachers and principals do not differ in their expectations for school success across different environmental climates.

(4) Schools utilizing individualized instruction fail a much lower percentage of their students.

Recommendations for Further Study

The following recommendations are derived from analysis of the data collected in this study and the findings of related research:

(1) It is recommended that as schools implement individualized instruction or make any major curricular or organizational changes, the humanistic climate should be assessed by pre- and post-tests.

(2) It is recommended that students who have not been promoted at any point in their elementary school years should be identified and a longitudinal humanistic study should be made.

(3) It is recommended that students who have not been promoted should be identified and research done to determine if they perceive their school climate any differently from promoted students.

(4) It is recommended that a similar study be conducted in a school where a conscious effort is being made to improve the humanistic climate and school achievement.

(5) It is recommended that a study be conducted to investigate the relationship of the self-concept to the humanistic school climate.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

CROWLEY INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
Sycamore Elementary School
1601 Country Manor Road
Fort Worth, Texas 76134

293-6033

Joe C. Bean
Principal

January 1976

Dear Fellow Principal,

Your help is requested in a study of environmental climates in elementary schools. The study is being done as a part of a doctoral dissertation under the direction of Dr. Frank Halstead, Division of Educational Leadership, North Texas State University.

Enclosed you will find three different questionnaires designed to survey various factors of the school climate. You are requested to complete one, each fifth-grade teacher one, and each fifth-grade student one. You can be assured that no personal or school identification will be revealed by fact or implication.

Thank you for using your valuable time and energy to participate in this study. The completion of the questionnaire should require no more than thirty minutes of anyone's time.

Sincerely,

Joe C. Bean
Principal
Sycamore Elementary School

JCB:pn

APPENDIX B

SCHOOLS INCLUDED IN THE STUDY

Elementary School	School District
Central	White Settlement
Dove	Grapevine
Dunn	Burleson
Francisco	Birdville
Hardeman	Birdville
Hedrick	Lewisville
Joshua	Joshua
Kennedale	Kennedale
Lakewood	Hurst-Euless-Bedford
Little	Arlington
Nash	Mansfield
North Castleberry	Castleberry
Oakwood Terrace	Hurst-Euless-Bedford
Shady Oaks	Hurst-Euless-Bedford
Short	Arlington
Souter	Everman
Thornton	Arlington
Watauga	Birdville
Wilshire	Hurst-Euless-Bedford
Wilson	Denton

APPENDIX C

PRINCIPAL'S QUESTIONNAIRE

Directions: Please answer every item as it applies to your present assignment.

1. Elementary School enrollment _____

2. From your last "Principal's Annual Report" how many students were nonpromoted in each grade level?
   K _____ 2 _____ 4 _____ 6 _____
   1 _____ 3 _____ 5 _____

3. From your "Superintendent's Annual Report" what was the average per pupil expenditure for 1975? _____

4. Number of years school has been in operation
   _____ 1. Less than 1 _____ 4. 3 _____ 7. 6
   _____ 2. 1 _____ 5. 4 _____ 8. More than 6
   _____ 3. 2 _____ 6. 5

5. Ethnic composition of your student body
   _____ 1. Predominantly Anglo (65% or more)
   _____ 2. Predominantly Negro (65% or more)
   _____ 3. Predominantly Mexican-American (65% or more)
   _____ 4. Mixed

6. Average income of the families served by your school
   _____ 1. Less than $3000 _____ 4. $10,000 - $20,000
   _____ 2. $3000 - $5000 _____ 5. $20,000 - $30,000
   _____ 3. $5000 - $10,000 _____ 6. More than $30,000

7. Your total years of experience in school work
   _____ 1. 2 - 5 years _____ 5. 18 - 21 years
   _____ 2. 6 - 9 years _____ 6. 22 - 25 years
   _____ 3. 10 - 13 years _____ 7. 26 - 29 years
   _____ 4. 14 - 17 years _____ 8. More than 29 years

8. Your total years as a principal
   _____ 1. 1 - 5 years _____ 5. 18 - 21 years
   _____ 2. 6 - 9 years _____ 6. 22 - 25 years
   _____ 3. 10 - 13 years _____ 7. 26 - 29 years
   _____ 4. 14 - 17 years _____ 8. More than 29 years

9. Principal's ethnic group/sex

_____ 1.	Anglo male	_____ 5.	Mexican-American male
_____ 2.	Anglo female	_____ 6.	Mexican-American female
_____ 3.	Negro male		
_____ 4.	Negro female	_____ 7.	Other

10. Highest earned college degree

_____ 1.	Bachelor's degree	_____ 3.	Doctor's degree
_____ 2.	Master's degree	_____ 4.	No degree

11. Principal's age

_____ 1.	Under 30	_____ 5.	46 - 50
_____ 2.	31 - 35	_____ 6.	51 - 55
_____ 3.	36 - 40	_____ 7.	56 - 65
_____ 4.	41 - 45	_____ 8.	65 or over

12. Organization structure of your school

_____ 1. Graded
_____ 2. Nongraded
_____ 3. Graded with some nongraded features
_____ 4. Multi-age grouping
_____ 5. Self-contained
_____ 6. Departmentalized
_____ 7. Platoon
_____ 8. Team teaching
_____ 9. Other _____

13. School plant design

_____ 1. Large open spaces
_____ 2. Clusters with movable walls
_____ 3. Traditional cubicals with fixed walls
_____ 4. Large open areas with several small special teaching spaces
_____ 5. Totally open
_____ 6. Other _____

14. Please check the statements that apply to your school.

_____ 1. School goals are written and revised with teachers periodically.
_____ 2. Volunteer parents and/or students are used as teacher aides.
_____ 3. Teachers as a whole have high morale.
_____ 4. Since kindergarten has been added, fewer nonpromotions have occurred.
_____ 5. This school has been involved in a pilot study or demonstration school in the past three years.
_____ 6. Kindergarten has had no effect on the number of nonpromotions.
_____ 7. Plan A special education classes have reduced nonpromotions.
_____ 8. A Parent-Teacher Association or organization in the school makes a valuable contribution to the school.

15. Nonpromotion practices
_____ 1. The teacher makes the decision to nonpromote a student.
_____ 2. The teacher and parent make the decision to nonpromote a student.
_____ 3. The teacher and the principal make the decision to nonpromote a student.
_____ 4. The principal makes the decision to nonpromote a student.
_____ 5. The teacher, parent, and principal make the decision to nonpromote a student.

16. Were you personally ever nonpromoted?
_____ 1. Yes _____ 2. No

17. Has anyone closely related to you been nonpromoted? (Brother, sister, child, husband, wife)
_____ 1. Yes _____ 2. No

18. As principal, do you require teachers who nonpromote a student to write a detailed account of the reasons for nonpromotion?
_____ 1. Yes _____ 2. No

19. Are physical examinations required of students who may be nonpromoted?
_____ 1. Yes _____ 2. No

20. Are psychological tests required of students who may be nonpromoted?
_____ 1. Yes _____ 2. No

21. To what extent do the central office personnel influence the number of nonpromotions in your school?
_____ 1. To no extent
_____ 2. To some extent
_____ 3. To a great extent

22. To what extent do the community and parents influence nonpromotions in your school?
_____ 1. To no extent
_____ 2. To some extent
_____ 3. To a great extent

23. Grading System--Check the statements that apply to your school.
_____ 1. A, B, C grades are used.
_____ 2. S-Satisfactory, N-Needs Improvement, O-Outstanding symbols are used.
_____ 3. Continuous progress is noted.

_____ 4. Parent-teacher conferences are used for reporting.
_____ 5. No grades are given.
_____ 6. Grades are given in terms of the student's rank with his peers.
_____ 7. Grades are based on the individual's own ability.
_____ 8. Student is not compared with his peers.

24. Corporal Punishment--Check the statements that apply to your school.
_____ 1. Corporal punishment is used by the principal only.
_____ 2. Corporal punishment may be used by teachers.
_____ 3. A witness is required when corporal punishment is administered.
_____ 4. All corporal punishment is administered in the school office.

25. Vandalism--(Destructive acts to school property)
_____ 1. Is a minor problem
_____ 2. Is a major problem
_____ 3. Is practically no problem
_____ 4. Is a problem of some concern

26. Based upon your past experience as a principal, if in September someone asked you, "What percentage of your students will fail or just get by?" how would you respond?
_____ 1. 1 - 4%
_____ 2. 5%
_____ 3. 10%
_____ 4. 15%
_____ 5. 25%
_____ 6. 35%
_____ 7. 50%

APPENDIX D

TEACHER'S QUESTIONNAIRE

Directions: Please answer every item as it applies to your present assignment. Check the appropriate space.

1. Based upon your past experience as a teacher, if in September someone asked you, "What percentage of your students will fail or just get by?" how would you respond?

_____	1. 5%	_____	4. 25%
_____	2. 10%	_____	5. 35%
_____	3. 15%	_____	6. 50%

2. Based upon your past experience as a teacher, if in September someone asked you, "What percentage of the students in your class will really master the material you present?" how would you respond?

_____	1. 15%	_____	4. 70%
_____	2. 25%	_____	5. 95%
_____	3. 45%		

3. Teachers often attempt to secure model answers from students in order to get discussion started, to illustrate correct answers, or to motivate the class. Based upon your experience, what percentage of the class can be depended upon to provide model responses which accomplish your purpose in terms of achievement?

_____	1. 10%	_____	4. 50%
_____	2. 20%	_____	5. 75%
_____	3. 30%		

4. Soliciting participation from students of low academic ability (Lows) is an exceedingly difficult teacher task. Lows often provide inappropriate responses and take a long time to respond, wasting the time of other students. Thus, other students are irritated by delays and frequently greet erroneous responses from Lows with a chorus of laughter. If teachers call upon Lows too often, it may lead them to experience continual embarrassment and eventually to withdraw. However, Lows possess limited attention spans and if the teacher fails to call upon these students, they probably will experience little educational gain. In general, what is your questioning strategy for Lows in comparison with other class members?

_____ 1. Call upon Lows less often than other students but call upon Lows when they are likely to know the answer.

_____ 2. Call upon Lows equally, without concern for whether or not they know the answer.
_____ 3. Call upon Lows more often than other students but call upon Lows when they are likely to know the answer.
_____ 4. Call upon Lows equally but call upon Lows when they are likely to know the answer.

5. Some researchers contend that the way to motivate and interest low-achieving students is to give them leadership experiences. Other researchers report that leadership opportunities may be very damaging to the low-ability student who is unprepared for a leadership role and subsequently fails, since public failure in a leadership role is more severe than private failure. From your experience, which of the statements best represents the advice you would give to young teachers?
_____ 1. Provide Lows with leadership opportunity as soon as the year begins so that they may gradually gain self-confidence.
_____ 2. Provide Lows with leadership opportunities like any other student without special consideration which may serve to dilute the importance of his accomplishments.
_____ 3. Attempt to gain rapport with Lows first and begin to develop their confidences and skills; then provide them with leadership roles later in the year when they are better prepared to cope with challenges.

6. Undergraduates continually ask, "Which students cause classroom discipline problems?" If you were predicting, in September which students would present most of your discipline problems, how would you respond?
_____ 1. Students with high and moderate achievement records bored with classroom life will cause most discipline problems.
_____ 2. There will be no differences in behavior problems between more able and less able students.
_____ 3. Students with low achievement records, disinterested in classroom life will cause most discipline problems.

7. Your total years of experience in schoolwork.

_____ 1.	2-5	_____ 5.	18-21
_____ 2.	6-9	_____ 6.	22-25
_____ 3.	10-13	_____ 7.	26-29
_____ 4.	14-17	_____ 8.	More than 29

8. Teacher's ethnic group/sex.
   _____ 1. Anglo male
   _____ 2. Anglo female
   _____ 3. Negro male
   _____ 4. Negro female
   _____ 5. Mexican-American male
   _____ 6. Mexican-American female
   _____ 7. Other

9. Highest earned college degree.
   _____ 1. Bachelor's degree
   _____ 2. Master's degree
   _____ 3. Doctor's degree
   _____ 4. No degree

10. Nonpromotion practices.
   _____ 1. The teacher makes the decision to nonpromote a student.
   _____ 2. The teacher and parent make the decision to nonpromote a student.
   _____ 3. The teacher and principal make the decision to nonpromote a student.
   _____ 4. The principal makes the decision to nonpromote a student.
   _____ 5. The teacher, parent, and principal make the decision to nonpromote a student.

11. Have you in the past nonpromoted a student?
   _____ 1. Yes
   _____ 2. No.

12. Were you personally ever nonpromoted?
   _____ 1. Yes
   _____ 2. No

13. Has anyone closely related to you been nonpromoted?
   _____ 1. Yes
   _____ 2. No

14. To what extent do you feel influenced by your school policy or principal in determining to promote or nonpromote a student?
   _____ 1. Little to none
   _____ 2. To some extent
   _____ 3. A great extent

15. To what extent do you feel influenced by the community and parents in determining to promote or nonpromote a student?
   _____ 1. Little extent
   _____ 2. To some extent
   _____ 3. To a great extent

16. Do you consider the morale in your school to be
   _____ 1. High most of the time?
   _____ 2. About average most of the time?
   _____ 3. Low most of the time?

17. To what extent do teachers have a voice in determining school goals?
    _____ 1. Little to none
    _____ 2. To some extent
    _____ 3. A great extent

18. Have you completed an education course by extension or on campus at a college or university within the past
    _____ 1. one year
    _____ 2. two years
    _____ 3. three years
    _____ 4. four years
    _____ 5. five years to nine years
    _____ 6. ten years or longer

APPENDIX E

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT SURVEY

Instructions:

The following sample shows how to mark a sentence:

Sample Sentence: Circle your choice.

True	False		
1	2	1.	Homework in this school is very easy.

Now you are ready to mark each of the 43 sentences below. It is important to remember that the sentences are about the total school. Think about each sentence carefully and answer as honestly as you can. Take your time and mark only one answer for each sentence. Make sure all sentences are marked.

Beginning with sentence 1, circle either 1 for true or 2 for false and continue until you have answered all sentences.

I will read the sentences as you follow along and mark your answers.

True	False		
1	2	1.	Most of the teachers care about problems that students are having.
1	2	2.	Most students here care much about their school work.
1	2	3.	Students sometimes make plans to do something bad to the school.
1	2	4.	Students do not pay much attention to school rules and regulations.
1	2	5.	Many students like to stay around after school gets out.
1	2	6.	This school seems to be an unfriendly place.
1	2	7.	Many teachers are too busy to talk to students about their problems or to give them extra help.
1	2	8.	Most students are not interested in such things as poetry, music, or painting.

True	False		
1	2	9.	Many of the teachers go out of their way to help students.
1	2	10.	If students are unhappy in school, the teacher will call their parents.
1	2	11.	Students often interrupt while someone else is talking.
1	2	12.	This school teaches students to be polite.
1	2	13.	Most teachers do not talk to students about concerts, plays, and museums.
1	2	14.	Students have many chances to help other students.
1	2	15.	Students almost always wait to be called on before speaking in class.
1	2	16.	Students often work in small groups of about three or four students without the teachers.
1	2	17.	Students here are very quick to tell teachers about things that should be changed.
1	2	18.	Most students here do not like to get into any kind of argument.
1	2	19.	Teachers watch the students closely when they work to make sure there are no mistakes.
1	2	20.	Students here do not work on projects by themselves.
1	2	21.	Students often tell teachers what they would like to study.
1	2	22.	Many of the students here are unhappy about the school.
1	2	23.	The students in this school feel like they are one big family.
1	2	24.	Students do not get any special favors in this school.

True	False		
1	2	25.	Many students get into trouble with the teachers.
1	2	26.	Many students say that they do not like the rules made by the teachers.
1	2	27.	Many students help each other with their classwork.
1	2	28.	Many students do not behave while they are on the playground.
1	2	29.	Students whom the principal and teachers know will have it easier in this school.
1	2	30.	One way to get good grades in this school is to be nice to the teachers.
1	2	31.	The teachers usually check to make sure that students finish their schoolwork.
1	2	32.	When students do something wrong, they usually get caught.
1	2	33.	Students know who the most important people in this school are.
1	2	34.	It is difficult for students to get the teacher to like them.
1	2	35.	Students know when they can get away with doing something wrong.
1	2	36.	Teachers seldom take their classes to the library so that students can look up information.
1	2	37.	Students may take books from the library shelves without the help of the librarian or teacher.
1	2	38.	Students often take field trips to interesting places.
1	2	39.	Most the teachers in this school are unfriendly.
1	2	40.	In this school students have many chances to listen to music.

True	False		
1	2	41.	Sometimes students watch lessons on television.
1	2	42.	This school has very few exhibits and pictures for students to look at.

Boy	Girl		
( )	( )	43.	Place an X in the appropriate column.

Make sure you have answered every sentence.

Will the student who was selected to assist please collect the surveys and seal them in the envelope? Place the sealed envelope on the teacher's desk. Thank you for your help.

APPENDIX F

LETTER TO PARTICIPATING FIFTH GRADE TEACHERS

January 1976

Dear Fifth-Grade Teacher,

You and your class are requested to assist in a study of environmental climates in elementary schools. You are requested to answer a questionnaire, and your class is being asked to respond to a forty-two-item, true-false survey which is designed to determine how students perceive their school environment. It should take thirty minutes or less.

If you can provide a cassette player, the recording includes instructions to the students. Help them select a class member to distribute the materials and collect them after they have responded. You will be able to answer your questionnaire during the same time.

It would be helpful in reducing test bias if you will let the class members know that you will not see their responses. The sealing of the envelope at the end of the exercise will reinforce this also.

You may seal your teacher questionnaire in the envelope provided and return it, the cassette tape, and the student surveys to the coordinating teacher for the fifth-grade project.

Thank you for using your valuable time and energy to participate in this important study.

Sincerely,

Joe C. Bean
Principal
Sycamore Elementary

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Bagley, William Chandler, The Educative Process, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1917.

Baker, J. P. and J. L. Christ, "Teacher Expectations: A Review of the Literature," Pygmalion Reconsidered, Worthington, Ohio, Charles A. Jones, 1971.

Bestor, Arthur E., Educational Wastelands, Urbana, The University of Illinois Press, 1953.

Bidwell, Charles E., "The School as a Formal Organization," Handbook of Organizations, Chicago, Rand McNally, 1964.

Campbell, Donald and Julian Stanley, Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research, Chicago, Rand-McNally and Company, 1963.

Cremin, Lawrence A., The Transformation of the School, New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1961.

Dale, Edgar, Building a Learning Environment, Bloomington, Indiana, Phi Delta Kappa, 1972.

Dewey, John, Individualism Old and New, New York, Minton, Balch and Company, 1930.

Drake, William E., The American Schools in Transition, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1955.

Elashoff, Janet D. and Richard E. Snow, Pygmalion Reconsidered, Worthington, Ohio, Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1971.

Featherstone, Joseph, Informal Schools in Britain Today, New York, Citation Press, 1971.

Ferguson, George A., Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971.

Fox, Robert S., School Climate Improvement: A Challenge to the School Administrator, Bloomington, Indiana, Phi Delta Kappa, 1975.

Frazier, Alexander, Open Schools for Children, Washington, D.C., ASCD Publication, 1972.

Frymier, Jack R., A School for Tomorrow, Berkeley, California, McCutchan Publishing Company, 1973.

Frymier, Jack R. and Horace C. Hawn, Curriculum Improvement for Better Schools, Worthington, Ohio, Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1970.

Glasser, William, Schools Without Failure, New York, Harper and Row, 1969.

Good, Thomas L., Bruce J. Bibble, and Jere E. Brophy, Teachers Make a Difference, New York, Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1975.

Goodlad, John I., and Robert Anderson, The Nongraded Elementary School, New York, Harcourt, Brace and World, 1973.

_____, Toward a Mankind School, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Hurrvitz, Emanuel J. and Robert Mailment, "The Grade Dilemma," Criticism, Conflict and Change: Readings in American Education, New York, Dodd, Mead and Company, 1970.

Jackson, Philip W., Life in Classroom, New York, Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

Judd, Charles H., Problems of Education in the United States, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1933.

Keith, Lowell, Paul Blake, and Sidney Tiedt, Contemporary Curriculum in the Elementary School, New York, Harper and Row, 1968.

Lawler, Marcella R., Strategies for Planned Curriculum Innovation, New York, Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1970.

Likert, Rensia, New Patterns of Management, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1961.

McGregor, Douglas, The Human Side of Enterprise, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1960.

Maslow, Abraham H., Motivation and Personality, New York, Harper and Row, Publishers, 1970.

Otto, Henry J. and others, Nongradedness: An Elementary School Evaluation, Bureau of Laboratory Schools, Monograph No. 21, Austin, University of Texas Press, 1969.

Pace, C. Robert, College and University Environment Scales: Technical Manual, 2nd ed., Princeton, Educational Testing Service, 1969.

Purkey, William W., Self Concept and School Achievement, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

Queenley, Mary A., "Nongrading in an Urban Slum School," Innovations in Mass Education, New York, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1969.

Rascoe, John T., Fundamental Research Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences, New York, Holt Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1975.

Raubinger, Fredrick and Harold G. Rowe, The Individual and Education, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1968.

Reich, Charles A., The Greening of America, New York, Random House, 1970.

Rickover, Hyman G., American Education--A National Failure, New York, E. P. Dutton and Co., Inc., 1963.

Rogers, Carl, On Becoming a Person, Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1961.

Rogers, Vincent R., Teaching in the British Primary School, London, The Macmillan Company, 1970.

Shipman, David A., Carmen N. Calver, and Ann Lieberman, Teachers on Individualization: The Way We Do It, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Siegel, Ernest, Teaching One Child, New York, Educational Activities, Inc., 1972.

Sizer, Theodore R., Places for Learning--Places for Joy, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1973.

Stahl, Donna K. and Patricia M. Anzalove, Individualized Teaching in the Elementary School, West Nyack, N.Y., Parker Publishing Company, 1970.

Street, David, Innovation in Mass Education, New York, John Wiley and Sons, 1969.

Swift, David W., Ideology and Change in the Public Schools, Columbus, Ohio, Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1971.

Wiles, Kimball, Teaching for Better Schools, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1952.

Wilson, L. Craig, The Open Access Curriculum, Boston, Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971.

Articles

Almy, Millie, "Piaget in Action," Young Children, 31 (January, 1976), 93-96.

Bloom, Benjamin S., "Learning for Mastery," Evaluation Comment (May, 1968), pp. 3-11.

Brody, Ernest B., "Achievement of First and Second-Year Pupils in Graded and Nongraded Classrooms," The Elementary School Journal, 71 (April, 1970), 391-394.

Brophy, Jere E. and Thomas L. Good, "Teacher's Communication of Differential Expectations for Children's Classroom Performance: Some Behavioral Data," Journal of Educational Psychology, 61 (1970), 365-374.

Case, David A., "A Comparative Study of Fifth Graders in a New Middle School with Fifth Graders in Elementary Self Contained Classrooms," Dissertation Abstracts, 32 (1971), 86A.

Chamberlain, Leslie J., "What to Do When the Walls Come Down!" The Clearing House, 59 (October, 1975), 71-74.

Combs, Arthur W., "Florida Studies in the Helping Professions," Social Science Monograph, 37, Gainesville, Florida, University of Florida Press, 1969.

Finn, Jeremy D., "Expectations and the Educational Environment," Review of Educational Research, 42 (1972), 387-407.

_____, Eugene L. Gaier, Samuel S. Peng, and Ronald E. Banks, "Teacher Expectations and Pupil Achievement: A Naturalistic Study," Urban Education, 10 (July, 1975), 175-197.

Gigliotti, Richard J. and Wilbar B. Brookover, "The Learning Environment of High and Low Achieving Elementary Schools," Urban Education, 10 (October, 1975), 245-258.

Godfrey, Ernestine, "The Tragedy of Failure," North Carolina Education, 2 (October, 1971), 10-11, 29.

Goss, Beatrice and Ronald Goss, "A Little Bit of Chaos," Saturday Review, May 16, 1970, p. 14.

McLaughlin, William P., "Continuous Pupil Progress in the Nongraded School: Hope or Hoax?" The Elementary School Journal, 71 (November, 1970), 90-96.

Morris, Vernon R., Barton B. Proger, and James E. Morrell, "Pupil Achievement in a Nongraded Primary Plan after Three and Five Years of Instruction," Educational Leadership, 4 (March, 1971), 621-625.

Morshead, Richard W., "The Clash of Hidden Ideologies in Contemporary Education," The Education Digest, 41 (November, 1975), 16-19.

Myers, R. E., "A Comparison of the Perceptions of Elementary School Children in Open Area and Self-Contained Classrooms in British Columbia," Journal of Research and Development in Education, 4 (Spring, 1971), 100-106.

Nyquist, Ewald B., "The Concept of Open Education," The Science Teacher, 38 (September, 1971), 25-28.

Palardy, J. M., "What Teachers Believe--What Children Achieve," Elementary School Journal, 69 (April, 1969), 370-374.

Pavan, Barbara N., "Nongradedness, One View," Educational Leadership, 30 (February, 1973), 401-403.

_____, "Good News, Research on the Nongraded Elementary School," Elementary School Journal, 74 (March, 1973), 333-343.

Purkey, William W., William Graves, and Mary Zellner, "Self-Perceptions of Pupils in an Experimental Elementary School," Elementary School Journal, 71 (December, 1970), 166-171.

Rosenthal, Robert and Lenore F. Jacobson, "Teacher Expectations for the Disadvantages," Scientific American (April, 1968), pp. 19-23.

Sadker, David, "Dimensions of the Elementary School Environment: A Factor Analytic Study," The Journal of Educational Research, 66 (July-August, 1973), 441-442.

_____, Myra Sadker, and James M. Cooper, "Elementary School Through Children's Eyes," The Elementary School Journal, 74 (March, 1973), 289-296.

Saunders, Bruce Thomas, "Emotional Disturbance and Social Position within the Nongraded Classroom," Psychology in the Schools, 7 (July, 1970), 269-271.

Silberman, Melvin L., "Behavioral Expressions of Teachers' Attitudes Toward Elementary School Students," Journal of Educational Psychology, 60 (1969), 402-407.

Thomas, Donald, "Five Clues to a Good School," The Education Digest (February, 1971), pp. 29-31.

Van Til, William, William E. Brounson, and Russell L. Hamm, "Back to Basics--With a Difference," Educational Leadership, 33 (October, 1975), 8-13.

Ward, Dayton N., "An Evaluation of a Nongraded School Program in Grades One and Two," Dissertation Abstracts, 30 (1970), 2786A.

Wilt, Hiram J., "A Comparison of Student Attitudes toward School, Academic Achievement, Internal Structures and Procedures: The Nongraded School vs. the Graded School," Dissertation Abstracts, 31 (1971), 5105A.

Reports

Good, Thomas L. and Myron H. Dembo, Teacher Expectations: Self Report Data, Technical Report No. 64, Center for Research in Social Behavior, University of Missouri, Columbia, 1973.

Texas Education Agency, A Plan for a Network of Demonstration Schools, Austin, Texas, 1973.

Vogel, Francis X. and Norman D. Bowers, Pupil Attitudes, Achievement and Behavior in a Multi-Age Nongraded School, unpublished report, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, 1968.

Publications of Learned Organizations

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Yearbook, Humanizing Education, edited by Robert R. Leeper, Washington, D.C., Department of National Education Association, 1967.

____, Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming, Washington, D.C., National Education Association, 1962.

Glasser, William, The Effect of School Failure on the Life of a Child, Washington, D.C., National Association of Elementary Principals, 1971.

National Education Association, NEA Research Memo, NEA Research Division, May, 1962, pp. 1-13.

Pidgeon, Douglas A., Expectation and Pupil Performance, London, National Foundation for Educational Research in England and Wales, 1970.

Sadker, David, Elementary School Environment Survey, Kenosha, University of Wisconsin--Parkside, 1971.

Texas Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, School Curriculum Design for the 1980's, The TASCD Task Force to Study Needed Improvement in Texas Public Education, 1974.

Unpublished Materials

Bowman, Betty L., "A Comparison of Pupil Achievement and Attitude in a Graded School with Pupil Achievement and Attitude in a Nongraded School," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, 1971.

French, Glenn, "Elementary School Retentions in Texas," unpublished report, Texas Education Agency, Austin, Texas, 1974.

McKay, A. Bruce, "Principals, Teachers, and Elementary Youth: A Study of the Relationships Between Selected Variables of Teacher-Principal Social Interaction and Six Features of the Educational Environment," unpublished paper distributed at the American Education Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, February, 1973.

Sadker, David, "An Investigation of Environments Through the Factor Analysis of Beta Press," unpublished paper presented at American Education Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, February, 1973.

Wakeland, Justin, "The Role of the Principal in Open Plan Elementary Schools in Texas," unpublished doctoral dissertation, School of Education, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas, 1972.

Periodicals

U. S. News and World Report, October 28, 1974, p. 37.