PUPIL-CONTROL IDEOLOGY AND MIDDLE SCHOOL CONCEPT IMPLEMENTATION IN SELECTED OKLAHOMA MIDDLE SCHOOLS

By

SANDRA JO BROTHERS

Bachelor of Science in Education
University of Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma
1963

Master of Education
University of Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma
1968

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
December, 1985

PUPIL-CONTROL IDEOLOGY AND MIDDLE SCHOOL CONCEPT IMPLEMENTATION IN SELECTED OKLAHOMA MIDDLE SCHOOLS

Thesis Approved:

Kenneth St. Clair
Thesis Adviser

Thomas J. Smith

A. Kenneth Stout

Wilfrain F. Segall

Norman N. Durham
Dean of the Graduate College

PREFACE

The purpose of this study was to investigate pupil-control ideology in selected Oklahoma middle schools to determine if there was a difference in the ideology of professional personnel in the schools with high versus low levels of middle school concept implementation.

I wish to express my appreciation and gratitude to Dr. Kenneth St. Clair, who served as the chairman of the advisory committee. It was his calm, capable, and understanding manner that made it possible for me to complete the necessary requirements for the doctoral program. Sincere appreciation is also expressed to Dr. Kenneth Stern, Dr. Thomas Smith, and Dr. William Segall for their assistance and support throughout the program.

Special thanks are also extended to Dr. Edgar Petty, Central State University, for his assistance and support in the area of statistical analysis.

A "very special" thank you and appreciation goes to my husband, John, who offered encouragement, understanding, and support in the most cheerful and positive way.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

Introduction

Accreditation standards were established in 1970 by the State Department of Education to recognize and give legitimacy to the formation of middle schools in the state. The number of accredited middle schools in Oklahoma has grown from two in 1970 to a current total of 105. From these figures, growth in the number of schools identified as middle schools is revealed. However, since there has been less than 20 years of experience and contact with middle schools and their programs in this state, additional information is needed in order to more accurately assess the current status and developmental progress in the area of middle school education. Presently in Oklahoma, there appears to be limited information pertaining to the area of middle school education and to the professional personnel who staff the schools.

In this chapter, the research problem for the study will be described. Included will be the background for the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, definition of terms, and limitations of the study.

Background for the Study

The middle school concept emerged as a new idea in the 1950's

when the first middle school opened in Bay City, Michigan. According to Gatewood and Dils (1975), middle school concepts were slow to be accepted during the 1950's and early 1960's, but from the mid-1960's they became quite popular. With the popularity of the ideas and practices, adoption and implementation began to flourish and the number of middle schools began to increase rapidly.

Lounsbury and Vars (1971) advocated the middle school as a "new opportunity, a new rallying point, a fresh start" (p. 19). The middle school was seen as an opportunity for educators to make changes in the educational programs, procedures, and activities that would more appropriately meet the needs of those students in the stage of early and preadolescence, or more descriptively called the period of "transescence":

> Eichorn (1966) coined the term 'transescence' to identify a transitional stage of development during which younsters differ from younger children in the elementary school and from the high school's full-fledged adolescent. These youngsters are generally within the age range of 10 to 14 (Compton, 1974, p. 52).

Other advocates such as Overly (1972, p. 15) declared that "humanizing education, or providing a needed humaneness toward youth during a unique growth and development period" was the real intent of the middle school.

The need for something new seemed to emerge because of a certain amount of dissatisfaction with the traditional junior high school. The junior high school was described as a mere imitation of the high school, and the critics felt it had not lived up to its orginal purpose of bridging the gap between the elementary school and the high school. In a 1975 survey by Sinks and Hess, educators who responded

indicated the primary reason for the establishment of middle schools was to provide a better educational program and environment for a special age grouping of young people. In Sinks and Hess' (1975, p. 59) survey, "61 percent of the educators indicated a grade organization of 5-6-7-8 or 6-7-8 had been adopted" in an effort to provide a setting and programs that would better meet the unique needs of the 10 to 14 year old student.

In 1970, Oklahoma gave credibility to the move toward middle schools through the adoption of accreditation standards. The Annual Bulletin of the Oklahoma State Department of Education (Administrator's Handbook, 1984-85) defined a middle school as a minimum of two consecutive grades, which may be any two of the grades six through eight. The Annual Bulletin also included a philosophical position and purpose for middle schools of Oklahoma, as stated below:

> The philosophy should be in harmony with the educational needs of its students. The basic function of the middle school is to help preserve and improve our free democratic way of life by educating individuals for effective participation. It should provide an intellectually responsible, needs-centered, guidance-oriented, exploration-conscious program of learning. There must be a deep concern for democratic, moral, and intellectual values and special attention to the needs of society, the needs of the individual, and the nature of the learning process (Administrator's Handbook, 1984-85, p. 57).

Just as the whole is more than the sum of its parts, the middle school, as a social system, is more than its various discrete elements which were mentioned in the philosophical statement. Each element is vital to an effective middle school and will have impact on all other basic elements in either a positive or negative manner (Lounsbury, 1983). Of all these elements, the teacher plays a critical role in

determining whether school is perceived as a positive or a negative environment for students.

The role of the teacher is very influential in determining the quality of the student-teacher relationship and consequently the effectiveness of the school. McKinney (1971) determined that teacher input and influence are more important than the particular grade structure which may be used in a middle school's organization.

The professionals who staff the elementary schools have frequently been perceived as more child-centered and open with students than have the personnel who work in the secondary schools. According to Willower and Lawrence (1979), that has been due to the fact that secondary personnel came in contact with students who were seen as more rebellious and threatening, as well as more resistant to the control of the teacher.

Since the staff in a middle school is involved with an age grouping that has many unique developmental needs, these students can also be challenging to the status and security of the adults who work with them. As educational professionals enter the school setting, most enter as either elementary or secondary trained educators, and they have not been specifically prepared and coached in strategies which assist in dealing with transescents (Alexander and McEwin, 1984). Those who are able to adapt, who have an open mind, who are flexible, and who are sensitive to the needs of students seem to have been the most effective and successful (Hardesty, 1978).

Most educators agreed that if classroom instruction is to be effective, one's ability to manage student behavior is crucial in providing maximum educational opportunities. The philosophy or

ideology held by the teacher determines the climate for learning within the classroom, and according to Ayllon and Roberts (1974), a teacher's attitude toward student control and management seems to fall into two categories. There are those who can tolerate no disruption and those who feel disruption can be tolerated up to a point where it begins to impede and interfere with the achievement of nondisruptive students (Ayllon and Roberts, 1974).

Ideally, there should be a balance between these two extremes with regard to management and control of behavior. The ability to achieve this delicate balance gives flexibility and consistency, but it also displays a sensitivity towards the personal needs of the individual student. If frustration is to be minimized, and if students are to receive effective instruction, a nonthreatening and supportive environment should be a fundamental goal of middle school educators (Hardesty, 1978).

It has been found that teacher attitudes and behaviors may be either a constructive or a destructive force with regard to classroom environment. Findings by Thomas, Becker, and Armstrong (1968) indicated that the approving and accepting teacher was able to maintain appropriate classroom behavior. However, when teachers withdrew their approval, acceptance, and support, the level of disruptiveness tended to become higher.

Since public schools have organizational structures which do not control client selection, and most clients, similarly, have no control over their participation in the organization (Carlson, 1964), coping with diverse student needs is an inevitable concern for teachers.

Statement of the Problem

Overly (1972) and other middle school advocates stressed the importance of a necessary and needed humaneness toward students, rather than a rigid, subject-oriented, impersonal approach to the educational process. Required for schools with students in the age category of 10-14 is a philosophy with a focus on personalizing the education for the total child (Curtis, 1977). Programs should reflect this philosophical position, and there should also be a staff that is flexible and willing to work hard at assisting students with the transition from childhood to adolescence. Middle schools with the philosophy which promotes a concern for students and their related needs can more easily establish an environment which facilitates flexibility and openness.

Findings indicated, however, that middle school practices and concept implementation varied considerably throughout the country (Brooks, 1983). In a study of Oklahoma middle schools, Butler (1983) surveyed the 93 accredited schools for their levels of middle school concept implementation and likewise found a considerable variation among the levels of implementation in the schools. This study will focus on the attitudes of the professional personnel toward pupil-control in selected middle schools which were surveyed by Butler.

Webster (1968) and Ban and Ciminillo (1977) contended that problems which related to pupil-control were found at every level of the school system and with students of all ages. Helsel and Willower (1974) determined that educators could be expected to actualize controlling behavior which was in agreement with their ideology or

attitude toward pupil-control. If middle schools are concerned with personalization, humaneness, and being student-centered, the professionals who staff these schools should possess ideologies which reflect these values (Walter and Fanslow, 1980).

Willower, Eidell, and Hoy (1967), in their studies of pupil-control, developed the Pupil-Control Ideology Form (PCI) (Appendix A) to assist in determining the level of humanistic versus custodial ideology held by teachers toward students and the control of their behavior. Since the philosophical emphasis of the middle school is based on a concern for humaneness (Overly, 1972), the PCI will be useful in assessing the level of humanistic attitudes displayed by middle school personnel in selected Oklahoma schools which have varying degrees of middle school concept implementation. For this study, the problem is: "Is there a difference in the pupil-control ideology of the professional staff in middle schools with a higher level of middle school concept implementation as compared to the professional staff in schools with a lower level of middle school concept implementation?"

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to determine if there is a difference between the attitudes of the professional personnel toward pupil control in selected middle schools which have high versus low levels of concept implementation. More specifically, answers to the following questions will be sought:

1. Is there a difference in the pupil-control ideology of the professional staff according to the level of middle school

concept implementation in schools with high versus low levels of implementation?

2. Are there differences in attitudes of the professional middle school personnel toward pupil control when compared on the 10 demographic factors: (1) sex, (2) age, (3) type of teacher certification, (4) present position, (5) present teaching field, (6) student enrollment (school size), (7) grade structure, (8) years of school experience, (9) level of academic preparation, and (10) continued professional growth?

3. Will the mean PCI score of personnel who consider professional preparation to be adequate differ significantly from those who consider professional preparation to be inadequate?

Definition of Terms

Particular terms and definitions were pertinent in achieving the purpose of this study. These definitions appear as they related to the study:

Pupil-Control Ideology (PCI) - Refers to the orientation which the professional staff within the school holds with regard to the control of student behavior. This orientation is conceptualized by Willower, Eidell, and Hoy (1967) along a continuum ranging from "custodial" at one extreme to "humanistic" at the other. The pupil-control ideology is determined by the total score achieved on a 20-item questionnaire called the PCI Form. The higher the score, the more custodial the measure of pupil-control ideology.

Professional Middle School Personnel - Any licensed or certificated professional who works within the school. The person may hold either elementary or secondary credentials, and some may hold both.

Middle School Philosophy - Middle school philosophy reflects an emphasis on the development of the social, emotional, physical, and academic skills based on a commitment to personalizing the curriculum to address student needs. According to Eichorn (1983), diversity among students is so great that in order to meet the needs, an open-ended, flexible, curriculum which requires a humaneness in its application is required.

Middle School - A school which consists of a minimum of two consecutive grades, and they may be any two between grades five through eight except in Oklahoma, where middle schools "shall include at least two consecutive grades in the sixth through eighth sequence" (Administrator's Handbook, 1984-85, p. 57).

Middle School Practices Index (MSPI) - Riegle (1971) developed the MSPI and defined 18 middle school principles as ones which would exemplify the ideal school. They are: continuous progress, multi-media approach, flexible schedules, social experiences, physical experiences, intramural activities, creative experiences, security, evaluation, team teaching, planned gradualism, exploratory experiences, guidance programs, independent study, basic skill extension and adjustment, community relations, student services, and auxiliary staffs. Middle school practice implementation levels were measured by Butler (1983) using these factors as the criteria on a version of the MSPI which was modified by Romano in 1982.

Custodialism - The school with a custodial environment is characterized by rigidity and a concern with the maintenance of order. Students are viewed with distrust, and a moralistic stance is taken toward deviant behavior (Brenneman, Willower, and Lynch, 1975).

Humanistic - The school with the humanistic environment is characterized by a democratic atmosphere and a flexibility which promotes an open, accepting attitude (Willower, 1975). Students are viewed in a more trusting and optimistic manner, and they are seen as capable of being self-disciplined. The humanistic environment emphasized the worth, dignity, and importance of the individual.

Transescence - A term which originated with Eichorn (1966) to describe the transitional, developmental stage between childhood and adolescence which encompasses the age group of 10-14 year olds.

Limitations of the Study

This study is limited to those middle schools voluntarily agreeing to participate in the study. Although the schools were representative of those schools ranked as either high or low on the MSPI, the number of participants in the high category is much larger than the number in the low category. However, in the statistical analyses, statistical calculations were utilized to compensate for the inequality of the numbers in the two groups.

There must also be a consideration of the constraints placed on data gathering through the use of questionnaires. Generalizations drawn from this study should be applied with the following limitations in mind:

1. Analysis of teacher attitudes toward pupil control would be limited to scores on the PCI.

2. The level of middle school practices is limited to the score attained on the MSPI.

3. The analysis of responses is based on the assumption that all respondents completed the questionnaires honestly and to the best of their ability.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE, RATIONALE, AND HYPOTHESES

Introduction

This review of the literature chapter contains three sections: (1) literature sources which are pertinent to middle school practices and implementation, (2) those relevant to the concept of pupil-control ideology, and (3) sources related to the preparation and training of middle school professionals. These concepts are presented and analyzed in a manner which provides a rationale for answering the three main research questions.

Middle School Practices and Implementation

Development of the middle school began in earnest during the 1960's; however, as researchers began to study middle schools and their programs, a great diversity in the types of programs became apparent. National Education Association (NEA) (1969) researchers observed that a "middle school" meant many different things to different people. These observations were based on the results of surveys from 154 schools in 51 different school systems with a student population which totaled over 12,000. The NEA findings indicated that many schools were labeled or called "middle schools," but were not functioning as middle schools based on generally accepted middle

school philosophy. There were wide disparities and discrepancies in the levels of program implementation. This wide variation in the types of programs could be attributed to reasons such as: the failure of state departments of education to address themselves to the middle school concept (to recommend middle schools to districts or to ask for legislation which defined the nature and characteristics needed for middle schools) (Pumerantz, 1969). Other researchers found problems which related to the local school boards. Dubel (1976, pp. 46-47) found that the "grade organizational patterns, student population, geographical locations of buildings, and length of the school day of middle schools were determined by local concerns, priorities, available facilities and individual needs."

A comprehensive national study conducted in 1978 by Foley and Brooks reported the following characteristics as typical in most middle schools: (1) discipline-oriented; (2) teaching was by an individual teacher rather than with academic teacher teams; (3) the grouping of students in traditional class sizes was most common, and flexible alternatives were being used rarely if at all; (4) the curriculum reflected little uniqueness from the courses offered by junior and senior high schools; and (5) programs revealed little, if any, concern with the needs of the individual learner. When these findings were reviewed by Alexander (1978), he stated that the lack of progress was due mainly to an ignorance on the part of educators concerning the criteria, goals, and objectives necessary for the implementation of programs appropriate for middle schools.

National studies, such as the ones cited, have contributed to the information on the progress being made toward the implementation of

middle school practices and programs; however, the major portion of the research in this area has been conducted in individual cities and states. Studies conducted in a variety of states support most of the findings listed by Brooks (1983). In New Jersey, Kopko (1976, p. 16) concluded that the "implementation of the recommendations by middle school educators in the state was questionable." He also indicated that New Jersey middle schools did not appear to be "totally committed to the basic philosophy of middle school education" (p. 55).

Studies of California, Texas, Arkansas, and Virginia middle schools supported most of the observations made by Kopko (1976) and Foley and Brooks, (1978). Schools which had adopted the name "middle school" did not necessarily display high levels of middle school practices and concept implementation.

Riegle (1971) developed a questionnaire entitled, "Middle School Practices Index" (MSPI), which was based on 18 middle school principles. His study in Michigan and other similar studies (Raymer, 1974; Brown, 1978) concluded that there was a lack of implementation on many of the identified 18 principles: (1) continuous progress, (2) multimedia approach, (3) flexible schedules, (4) social experiences, (5) physical experiences, (6) intramural activities, (7) creative experiences, (8) security, (9) evaluation, (10) team teaching, (11) planned gradualism, (12) exploratory experiences, (13) guidance programs, (14) independent study, (15) basic skill extension and adjustment, (16) community relations, (17) student services, and (18) auxiliary staff. Many of the principles which are considered basic, (such as team teaching, flexible scheduling, and individualized instruction) were at a particular low level of implementation. Beckman (1983) compared

Missouri junior high and middle schools on the 18 characteristics identified by Riegle. He concluded that middle schools in Missouri had not implemented the basic principles to any great extent, and for the most part they existed more in theory than in practice.

In 1983, Butler surveyed middle schools in Oklahoma and discovered that six of Riegle's 18 middle school characteristics: (1) flexible schedule, (2) team teaching, (3) intramural activity, (4) planned gradualism, (5) basic learning experiences, and (6) community relations, all received a composite percentage of 33% or less in the schools chosen for the study. Butler concluded that it could take several more years for Oklahoma schools to convert from the junior high school concept to fully functioning middle schools.

Riegle's 18 middle school principles can provide the basic foundation for developing and implementing appropriate programs for middle school students. However, the attitudes held by the professional staff, as they relate to student needs and behaviors, are also important. Professionals who have demonstrated a positive attitude when working with students are necessary if schools with a positive climate for learning are to emerge (Hunsaker, 1978). If the atmosphere within schools can be marked by openness and acceptance, then a willingness to work cooperatively can emerge. Middle school educators must see and view students as human beings and provide learning experiences which foster maximum growth and development. Implementation of the necessary middle school characteristics and principles which promote a positive learning environment for young people can be more easily achieved by personnel who are committed to the middle school and its total philosophy (Arth, 1983).

Pupil Control

In surveys conducted by Rankin (1969), middle schools seemed to foster healthy learning environments and simultaneously promoted academic learning. However, for these objectives to be achieved, the role of the professional staff within the school should be examined.

Teachers have the task of motivating and teaching students, as they exercise control and teach appropriate behavior. This is essential if they are to implement programs which provide opportunities for maximum educational growth. Public schools are unique organizations, along with hospitals and prisons, in the fact that the clients have no choice in deciding if they will participate in the activities of the organization (Gilbert and Levinson, 1957). The inability of clients to have a choice makes controlling behaviors an ever present problem for teachers. According to Carlson (1964), public schools are a service organization where the control of behavior is most likely to be the most acute problem with which schools and their personnel must deal.

The feelings and attitudes held by teachers toward behavior exhibited by students are critical because teachers must be concerned with influencing how students respond behaviorally. Since controlling behavior has been an issue and is still a concern for most educators, an understanding of the pupil-control ideology held by the school's personnel may be helpful in addressing the concerns of behavior management. The student-teacher relationships which result from interactions within the school can create an environment which can be characterized as either open and accepting, or closed and hostile

(Hoy, 1971). The atmosphere and feelings which emerge can either assist or impede the development of a more appropriate educational setting for middle school students.

Theoretical Framework

According to Hoy and Miskel (1982), the pupil-control ideology held by teachers has provided important information on relationships between teachers and their students. Willower, Eidell, and Hoy (1967) conceptualized pupil control on a continuum from custodial to humanistic. Pupil-control, as conceptualized on the continuum, refers to contrasting views of student behavior. The custodial view is most often seen in the more traditional school where teachers operate in a more autocratic, subject-centered manner. Teacher-pupil relationships are rigid and students are perceived as irresponsible, undisciplined persons who must be controlled through punitive sanctions (Willower, Eidell, and Hoy, 1967). Impersonal relationships, cynicism, and mistrust pervade the atmosphere of the custodial school (Hoy and Miskel, 1982).

"Distrust of students and concerted efforts to control them are mutually reinforcing" (Tjosvold, 1976, p. 12). If teachers are concerned with power and control more than with the needs of the learner to develop self-discipline, a tyrannical and authoritarian environment emerges. In this setting, rules and regulations become very important and may easily become excessive. Schools that are overly concerned with unilateral control of students may experience difficulty in meeting objectives that permit students opportunities to become responsible and self-directed (Tjosvold, 1976).

The humanistic view leads to a more democratic atmosphere within the school. Learning is a cooperative effort which involves interactions between the teacher and the student. Students are provided with opportunities for involvement and planning. Self-discipline is a goal rather than strict control and rigid constraints on behavior (Willower and Landis, 1970).

Dreikurs and Cassel (1972) have indicated the most suitable approach to control, and one which produces the greatest opportunity for teacher effectiveness, is the democratic approach. A democratic teacher is one who is kind but firm, is motivating, offers encouragement to students, and maintains order by enabling students to be involved in appropriate decision-making. In a democratic classroom, students are given responsibilities as individuals, but their learning also includes becoming a responsible group member.

Humanistic orientations lead teachers to desire an atmosphere with open channels of two-way communication between themselves and their students (Hoy and Henderson, 1983). Schools with personnel who reflect and promote this atmosphere of openness and seek to provide opportunities for involvement and participation tend to be more humanistic in their pupil control (Hoy and Henderson, 1983).

Empirical Study of Pupil Control

According to Willower, Eidell, and Hoy (1967, p. 3), "Pupil control plays a central part in the organizational life of public schools." Nearly 100 studies have been conducted which have included the use of the PCI. The PCI is an instrument devised by Willower, Eidell, and Hoy to measure the ideology one holds as it relates to

pupil-control beliefs. "The PCI presents twenty declarative statements that can be responded to on a Likert-type, five-point scale. Scores are computed and placed on a continuum of humanism through custodialism" (Foley and Brooks, 1978, p. 105). The lower one scores on the PCI; the more humanistic is the classification of an individual's belief system on pupil control.

Control problems have been common to educators who have worked with students of every age category because schools have traditionally been viewed as institutions which were very concerned with order and discipline (Hamalian, 1979). The development of the middle school and its more flexible philosophy was an attempt to ease regimentation and become more humanistic and open with students (Curtis, 1977).

> The uniqueness of the middle school should rest primarily upon personalization; i.e., that education which meets the needs, purposes, and desires of the individual. This term does not indicate any sort of instructional methodology dealing with one pupil at a time, but is rather related to treating each individual as a unique entity (Curtis, 1977, p. 35).

If this personalization is to occur, and if student needs are to be met both cognitively and affectively, a climate which reflects an openness and willingness to adapt must exist.

> Humanistic schools were different from custodial schools in several important ways. In addition to the basic contrast in orientations toward student control as measured by PCI scores, humanistic schools were more likely than custodial schools to have: (1) teachers who work well together, that pull together with respect to the teaching-learning task; (2) have high morale and satisfaction growing out of a sense of task accomplishment; and (3) an atmosphere marked by openness, acceptance, and authenticity (Hoy and Appleberry, 1970, p. 30).

Much of the literature has shown that schools which have a more open and humanistic climate promote education which is more open (Hoy

and Jalovick, 1979). Of course, an open environment does not necessarily guarantee open behaviors where teachers are concerned. However, according to Hoy and Jalovick (1979), teacher attitudes are an important variable which may contribute in a positive way to the development of schools that place an emphasis on attempting to meet individual student needs.

The attitudes of teachers were examined in several studies, and it was determined that elementary teachers and administrators were more humanistic than secondary-trained educators (Willower, Eidell, and Hoy, 1967; Willower and Landis, 1970; Hoy, 1971; Yuskiewicz and Willower, 1973). Even though the elementary teacher was found to be more humanistic than the secondary professionals, they were more custodial than their administrators (Willower, Eidell, and Hoy, 1967). This was attributed to the teacher's having more direct contact with students than did the principal (Willower, Eidell, and Hoy, 1967); Willower and Landis, 1970; Hoy, 1971). Willower, Eidell, and Hoy (1967, p. 35) found the "prototypic closed minded educator was the older, more experienced, male secondary teacher." Support was given by Budzik (1971) and Hamalian (1979) to the findings of Willower, Eidell, and Hoy (1967) that males were, indeed, more custodial in their pupil- control ideology than were females.

Given the uniqueness of the developmental needs of students in the age category of 10-14 years, the importance of an open attitude on the part of the school's personnel is vital. Hoy and Appleberry (1969) and Hoy and Jalovick (1979) concluded that a humanistic pupil-control ideology and openness toward education were interrelated in a

positive way and were both contributing factors to an organization with a healthy environment for learning.

Open education can be promoted through the philosophy and attitude of personnel within the school, but frequently the philosophical stance can be impacted by other factors. Some of the factors could be: (1) the size of the school, (2) the grade structure of which the school is composed, and (3) the organizational structure for teaching (Lipsitz, Krabill, Lefstein, and Rosenzweig, 1985). However, it appears that much of the middle school research has failed to include the factors of school size and the organizational structure for teaching as variables when conducting research. According to Lipsitz et al. (1985), these are factors which do have some effect, but it is unclear as to how they influence the functioning of the school. There are also hints that grade structure may indirectly make a difference in the school's effectiveness, but there has been nothing definitive on a stated specific grade organization (Lipsitz et al., 1985).

Brenneman, Willower, and Lynch (1975) studied teacher acceptance of others to determine if there was a relationship between one's pupil-control ideology and acceptance of others. They concluded that there was a significant relationship between the teacher's ability to accept others and a humanistic pupil-control ideology.

Barfield and Burlingame (1974) found that teachers who viewed themselves as effective were less concerned with control and power, and their pupil control was more humanistic. This was correlated with teacher opportunities for shared decision making and the opportunity to work in a more open, cooperative environment which is a major goal of the middle school. If a school is primarily concerned with

compliance and conformity to rules, the rigidity within the organizational structure creates a more custodial ideology toward pupil control (Barfield and Burlingame, 1974).

McGee and Kraejewski (1979) found that teachers who were working under a "middle school concept and philosophy" felt more positive and confident when working with students. This confidence seemed to come from more open communications which had developed among teachers who were working in a more open environment such as team teaching. This openness in the communication process was experienced by students as well as the professional staff. There was a sense of confidence which developed and resulted in a sharing of experiences among teachers and students. The confidence, which was passed on to students through teacher attitudes, facilitated student opportunities for self-direction and responsibility. As reported by Hoy and Henderson (1983), these kinds of teacher-student interactions exhibited a high degree of authenticity and appeared to be fostered by teachers who displayed a high level of humanism in their pupil-control ideology.

Cheser, McDaniel, and Cheser (1982) found that students in the preadolescent age range needed to be exposed to teachers who were more positive and less custodial in their approaches to student control. "As students begin to mature, they should develop more self-discipline and be accorded the freedom and responsibility that must accompany adulthood" (Cheser, McDaniel, and Cheser, 1982, p. 4). Findings from Evans (1970), Willower (1975), and Highberger (1976) indicated that middle school teachers were more democratic and possessed a more humanistic attitude toward student control than either junior high or high school teachers. However, they were more custodial than their

elementary counterparts. "This could be attributed to the fact that elementary school students, as compared with secondary students, pose a lesser threat to teacher status because of the elementary students' relative size, age, and immature" (Willower and Lawrence, 1979, p. 586).

There seem to be many factors which contribute to a more humanistic attitude toward pupil control (Lunenburg and O'Reilly, 1974). There are daily conflicts between the demands of the cognitive and affective needs of students in the actual learning process. There are also the demands of the institution itself and the need for the environment to be structured, organized, and controlled. "Social control is a critical element of group life for establishing and maintaining social order" (Hamalian, 1979, p. 37). However, teachers must develop an ability to adjust and balance these conflicting demands in order to attain an environment which reflects consideration for students and their needs (Hoy and Jalovick, 1979). The need for social control is lessened if individuals are given appropriate opportunities for developing self-control.

The pupil-control ideology of teachers seems to be a significant and integrative element in creating a more humanistic school (Lunenburg and O'Reilly, 1974). Researchers have found that the PCI is a relatively reliable instrument to utilize in measuring the pupil-control ideology of educators; consequently, it will be used to measure the attitudes of middle school personnel. From the data, an attempt will be made to determine if there is a difference between the pupil-control ideologies of middle school personnel in schools with high versus low levels of implementation. The study will be accomplished in selected Oklahoma middle schools.

Professional Preparation and Training

Can programs for middle school youngsters be expected to be appropriate if the professionals in the schools are not specifically trained to assess and plan for the diversity of needs? Most of the professional staff within a middle school have received a degree through a program designed for secondary education, which placed emphasis on the teaching of content matter more than being concerned with the particular needs of the learner; or from a program which focused on elementary education, which was more concerned with younger children and their needs (McEwin, 1983). There are some institutions with programs for those interested in working with the child in the middle; however, these are still a small minority.

There are several reasons for this apparent lack of attention to this needed area of teacher education. According to Alexander and McEwin (1984), they are:

> (1) the uncertain and sometimes controversial development of middle level organizations, (2) the traditional two-tier elementary-secondary organization of schools, (3) the reputed problems of teaching students in the middle school years, and (4) current problems of teacher education as a whole (p. 6).

Without the specific training afforded the elementary and secondary teachers, middle school educators must develop the insight, skill, and knowledge necessary for working effectively with the 10-14 year old students while they are performing their tasks. Walter and Fanslow (1980, p. 29) indicated that the "lack of properly prepared teachers has been a major cause of the failure of the middle school to meet many of its original goals."

When middle school administrators were surveyed by Bobruff, Howard, and Howard (1974), they responded with the most common cause for ineffectiveness on the part of teachers as being related to the lack of understanding of the students with whom they were working. This would be expected since there is almost no specialized training for these educators. If middle school education, its programs, and its personnel are to be successful, education for those who work with 10-14 year olds is essential (Alexander and McEwin, 1984).

Rationale and Hypotheses

It would appear, after a review of the literature, that middle school practices vary in their levels of application. Findings also indicate a great diversity among educators in their perceptions of what is essential in developing middle school programs which reflect generally accepted middle school philosophy.

The personnel within the schools appear to play critical roles in the development of programs, as well as influencing the philosophy of the schools. If middle schools are to reflect a philosophy which demonstrates humaneness and an open acceptance of students, the personnel must be willing to create an environment which is open and supportive to the unique growth and development needs of the middle level youngster.

According to Willower, Eidell, and Hoy (1967), pupil control seemed to be a central issue in the organizational life of a public school. Consequently, they conceptualized pupil control on a continuum from custodial to humanistic. An examination of the pupil-control ideology of the professional personnel in middle schools may provide

data which can contribute to a better understanding of the status and development of Oklahoma middle schools and the people who staff the schools.

Statement of Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were developed to determine if differences in pupil-control ideology exist among middle school personnel. For this investigation, 12 null hypotheses have been formulated.

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the mean PCI scores of the "Group A" and "Group B" schools.

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference in mean PCI scores between male and female personnel.

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference in mean PCI scores among the personnel in the four age groups: (1) 20-29, (2) 30-39, (3) 40-49, (4) 50 and over.

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference in mean PCI scores among personnel in the four certification groups: (1) elementary, (2) secondary, (3) more than one, (4) other = elementary-secondary.

Hypothesis 5: There is no significant difference in mean PCI scores among the four groups of school personnel based on present position: (1) teacher, (2) counselor, (3) administrator, (4) other = nurse, librarian, speech pathologist.

Hypothesis 6: There is no significant difference in mean PCI scores among personnel in the six teaching fields: (1) mathematics, (2) science, (3) English/reading, (4) social studies, (5) electives, (6) more than one.

Hypothesis 7: There is no significant difference in mean PCI scores among the four groups of school personnel based on size of school: (1) 0-399, (2) 400-799, (3) 800-1199, (4) 1200 +.

Hypothesis 8: There is no significant difference in mean PCI scores among the five groups of school personnel based on grade structure: (1) 5, 6, 7, and 5, 6, 7, 8; (2) 6, 7, 8; (3) 7, 8, 9; (4) 6, 7, 8, 9; (5) other = 7, 8.

Hypothesis 9: There is no significant difference in mean PCI scores among the four groups of school personnel based on years of experience: (1) 0-5, (2) 6-10, (3) 11-15, (4) 16 +.

Hypothesis 10: There is no significant difference in mean PCI scores among the three groups of school personnel based on level of academic preparation: (1) bachelor's +, (2) master's +, (3) doctor's +.

Hypothesis 11: There is no significant difference in mean PCI scores among the three groups of school personnel based on continued professional growth: (1) 0-4 years, (2) 5-8 years, (3) 9 + years.

Hypothesis 12: There is no significant difference in mean PCI scores among the four groups of middle school personnel based on their opinion concerning adequacy of professional preparation for middle school personnel: (1) adequte, (2) training needed, (3) certification needed, (4) more than one.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

A description of the research design and procedures utilized for the collection of data are presented in this chapter. Included are sampling procedures, instrumentation, data collection, statistical analysis of the data, and summary.

Sampling

The teachers, counselors, and administrators in eight middle schools from eight school districts throughout the state of Oklahoma were asked to respond to the PCI (Appendix A). These schools were selected from categories based on an Oklahoma middle school survey conducted by Butler in 1983. On the previous survey, the state's 93 middle schools fell into a high, medium, or low category as measured on the MSPI which had been developed by Riegle (1971).

For the present study, the superintendents of the 12 schools in the high category and those in the 7 schools of the low category were contacted for permission to conduct the study in selected middle schools within their districts. Five of the twelve schools in the high category and four of the seven in the low category were willing to participate. There was only one superintendent who did not

respond. All other superintendents indicated that it would be necessary for the district to determine if the study would serve their needs or would provide a service to the participating school.

The superintendents who granted immediate permission made their approval contingent on the willingness of the building principal to allow the identified school to be included in the study. All nine principals were contacted by the researcher, and they all accepted the invitation to participate. The cooperation and support of the building principals made it possible to provide all staff members with the necessary information needed to respond to the PCI questionnaire and to obtain a significant return from each site. From the participating schools, a total of 226 questionnaires were returned from 279 possible respondents, for a response rate of 81% from the total population on the first mailing.

Instrumentation

The instruments utilized for data collection relevant to this study were modified versions of the MSPI and the PCI. The original MSPI was developed by Riegle (1971), and in Butler's (1983) survey a modified version provided by Romano (1982) was utilized. The modified version of the MSPI consisted of 53 items designed to measure the degree of implementation of the following 18 middle school characteristics:

> . . . continuous progress, multi-materials, flexible schedule, social experiences, physical experiences, intramural activity, team teaching, planned gradualism, exploratory experiences, guidance services, enrichment and creative experiences, independent study, evaluation practices, student security factor, basic skill extension,

> auxiliary staffing, student services, and community relations (Riegle, 1983, p. 109).

The 53 questions consisted of a statement with a variety of choices from which to choose a response which best described the program in the school. Percentages on the 18 characteristics were computed from the summed scores on the responses to the 53 questions.

The PCI, utilized for this study, was developed by Willower, Eidell, and Hoy (1967). The development was "based on literature, their experience in public schools, field notes from previous studies, and the classification of client control proposed by Gilbert and Levinson" (Hamalian, 1979, p. 40). The PCI consists of 20 statements which are measured on a five-point, Likert-type scale which ranges from "strongly agree" (5 points) to "strongly disagree" (1 point) (Appendix A). Eighteen of the items are stated as positive to a custodial view, and the other two items are positive to the humanistic view. The possible range in scoring the PCI is from a high of 100 to a low of 20. A higher score is indicative of a custodial attitude toward pupil control, and a lower score reflects a more humanistic attitude toward the control of students and their behavior.

Willower, Eidell, and Hoy (1967) reported that reliability for the PCI was tested with split-half reliability coefficients calculated by correlating even-item subscores with odd-item subscores (N=170). A Pearson Product Moment Coefficient of .91 was calculated and a Spearman-Brown formula yielded a corrected coefficient of .95. These researchers repeated the test for reliability with a smaller sample (N=55) and obtained an .83 on the Pearson and .91 for the Spearman-Brown. The known-groups technique was used to establish the construct validity for the measure (Hardesty, 1978).

Demographic information was included by Willower, Eidell, and Hoy (1967). The eight demographic items which they originally used were expanded for this study to include a total of 11 items which were designed to relate more directly to information pertinent to middle schools and their personnel (Appendix A).

Data Collection

In a previous study which was completed in 1983, the MSPI was mailed to the principals of the 93 schools accredited as middle schools in Oklahoma. Butler (1983) reported:

> . . . a response from 69 principals for a 74% response rate. Responses to the 53 questions on the MSPI were scored. The mean of means for each of the 18 middle school characteristics was determined by summing the scores of the questions on each characteristic. Percentages were computed for each of the 18 middle school characteristics, and a total MSPI score was computed for each school. Scoring followed the specifications determined by the author of the instrument. Schools were then ranked according to their total MSPI score (p. 26).

The schools from this 1983 study were placed into a high, medium, or low group based on the MSPI score. For the current study, the 12 schools which comprised the high group and the 7 schools which comprised the low group were the districts contacted.

Initial permission from each superintendent was elicited by sending a personal letter (Appendix B), stating the purpose and procedures for the study. Permission was given immediately by the superintendents of 9 of the possible 19 schools. Principals of the nine schools were then contacted by telephone and with a follow-up cover letter (Appendix B), explaining the study. All nine principals agreed for their schools to be included, but before the questionnaires were

mailed for each school, one principal chose to withdraw from the study. This left a total of eight participating schools.

Schools were coded by numerical order. Schools one through five were identified as "Group A," the group with a higher level of middle school concept implementation as measured on the MSPI. Schools six, eight, and nine comprised "Group B," which was the group with the lower level of middle school concept implementation as determined by the MSPI. School seven in Group B was the school which withdrew.

Since the number of professional staff members per school within the sample varied from a high of 66 to a low of 13, and since participation in the study was of a voluntary nature, it was not feasible to balance the number of schools or respondents in Group A and B equally. There were 221 potential respondents in Group A and 51 in Group B. Group A returned 174 usable questionnaires, for a total return rate of 79%. There were 44 usable forms returned for Group B, which yielded a response rate of 86%. All complete responses were included in the analysis.

The principal in each of the eight schools received a package containing a cover letter (Appendix B) and individual packets for each staff member. The individual packets contained the PCI (Appendix A), a letter to each professional educator (Appendix B), and a self-addressed, stamped envelope for use in returning the questionnaire directly to the researcher.

During a three week period, a total of 226 forms was received. This accounted for 81% of the total population of the eight schools; consequently, a follow-up was not considered necessary. Of the 226 returned PCIs, seven were discarded because they were either

incomplete or were filled out incorrectly. No attempt was made to survey those with an unreturned questionnaire because the usable returns were deemed sufficiently representative of the selected population.

Treatment of Data

A modified version of Riegle's (1971) MSPI was used in the 1983 study by Butler to determine frequency and consistency of the level of middle school concept implementation in the 93 accredited middle schools of Oklahoma. Instructions for scoring the MSPI were those specified by the author. Based on the percentages derived for each of the 18 characteristics, a total MSPI score was calculated for each school. Schools were then ranked from high to low according to the MSPI score. The MSPI score for the schools in the high and low categories on the level of middle school concept implementation was used as a variable for this study.

The PCI was developed by Willower, Eidell, and Hoy (1967) to measure the pupil-control ideology of professionals in the public schools. In this study, the middle school educators were responding to the PCI, 10 demographic items, and 1 related question. There was a response from a total of 226 school professionals, but only 219 of the responses were coded for analysis with the Statistical Analysis System computer package through the computer center of Oklahoma State University. Hypotheses under investigation were tested using the analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure and Tukey's (HSD) test of variance.

Summary

Eight middle schools in the state participated in the study. Five were categorized in the high group on the level of middle school concept implementation. Three were categorized in the low group on the level of middle school concept implementation. All of the professional personnel within each of the eight schools were asked to complete the PCI in order to measure the pupil-control ideology of the staff.

To determine if a significant difference in ideology existed in the two groups of schools, the analysis of variance procedure, followed by Tukey's (HSD) test of variance, were used to test the data. Hypotheses were developed from the three research questions. They were then tested to determine if differences existed at a .05 level of significance.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

In this chapter, the presentation of the data will begin with a summary of the demographic data from the middle school teachers, counselors, and administrators of the eight participating schools. The remainder of the chapter will report and analyze the data on pupil-control ideology and the level of middle school concept implementation as they related to the three research questions and the 12 stated null hypotheses.

Statistical measures used were frequencies, percentages, the means, analysis of variance, and Tukey (HSD) Test for Variance. The data were processed using the Statistical Analysis System (SAS).

Demographic Data

The PCI included 10 demographic items and one related question pertaining to professional preparation. These items contributed to the development of variables which aided in a more descriptive study of middle school personnel. A summary of major observations pertinent to the demographic information for the sample includes the following:

1. Female teachers outnumbered male teachers 2 to 1.

2. Over one-third of the respondents were between 30-39 years of age and just over one-fourth were between 40-49 years of age. The two age groups accounted for over one-half of the sample.

3. Over two-fifths of the respondents were secondary certified, while just over one-fourth of the respondents were elementary certified.

4. Over four-fifths of the respondents were teachers.

5. One-fifth of the teachers were teachers of English/reading. The other curriculum areas ranged from a low of 13% for science to a high of 19% for those teaching more than one content area.

6. Just under one-half of the respondents were from schools with a student enrollment population of 400-799. This would be considered a medium size school for this study.

7. More than three-fourths of the respondents were from middle shcools with a grade structure of 6-7-8.

8. Approximately three-fifths of the respondents had a master's degree or above.

9. Almost three-fourths of the respondents had continued with some type of professional preparation in the last four years.

Tables I through X present the demographic data pertinent to the observations listed above.

Analysis of Data

Research Question One

Is there a difference in the pupil-control ideology of the professional staff according to the level of middle school concept implementation in schools with high versus low levels of implementation?

TABLE I

RESPONDENTS CATEGORIZED BY SEX

Category	Number	Percentage
Male	68	31
Female	150	69

TABLE II

RESPONDENTS CATEGORIZED BY AGE

Category	Number	Percentage
20-29	48	22
30-39	81	38
40-49	59	27
50 and Over	28	13

TABLE III

RESPONDENTS CATEGORIZED BY TYPE OF TEACHER CERTIFICATION

Category	Number	Percentage
Elementary	59	27
Secondary	101	46
More Than One	32	15
Other	27	12

TABLE IV

RESPONDENTS CATEGORIZED BY PRESENT POSITION

Category	Number	Percentage
Teacher	192	88
Counselor	10	5
Administrator	14	6
Other	3	1

TABLE V

RESPONDENTS CATEGORIZED BY PRESENT TEACHING AREA

Category	Number	Percentage
Mathematics	29	15
Science	25	13
English/Reading	40	20
Social Studies	32	16
Electives	36	18
More Than One	37	19

TABLE VI

RESPONDENTS CATEGORIZED BY SCHOOL SIZE

Category	Number	Percentage
0-399	41	19
400-799	101	47
800-1199	31	14
1200 +	44	20

TABLE VII

RESPONDENTS CATEGORIZED BY GRADE STRUCTURE

Category	Number	Percentage
5,6,7 & 5,6,7,8	1	0.5
6,7,8	160	73.0
6,7,8,9	0	0
7,8,9	2	0.9
Other = 7,8	56	26.0

TABLE VIII

RESPONDENTS CATEGORIZED BY YEARS OF EXPERIENCE

Category	Number	Percentage
0-5	55	25
6-10	49	23
11-15	54	25
16 +	59	27

TABLE IX

RESPONDENTS CATEGORIZED BY LEVEL OF ACADEMIC PREPARATION

Category	Number	Percentage
Bachelor's +	91	42.00
Master's +	127	58.00
Doctor's +	1	0.05

TABLE X

RESPONDENTS CATEGORIZED BY GROUPS BASED ON FREQUENCY OF CONTINUED PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION

Category	Number	Percentage
Last 0-4 Years	157	72
5-8 Years	24	11
9 Years or More	30	14
Other	7	3

Research question one was formulated to examine pupil-control ideology as it relates to personnel in middle schools and to better understand any differences that might exist between groups. To answer this question, a null hypothesis was formulated and tested using an analysis of variance and the Tukey's test of variance.

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the mean PCI scores of the Group A and Group B schools.

To test this hypothesis, a mean PCI score was computed for each of the eight schools' personnel. An analysis of variance was used to compare these mean PCI scores, and a significant difference among the eight schools was found at the .05 level of significance (Table XI).

The analysis of variance was followed by the Tukey's test of variance to compare the different sets of mean PCI scores and specifically to locate the significant differences between these sets of means at the .05 level of significance. In Group A, the schools with

the higher level of middle school concept implementation, the mean PCI score of the personnel in School Two differed significantly at the .05 level from that of the personnel in Schools Three, Four, and Five. However, the mean score for School Two was not significantly different from that of School One, Group A (Table XII).

TABLE XI

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR MEAN PCI OF THE EIGHT PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Eight Schools					
Between Groups	7	2170.12	310.02	3.65	0.001
Within Groups	211	17899.36	84.83		
Total	218	20069.48			

In Group B, the schools with the lower level of middle school concept implementation, the mean PCI score for the personnel of School Two, Group A, differed significantly from that of School Eight, Group B; however, the mean score for School Two did not differ significantly from Schools Six and Nine, Group B (Table XII). Table XII presents the mean PCI scores according to the level of middle school concept implementation (MSPI) score.

TABLE XII

MEAN PCI AND MSPI SCORES FOR
THE EIGHT SCHOOLS

School Code	Number	Group	Mean PCI	Mean MSPI
1	53	A	57	155
2	38	A	53*	152
3	37	A	61	147
4	26	A	61	143
5	22	A	61	142
6	15	B	57	76
7**				
8	13	B	63	61
9	15	B	59	48

*Significantly different at the .05 level between the mean and those of 3, 4, 5, and 8.

**Withdrew from the study.

While there was a significant difference between the mean PCI scores of the individual schools in Table XII, this does not support an overall significant difference in the mean PCI scored between personnel in Group A and Group B schools (Table XIII). Table XIII presents a grand mean PCI for each of the two groups (Groups A and B). The grand mean PCI for Group A was 58; Group B was 59, a difference of one. From this difference it is evident that there is no significant statistical difference between the grand mean PCI scores.

From this analysis of data, it can be inferred that the professional personnel in middle schools with a high level of middle school concept implementation do not have a different pupil-control ideology

from the professional personnel of middle schools with a low level of middle school concept implementation.

TABLE XIII

PCI SCORES FOR GROUPS A AND B

Group	Number	PCI
A	176	58
B	43	59

Research Question Two

Are there differences in attitudes of the professional middle school personnel toward pupil control when compared on the 10 demographic factors: (1) sex, (2) age, (3) type of teacher certification, (4) present position, (5) present teaching area, (6) student enrollment (school size), (7) grade structure, (8) years of school experience, (9) level of academic preparation, and (10) continued growth?

To answer these questions, 10 null hypotheses were formulated and tested to determine differences which might exist in these various categories. This additional information provided data to better understand the rationale of pupil-control ideology.

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference in mean PCI scores between male and female personnel.

To test this hypothesis, an analysis of variance was used to compare mean PCI scores of middle school males and females. In the eight participating schools there were 68 males with a total mean PCI score of 61, and 150 females with a total mean PCI score of 57. When the mean scores of these two groups were compared, a significant difference at the .05 level was obtained; therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected (Table XIV).

TABLE XIV

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR MEAN PCI OF MALES AND FEMALES

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Sex					
Between Groups	1	660.86	660.86	7.37	0.001
Within Groups	216	19356.26	89.61		
Total	217	20017.12			

Since there was a significant difference between middle school males and females in this study, males would be considered more custodial than females because of the higher mean PCI score (Table XV).

TABLE XV

MEAN PCI SCORES BASED ON SEX OF INDIVIDUAL

Sex	Number	Mean PCI
Female	150	57
Male	68	61

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference in mean PCI scores among personnel in the four age groups: (1) 20-29, (2) 30-39, (3) 40-49, and (4) 50 and over.

The analysis of variance and the Tukey's (HSD) were used to analyze the mean PCI scores of the four age groups: (1) 20-29, (2) 30-39, (3) 40-49, and (4) 50 and over. The null hypothesis was retained, since no significant difference was revealed at the .05 level of significance (Table XVI).

The categories in this study which were included in order to analyze a person's age as a factor which might influence pupil control, did not reveal significant differences. The mean PCI scores for each age category are reported in Table XVII, which illustrates a total difference of three points between the high and low PCI mean scores.

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference in mean PCI scores among personnel in the four certification groups: (1) elementary, (2) secondary, (3) more than one, and (4) other = elementary-secondary.

TABLE XVI

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR MEAN PCI
BASED ON AGE

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Age					
Between Groups	3	252.11	84.04	0.91	0.44
Within Groups	212	19650.85	92.69		
Total	215	19902.96			

TABLE XVII

MEAN PCI SCORES BASED ON AGE

Age	Number	Mean PCI
20-29	48	59
30-39	81	57
40-49	59	59
50 and Over	28	60

To test Hypothesis 4, the mean PCI score for the four groups: (1) elementary, (2) secondary, (3) more than one type of certification, and (4) other = which was the elementary-secondary certification, were compared with an analysis of variance procedure. In this study, there was no significant difference at the .05 level (Table XVIII).

TABLE XVIII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR MEAN PCI BASED ON TYPE OF CERTIFICATION

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Certification Type					
Between Groups	3	89.59	29.86	0.32	0.81
Within Groups	215	19979.89	92.93		
Total	218	20069.48			

Based on the findings of no significant difference, the null hypothesis was retained. There appeared to be no differences in pupil-control ideology among these groups of middle school personnel based on their types of certification. This is more specifically reported in Table XIX, which contains the high mean PCI score of 59 for secondary certified personnel and the low mean PCI score of 57 for personnel who were elementary certified.

TABLE XIX

MEAN PCI SCORES BASED ON TYPES OF CERTIFICATION

Type of Certification	Number	Mean PCI
Elementary	59	57
Secondary	101	59
More Than One	32	58
Other = Elem.-Second.	27	58

Hypothesis 5: There is no significant difference in mean PCI scores among the four groups of school personnel based on present position: (1) teacher, (2) counselor, (3) administrator, (4) other = nurse, library, speech pathologist.

To test this hypothesis, an analysis of variance procedure was used to compare the mean PCI scores of the four groups of school personnel based on present positions: (1) teacher, (2) counselor, (3) administrator, and (4) other = which could be a nurse, librarian, speech pathologist. When the analysis of variance was computed, there was a significant difference at the .05 level. When the comparisons were made, a significant difference was found; therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected (Table XX).

The analysis of variance was followed by the Tukey's test of variance. Tukey's was used to compare the different sets of mean PCI scores in order to locate the significant differences among the four groups. The level of significance was set at .05.

TABLE XX

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR MEAN PCI OF PERSONNEL BASED ON PRESENT POSITION

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Present Position					
Between Groups	3	1897.36	632.45	7.48	.0001
Within Groups	215	18172.12	84.52		
Total	218	20069.48			

Of the four groups, teachers were most significantly different from counselors and administrators. The teachers' group mean PCI score of 59 was the highest and most custodial score of the four groups. The counselors (with a score of 50) and the administrators (with a score of 51) were significantly lower and less custodial than were the teachers. Those who made up the "Other" group were not significantly different, but did have a score of 52, which was lower than that of the teachers (Table XXI).

Hypothesis 6: There is no significant difference in mean PCI scores among the personnel in the six teaching fields: (1) mathematics, (2) science, (3) English/reading, (4) social studies, (5) electives, and (6) more than one.

Hypothesis 6 was tested using the analysis of variance procedure. Comparisons were made of the mean PCI scores of personnel in the six different teaching fields were made: (1) mathematics, (2) science,

(3) English/reading, (4) social studies, (5) electives, and (6) more than one area. The Tukey's test for variance was used following the ANOVA, and there was no significant difference at the level of .05; consequently, the null hypothesis was retained (Table XXII).

TABLE XXI

MEAN PCI SCORES FOR FOUR GROUPS OF PERSONNEL BASED ON PRESENT POSITION

Present Position	Number	Mean PCI
Teacher	192	59
Counselor*	10	50
Administrator*	14	51
Other = Librarian, Nurse, Speech Path.	3	52

*Significantly different at the .05 level.

There was a high mean PCI score of 60 for those who taught in the two areas of mathematics and electives. The lowest mean PCI score was 58 for the group who taught in the area of English/reading. This was a difference of two points among all six groups (Table XXIII).

Hypothesis 7: There is no significant difference in mean PCI scores among the four groups of school personnel based on size of school: (1) 0-399, (2) 400-799, (3) 800-1199, and (4) 1200 +.

TABLE XXII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR MEAN PCI OF PERSONNEL BASED ON PRESENT TEACHING AREA

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Teaching Area					
Between Groups	5	45.29	9.06	0.10	0.99
Within Groups	193	17240.39	89.33		
Total	198	17285.68			

TABLE XXIII

MEAN PCI SCORES FOR SIX GROUPS OF PERSONNEL BASED ON PRESENT TEACHING AREA

Teaching Area	Number	Mean PCI
Mathematics	29	60
Science	25	59
English/Reading	40	58
Social Studies	32	59
Electives	36	60
More Than One	37	59

To test the null hypothesis, an analysis of variance was computed for each group of mean PCI scores. The Tukey's test was also used to compare the different sets of means for the four personnel groups based on school size. There was no significant difference at the .05 level found among the groups. The null hypothesis was retained based on the supportive data contained in Table XXIV.

TABLE XXIV

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR MEAN PCI OF PERSONNEL BASED ON SCHOOL SIZE

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
School Size					
Between Groups	3	407.00	135.67	1.47	0.22
Within Groups	213	19648.08	92.24		
Total	216	20055.08			

When the mean PCI scores were compared among the four groups, the lowest mean score of 56 was in the group which served 1200 or more students in a school. The most custodial mean PCI score of 61 was found in the category which contained schools consisting of 800-1199 students per school. The five-point spread between the high and low

mean scores was not significant enough for school size to be a factor in pupil-control ideology. Table XXV contains the specific mean scores for each category.

TABLE XXV

MEAN PCI SCORES FOR FOUR GROUPS OF PERSONNEL BASED ON SCHOOL SIZE

School Size	Number	Mean PCI
0-399	41	59
400-799	101	58
800-1199	31	61
1200 +	44	56

Hypothesis 8: There is no significant difference in mean PCI scores among the five groups of school personnel based on grade structure: (1) 5, 6, 7 and 5, 6, 7, 8; (2) 6, 7, 8; (3) 7, 8, 9; (4) 6, 7, 8, 9; and (5) Other = 7,8.

To test Hypothesis 8, a mean PCI was computed for each of the five groups of personnel based on grade structure. These groups were: (1) 5, 6, 7 and 5, 6, 7, 8; (2) 7, 8, 9; (3) 6, 7, 8; (4) 6, 7, 8, 9; and (4) Other = 7, 8. When the analysis of variance was used to compare the mean PCI scores between the groups, there was no significant difference at the level of .05. The null hypothesis was therefore

retained based on the results of the ANOVA. Table XXVI contains the analysis for grade structure.

TABLE XXVI

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR MEAN PCI OF PERSONNEL BASED ON GRADE STRUCTURE

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Grade Structure					
Between Groups	3	648.45	216.15	2.39	.07
Within Groups	215	19421.03	90.33		
Total	218	20069.48			

When the Tukey's test was used to compare the various sets within the category, a significant difference between two groups was located. The significant level of difference had been set at .05. The specific difference was between the 6-7-8 group and the "Other" group = 7-8.

The 6-7-8 group, where N=160, had a mean PCI score of 57. The "Other" group = 7-8, where N=56, had a mean PCI score of 61. Since the "Other" group = 7-8 had the higher PCI score, they would be more custodial in their pupil-control ideology than those in the 6-7-8 group. However, due to the inequality of size in the two groups, this finding may be suspect.

Table XXVII contains the mean PCI scores for each area within the category. There was a difference of three points between the high mean score of 61 to the low of 57. Further investigation in the area of grade structure is suggested.

TABLE XXVII

MEAN PCI SCORES OF PERSONNEL BASED ON GRADE STRUCTURE

Grade Structure	Number	Mean PCI
5,6,7 & 5,6,7,8	1	62
6,7,8	160	57
7,8,9	2	61
5,7,8,9	0	0
Other = 7,8	56	61

Hypothesis 9: There is no significant difference in mean PCI scores among the four groups of school personnel based on years of experience: (1) 0-5, (2) 6-10, (3) 11-15, and (4) 16 +.

The analysis of variance procedure and Tukey's test of variance were used to test the hypothesis and make comparisons of the mean PCI scores of the four groups of school personnel based on years of experience: (1) 0-5, (2) 6-10, (3) 11-15, and (4) 16 +. There was no significant difference found when the level of significance was set at

.05. The null hypothesis was retained based on the analysis which is found in Table XXVIII.

TABLE XXVIII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR MEAN PCI OF PERSONNEL BASED ON YEARS OF EXPERIENCE

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Years of Experience					
Between Groups	3	97.52	32.51	0.35	0.79
Within Groups	213	19963.56	93.73		
Total	216	20061.08			

An examination of the mean PCI scores for each group in the category of experience revealed only one point difference between the high mean score and the low score (Table XXIX).

Hypothesis 10: There is no significant difference in mean PCI scores among the three groups of school personnel based on level of academic preparation: (1) Bachelor's +, (2) Master's +, and (3) Doctor's +.

Hypothesis 10 was tested using the analysis of variance to compare the mean PCI scores of the three groups of personnel. The three groups were: (1) Bachelor's +, (2) Master's +, and (3) Doctor's +,

and according to the analysis, there was no significant difference among the groups when the level of significance was set at .05.

TABLE XXIX

MEAN PCI SCORES FOR FOUR GROUPS OF PERSONNEL BASED ON YEARS OF EXPERIENCE

Years of Experience	Number	Mean PCI
0-5	55	58
6-10	49	58
11-15	54	58
16 +	59	59

An examination of the mean PCI score for each of the three groups revealed a low mean score of 40 and a high mean score of 59. Since the number of participants for the group containing the low score of 40 equaled one, this group did not contain adequate numbers to consider it significant. There was only one point difference between the other two groups. Table XXX contains the three groups within the category of academic preparation. Based on the analysis, the null hypothesis was retained.

Hypothesis 11: There is no significant difference in mean PCI scores among the four groups of school personnel based on continued professional growth: (1) 0-4, (2) 5-8, and (3) 9 +.

TABLE XXX

MEAN PCI SCORES FOR GROUPS OF PERSONNEL
BASED ON ACADEMIC PREPARATION

Academic Preparation	Number	Mean PCI
Bachelor's +	91	59
Master's +	127	58
Doctor's +	1	40

To test the hypothesis, the analysis of variance procedure and the Tukey's test were used to compare the mean PCI scores of the three groups within the category which was based on one's return for continued professional growth. In this category, there was no significant difference found at the level of .05. The null hypotheses was retained based on the reported findings (Table XXXI).

From the results obtained through the analysis of data, it can be inferred that there are significant differences between mean PCI scores and 2 of the 10 demographic categories. When comparisons were made on: (1) sex, and (2) present position, the null hypotheses were rejected. Grade structure appeared to have a significant difference after it was analyzed with the Tukey's test. However, the two groups were very unequal in size, and this could have contributed to findings which bear further study.

TABLE XXXI

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR MEAN PCI OF PERSONNEL BASED ON RETURNING FOR PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Professional Preparation					
Between Groups	2	369.07	184.54	2.02	0.13
Within Groups	216	19700.41	91.21		
Total	218	20069.48			

Research Question Three

Will the mean PCI score of personnel who consider professional preparaton adequate differ significantly from those who consider professional preparation inadequate?

From this question, a null hypothesis was formulated. To test the hypothesis, an analysis of variance and Tukey's test of variance were calculated.

Hypothesis 12: There is no significant difference in mean PCI scores among the four groups of middle school personnel based on their opinion concerning adequacy of professional preparation for middle school personnel: (1) adequate, (2) training needed, (3) certification needed, and (4) more than one.

The analysis of variance procedure and the Tukey's test of variance revealed no significant difference in the mean PCI scores among the four groups of personnel in the category pertaining to adequacy of professional preparation. The level of significance had been set at .05; consequently, the hypothesis was retained based on the analysis.

Further analysis compared the groups by percentages according to their responses to the question: "As a middle school educator, my professional preparation for working with the 10-14 year old student is: (1) adequate for the job, (2) additional training would be helpful, (3) certification for educators working with 10-14 year olds is needed, and (4) other." Less than 45% of the sample surveyed reported the preparation for working with 10-14 year olds as adequate. There was a need for additional preparation, as reported by 50% of the respondents. Table XXXII contains the reported percentages by categories.

TABLE XXXII

PERCENTAGES AND MEAN PCI SCORES OF RESPONDENTS BASED ON OPINIONS TOWARD PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION

Opinion Toward Professional Preparation	Number	Percentage	Mean PCI
Adequate	99	44	59
Training Needed	73	33	59
Certification Needed	37	17	55
More Than One Response	12	5	54

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of the study was to determine if there was a difference between the attitudes of the professional personnel toward pupil control in selected middle schools which had high versus low levels of concept implementation.

The teachers, counselors, and administrators in eight middle schools from throughout the state of Oklahoma were asked to respond to the Pupil-Control Ideology (PCI) form. There were usable questionnaires returned from 192 teachers, 10 counselors, and 14 administrators.

The selection of the eight schools was determined by a middle school survey conducted by Butler (1983). The score on the Middle School Practices Index (MSPI) placed five schools in Group A, the group with higher levels of concept implementation. Three schools, which had lower levels of middle school concept implementation, formed Group B.

Each individual PCI score was computed and used to secure a mean PCI score for each school and for each category on the 10 demographic variables and one related question. An Analysis of Variance was used to determine variance between the groups, and Tukey's Test of Variance

was computed to locate specific and significant differences at the .05 level of significance. From the analysis of the data, the three research questions and their stated hypotheses were answered.

Findings

Findings which were obtained through the statistical analyses of the data were the following:

1. Hypothesis 1 of no significant difference between the mean PCI scores of Group A and Group B schools was retained.

2. Hypothesis 2 of no significant difference in mean PCI scores between male and female middle school personnel was rejected.

3. Hypothesis 3 of no significant difference in mean PCI scores among the four age groups was retained.

4. Hypothesis 4 of no significant difference in mean PCI scores among the four personnel certification groups was retained.

5. Hypothesis 5 of no significant difference in mean PCI scores among the four groups of personnel based on present position was rejected.

6. Hypothesis 6 of no significant difference in mean PCI scores among the six teaching fields of responding personnel was retained.

7. Hypothesis 7 of no significant difference in mean PCI scores among the four groups of school personnel based on school size was retained.

8. Hypothesis 8 of no significant difference in mean PCI scores among the five groups of personnel based on grade structure was retained.

9. Hypothesis 9 of no significant difference in mean PCI scores among the four groups of personnel based on years of experience was retained.

10. Hypothesis 10 of no significant difference in mean PCI scores among the three groups of personnel based on level of academic preparation was retained.

11. Hypothesis 11 of no significant difference in mean PCI scores among the four groups of personnel based on continued professional preparation was retained.

12. Hypothesis 12 of no significant difference in mean PCI scores among the four groups of personnel based on opinions concerning adequacy of professional preparation was retained.

Conclusions

From the findings in this study, the following conclusions have been derived:

1. Since there was no significant difference between the mean PCI scores of personnel in Group A and Group B schools, the conclusion would be that pupil-control ideology was not influenced by the level of middle school concept implementation.

Another conclusion might be related to the overall level of middle school concept implementation. According to Butler (1983), Oklahoma middle schools were converting from traditional junior high schools, but the changes were in many different stages of the process.

2. Hypothesis 2 indicated a significant difference in mean PCI scores between male and female personnel. This was consistent with findings in previous studies by Willower (1975) and many others using

the PCI in research. From this one might conclude that, regardless of the setting, age grouping, grade structure, and size of a school, females are less custodial than males in their pupil-control ideology.

3. Hypothesis 3 indicated no significant difference among the mean PCI scores according to age. Based on the age categories in the study, one conclusion would be that other variables are more important than one's age in promoting a more humanistic pupil-control ideology within a middle school.

4. Hypothesis 4 indicated no significant difference in mean PCI scores among personnel based on teacher certification. This finding was not consistent with that of Willower, Eidell, and Hoy (1967), which indicated personnel in elementary schools were less custodial than those in secondary schools. The conclusion which may be drawn is that the middle school is the only school setting which has both certification groups working together. This may facilitate the two groups being more similar than different in their pupil-control ideology.

5. Hypothesis 5 revealed a significant difference in mean PCI scores among the four groups of personnel, based on present position. Counselors were low, with a mean PCI of 49. The administrative group was next, with a mean score of 51, and the teachers were high, with a mean score of 59. Willower, Eidell, and Hoy (1967) reported similar findings.

Conclusions might be that since counselors are specifically trained to be more accepting and supportive in their relationships, they would naturally be less custodial. Since teachers are charged with daily responsibility and direct involvement with students, they may be more controlling and less accepting in their involvement with

students. From this, one might conclude that teachers may experience greater difficulties in being more humanistic. Expectations placed on teachers by relevant others, tradition, and students, often cause them to feel they must exert power and control.

6. Hypothesis 6 indicated that there was no significant difference in mean PCI scores among the personnel in the six teaching fields identified in this study. From this, it can be concluded that the subject taught is unrelated to the pupil-control ideology of the individual.

7. Hypothesis 7 indicated no significant difference in mean PCI scores among the personnel according to school size. From the results of this study, the conclusion is that personnel within a school can be open and accepting or closed and rejecting in a school of a few hundred students as easily as in a school of over one thousand students. School size should not impede professionals from being concerned with students and their needs, and simultaneously being open and accepting.

8. Hypothesis 8 indicated no significant difference in mean PCI scores of personnel based on the grade configuration of the school. There were 160 respondents in the 6-7-8 grade structure, and 56 respondents in the "Other" = 7-8 category. Pupil-control ideology did not seem to be influenced by the various grade groupings within the middle school until the Tukey's was calculated.

The conclusion would be that basically, grade structure should not be a critical factor if one is attempting to achieve a more open and humanistic approach to pupil control. However, there may be some indirect influence because of personnel who may be interested in working with particular grades.

9. Hypotheses 9, 10, and 11 all revealed no significant difference in mean PCI scores among personnel based on years of experience, level of academic preparation, and continued professional growth. There were only minimal differences within these various categories; consequently, the conclusion seems to be that these are not areas which influence pupil control. It might be more beneficial and insightful to examine relationships among the individuals within the school rather than demographic data pertaining to individuals.

10. Hypothesis 12 indicated no significant difference in mean PCI scores among the four opinion groups of personnel when compared on their responses to the adequacy of professional preparation. There were reported differences concerning the adequacy of professional preparation. A majority of the respondents indicated a need for additional preparation in order to deal with 10-14 year old students.

Possible conclusions which might be drawn from these findings are that if middle school personnel possess a broader understanding of the needs of the 10-14 age group, they could be more open and responsive in student-teacher situations. This would enable the personnel within the schools to be less custodial in their pupil control, and at the same time could enable the schools to move forward and improve on the level of middle school concept implementation.

Discussion

From this study, there were only two demographic factors--a person's sex and present teaching position--that revealed significant differences, and they were not related to the level of middle school

implementation. From the findings of the study, middle school concept implementation and pupil control appeared to be unrelated.

When each school's mean PCI score in Groups A and B were compared, there was only one school which stood out as being significantly different. In order to better understand this school and its philosophy, its programs, its personnel and their philosophical orientations, a follow-up examination (which would include interactions between students and staff as well as a closer investigation of middle school practices), is recommended.

From this study, there were several factors which appeared to be unrelated to pupil-control ideology. Since these factors have been identified, they can be beneficial to future researchers by excluding them and directing attention to variables which may reveal new information regarding pupil control. Factors which are not so closely related to demographics concerning the individual could be more revealing if included in future research.

No new factors were found in this study to influence pupil control which had not been identified through prior research. The findings of researchers such as Willower, Eidell, and Hoy (1967), which related pupil-control ideology to one's sex and position in the school, were supported.

Recommendations for Educators

The following are recommendations for educators which resulted from this study:

1. The State Department of Education could provide a forum which would focus on the programs, personnel, and needs of students in the

age category of 10-14. From this would emerge a position paper addressing:

a. The need for more appropriate programs

b. The goals and objectives of programs to meet the needs of this specific age group

c. The resources and strategies which could be utilized in achieving the stated goals

2. The Oklahoma State Department of Education should consider a revision of teacher certification requirements which would include a category to more adequately prepare the personnel who work with 10-14 year old students.

3. The State Department of Education could serve as a source of information to those wishing the service. Current materials, programs, and information pertinent to middle schools would be available upon request.

4. Local school districts interested in middle schools and their progress should cooperate to form networks of their personnel to support and share ideas, techniques, and strategies which appear to be successful in the daily operation of middle schools.

5. Building administrators should become well-informed, competent, and committed to the middle school and should simultaneously provide positive leadership for continuous professional growth for the personnel within the schools.

6. Certification of administrators should be reviewed, and requirements which would include appropriate preparation for those involved with the education of 10-14 year old students should be made mandatory.

7. Colleges and universities who prepare future educators could review their programs and seriously consider breaking away from the traditional, two-tier, elementary-secondary approach to the preparation of teachers and administrators, and then try to incorporate programs which focus on the preparation of personnel who will work with 10-14 year olds.

Recommendations for Further Study

Even though there was no significant relationship between pupil control and the level of middle school concept implementation, there were some significant differences between specific schools in the study. Because of the specific differences, there are several areas which could be investigated further. The recommendations are as follows:

1. This study should be replicated in a state where middle school concept implementation is at a higher level of practice.

2. What types of staff selection--such as: (1) team interviews, (2) random selection from all available applicants, (3) selection based on middle school interests, and so forth--are utilized in schools with higher PCI scores versus those with lower scores?

3. Do schools with the lower mean PCI scores have a lower pupil absentee rate than those with a higher mean PCI score?

4. Are schools with high mean PCI scores different from those with low scores when compared on: (1) the use of team teaching, (2) team planning, (3) the number and type of parent conferences, and (4) utilization of intramural activities?

Implications

Since 1983, the number of schools in Oklahoma that carry the title "middle school" have increased from 93 to 105. The numbers seem to increase yearly in the use of the title, but the level of concept implementation is not yet exceedingly high. If these schools are to contribute to maximum growth for middle level young people, they must be flexible and open, and must allow for diversity. These qualities can be accomplished by implementing the basic principles which are necessary for a middle school. However, professional personnel must be knowledgeable as to the characteristics and principles required for making these schools maximally effective.

Along with knowledge and the application of basic principles, there is also a need for an open, accepting, and supportive attitude on the part of the professionals who staff the schools. From this study, a need for additional information, methods, techniques, and strategies for working with the 10-14 year old is apparent from the respondents.

Trained professionals are a basic requirements if middle schools are to achieve their goals. Implementing change comes slowly and through commitment to basic goals and objectives. Understanding the mission for middle schools, as opposed to junior high schools, is complex, but without a basic philosophical foundation, progress can be expected to be minimal.

Currently, there is no one charged with the responsibility for promoting and developing the middle school concept outside of the individual school districts. If a school district should desire

assistance, there is no readily available resource. There is a need for assistance to interested people who are attempting to implement middle school programs. If the State Department of Education, as well as institutions of higher education, can assist in filling this void, the 10-14 year old student will ultimately be better served in the state of Oklahoma.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Administrator's Handbook. Oklahoma City: Oklahoma State Department of Education, 1984-85.

Alexander, W. M. "How Fares the Middle School Movement?" Middle School Journal, 9(3), August, 1978, pp. 19-21.

Alexander, W. M. and McEwin, C. K. "Solving the Dilemma--Training the Middle Level Educator." NASSP Bulletin, 68(473), September, 1984, pp. 6-11.

Allyon, O. and Roberts, M. "Eliminating Discipline problems by Strengthening Academic Performance." Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 7, Spring, 1974, p. 71.

Arth, A. A. "Examining Instructional Processes of Middle Level Educators." NASSP, 67(463), May, 1983, pp. 14-21.

Ban, J. R. and Ciminillo, L. M. Violence and Vandalism in Public Education. Danville, Illinois: Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1977.

Barfield, V. and Burlingame, M. "The Pupil Control Ideology of Teachers in Selected Schools." Journal of Experimental Education, 42(4), Summer, 1974, pp. 6-11.

Bartlett, L. V. "Teacher Attitudes as a Function of Pupil Control Ideology." Journal of Educational Administration, 14(2), October, 1976, pp. 211-219.

Beckman, F. F. "The Junior High School Movement: Its Beginnings." Organization of the Middle Grades: A Summary of Research. Arlington, Virginia: Educational Research Services, 1983, pp. 50-76.

Bobruff, J. L.; Howard, J. G.; and Howard, A. W. "The Principalship: Junior High and Middle School." NASSP Bulletin, 58(381), April, 1974, pp. 54-61.

Brenneman, O.; Willower, D.; and Lynch, P. "Teacher Self-Acceptance, Acceptance of Others, and Pupil Control Ideology." Journal of Experimental Education, 44, Spring, 1975, pp. 14-17.

Brooks, K. "The Middle Schools: A National Survey. Part I. Establishment and Administration." An Organization of the Middle

Grades: A Summary of Research. Arlington, Virginia: Educational Research Service, 1983, pp. 82-91.

Brown, J. "The Middle School Learner: Instructional Planning for a Transitional Stage." History and Social Science Teacher, 13(3), 1978, pp. 157-162.

Budzik, J. M. "The Relationship Between Teachers' Ideology of Pupil Control and Their Perception of Administrative Control Style." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1971.)

Butler, J. "Teacher Attitude, Classroom Climate, and the Level of Implementation of Recommended Middle School Practices in Oklahoma" (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1983.)

Carlson, R. O. "Environmental Constraints and Organizational Consequences: The Public School and Its Clients." In: Behavioral Science and Educational Administration. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964, pp. 56-64.

Cheser, W. B.; McDaniel, T. R.; and Cheser, D. B. "The Effect of a Classroom Management Course on Teachers' Disciplinary Styles." High School Journal, October-November, 1982, pp. 1-5.

Compton, M. "How Do You Prepare to Teach Transescents?" In: Middle School in the Making, R. Leeper, Ed. Washington, D.C.: ASCD, 1974, pp. 52-54.

Curtis, T. E. "The Middle School Tomorrow." The Middle School: A Look Ahead. Fairborn, Ohio: National Middle School Association, 1977, pp. 34-37.

Dreikurs, R. and Cassels, P. Discipline Without Tears. New York: Hawthorn Books, 1972.

Dubel, T. T. "A Descriptive Study of Organizational, Curriculum and Staff Utilization Patterns of Selected Middle Schools." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, George Washington University, 1976.)

Eichorn, D. H. "Focus on the Learner Leads to Clearer Middle Level Picture." NASSP Bulletin, 67(463), May, 1983, pp. 45-48.

Erb, T. O., Ed. Middle School Research Studies, 1981. Fairborn, Ohio: National Middle School Association, 1981.

Evans, C. L. Short Term Assessment of the Middle School Plan. Fort Worth, Texas: Fort Worth Independent School District, 1970.

Foley, W. J. and Brooks, R. "Pupil Control Ideology in Predicting Discipline Referrals." Educational Administration Quarterly, 14(3), Fall, 1978, pp. 104-112.

Friesen, D. "Middle School: An Institution in Search of Identity." Education Canada, 14(3), September, 1974, pp. 4-9.

Gatewood, T. L. and Dils, C. A. The Middle School We Need. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1975.

George, P. S., Ed. The Middle School: A Look Ahead. Fairborn, Ohio: National Middle School Association, 1977.

George P. S. "Middle School Teacher Certification: A National Survey." Educational Leadership, 33(3), December, 1975, pp. 213-216.

Georgiady, N. P.; Riegle, J. D.; and Romano, L. G. "What Are the Characteristics of the Middle School?" NASSP Bulletin, 58(381), April, 1974, pp. 72-77.

Gilbert, D. C. and Levinson, D. J. "Custodialism and Humanism in Mental Hospital Structure and in Staff Ideology." In: The Patient and the Mental Hospital, M. Greenblatt, Ed. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957, pp. 20-35.

Hamalian, A. "Pupil Control Ideology: Comparative Perspectives--United States and Canada." Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 25(1), March, 1979, pp. 37-47.

Hardesty, L. Pupil Control Ideology of Teachers As It Relates to Middle School Concepts. Wichita, Kansas: Wichita Public Schools, 1978.

Helsel, A. R. and Willower, D. J. "Toward Definition and Measurement of Pupil Control Behavior." Journal of Educational Administration, 12(1), May, 1974, pp. 114-123.

Highberger, J. H. "Attitude Toward Student Control and School Climate in Middle Schools and Junior High Schools." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, Fordham University, 1976.)

Hoy, W. K. An Investigation of the Relationships Between Characteristics of Secondary Schools and Student Alienation. Final Report. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, Bureau of Research, 1971.

Hoy, W. K. and Appleberry, J. B. "The Pupil Control Ideology of Professional Personnel in 'Open' and 'Closed' Elementary Schools." Educational Administration Quarterly, Fall, 1969, pp. 74-85.

Hoy, W. K. and Appleberry, J. B. "Teacher-Principal Relationships in 'Humanistic' and 'Custodial' Elementary Schools." Journal of Experimental Education, 39(2), Winter, 1970, pp. 27-31.

Hoy, W. K. and Henderson, J. "Principal Authenticity, School Climate, and Pupil-Control Orientation." Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 29(2), June, 1983, pp. 123-130.

Hoy, W. J. and Jalovick, J. M. "Open Education and Pupil Control Ideologies of Teachers." Journal of Educational Research, 73(1), September, 1979, pp. 45-49.

Hoy, W. K. and Miskell, C. G. Educational Administration. New York: Random House, 1982.

Huck, S. W.; Cormier, W. H.; and Bounds, W. G. Reading Statistics and Research. New York: Harper and Row, 1974.

Hunsaker, J. S. "A Comparison of the Organizational Climates of Selected Middle Schools and Junior High Schools." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, 1978.)

Kindred, L. W.; Wolokiewicz, R. J.; Mickelson, J. M.; and Coplein, L. E. The Middle School Curriculum. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1981.

Kopko, J. R. "A Comprehensive Study of Selected Middle Schools in the State of New Jersey." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, Rutgers University, 1976.)

Lipsitz, J.; Krabill, M.; Lefstein, L.; and Rosenzweig, C. "Grade Organization in the Middle Grades: Is There a 'Best' Solution?" ERS Spectrum, 3(1), Winter, 1985, pp. 18-13.

Lounsbury, J. H. "Developing Effective Middle Level Schools." NASSP Bulletin, 67(463), May, 1983, pp. 8-13.

Lounsbury, J. H. and Vars, G. F. "The Middle School: Fresh Start of New Delusion?" National Elementary Principal, 51(3), November, 1971, pp. 14-19.

Lunenburg, F. C. and O'Reilly, R. R. "Personal and Organizational Influence on Pupil Control Ideology." Journal of Experimental Education, 42(3), Spring, 1974, pp. 31-35.

McEwin, C. K. "Middle Level Teacher Education and Certification." NASSP Bulletin, 67(463), May, 1983, pp. 78-83.

McGee, J. C. and Kraejewski, R. "Middle School Effectiveness: A Three Year Study." Middle School Journal, 10(4), November, 1979, pp. 16-17.

McKinney, J. A. "A Correlational Comparison of the Relationship Between Interpersonal Values of Teachers and the Measured Self-Esteem and Social Behavior of Early Adolescent Students in Selected Middle Schools and Junior High Schools." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1971.)

Merenbloom, E. Y. Developing Effective Middle Schools. Fairborn, Ohio: National Middle School Association, 1982.

Middle School Research Studies. Fairborn, Ohio: National Middle School Association, 1980.

National Education Association (NEA). "Middle Schools in Theory and in Fact: Summary of Middle Schools in Action." NEA Research Bulletin, 47(2), May, 1965, pp. 38-56.

Overly, D. E. The Middle School: Humanizing Education for Youth. Washington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones, 1972.

Pumerantz, P. "State Recognition of the Middle School." NASSP Bulletin, 53(335), March, 1969, pp. 14-19.

Rankin, H. J. "A Study of the Pre and Post Attitudes and Academic Achievements of Students in Grades Five Through Ten in a Change From Junior High School Organization to a Middle School Organization in a Suburban School System." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, Syracuse University, 1969.)

Raymer, J. T. "A Study to Identify Middle Schools and to Determine the Current Level of Implementation of Eighteen Basic Middle School Characteristics in Selected United States and Michigan Schools." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1974.)

Riegle, J. D. "A Study of Middle School Programs to Determine the Current Level of Implementation of Eighteen Basic Middle School Practices." (Unpub. Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1971.)

Romano, L. G. "The Middle School and It's Issues." Principal, LVIII(1), Winter, 1982, pp. 29-30.

Sinks, T. A. and Hess, J. E. "Middle School Trend: Another Look in the Upper Midwest." Clearinghouse, 49(20), October, 1975, pp. 52-59.

Smyth, W. J. "Pupil Control Ideology and the Salience of Teacher Characteristics." Journal of Educational Administration, 15(2), October, 1977, pp. 238-247.

Stout, D. J. "Some Characteristics and Practices in Junior High Schools in Five Midwestern States." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, University of Iowa, 1962.)

Thomas, D. R.; Becker, W. C.; and Armstrong, M. "Production and Elimination of Disruptive Classroom Behavior by Systematically Varying Teacher's Behavior." Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, Spring, 1968, p. 43.

Tjosvold, D. Issues of Student Control. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, 1976.

Valentine, J. W. "A National Study of Schools in the Middle." NASSP Bulletin, 68(473), September, 1984, pp. 12-18.

Wallnick, L. R. "School Climate: An Organizational Development View." Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, 1980.

Walter, J. M. and Fanslow, A. M. "Professional Competencies for Middle School Teachers." Middle School Journal, XI(3), August, 1980, pp. 23-29.

Webster, S. W. Discipline in the Classroom. San Francisco: Chandler, 1968.

Willower, D. J. "Some Comments on Inquiries on Schools and Student Control." Teacher College Record, 77(33), 1975.

Willower, D. J.; Eidell, T. L.; and Hoy, W. K. Penn State Studies: The School and Pupil Control Ideology. University Park, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1967.

Willower, D. J. and Landis, C. A. "Pupil Control Ideology and Professional Orientation of School Faculty." Journal of Secondary Education, 45(3), March, 1970, pp. 118-123.

Willower, D. J. and Lawrence, J. D. "Teacher's Perceptions of Student Threat to Teacher Status and Teacher Pupil Control Ideology." Psychology in the Schools, 16(4), 1979, pp. 586-590.

Yuskiewicz, V. D. and Willower, D. J. "Perceived Pupil Control Ideology Consensus and Teacher Job Satisfaction." Urban Education, 8(3), October, 1973, pp. 231-238.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

PCI FORM

Information Sheet

INSTRUCTIONS: Please complete this form by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in blanks where indicated.

1. SEX
   ( ) Male ( ) Female

2. AGE
   ( ) 20-29 ( ) 30-39 ( ) 40-49 ( ) 50-59 ( ) 60-69

3. TYPE OF CERTIFICATION
   ( ) Elementary ( ) Secondary ( ) Other (Specify)_____

4. PRESENT POSITION
   ( ) Teacher ( ) Counselor ( ) Administrator ( ) Other (Specify)

   _____

5. PRESENT TEACHING AREA
   ( ) Math ( ) Science ( ) English (Language Arts) ( ) Reading

   ( ) Social Studies ( ) Electives ( ) Physical Education

6. STUDENT ENROLLMENT IN THE SCHOOL
   ( ) 0 - 399 ( ) 400 - 799 ( ) 800 - 1199 ( ) 1200 and over

7. GRADE STRUCTURE IN THE SCHOOL
   ( ) 5-6-7 ( ) 6-7-8 ( ) 7-8-9 ( ) 5-6-7-8 ( ) 6-7-8-9

   ( ) Other (Specify)_____

8. YEARS OF EXPERIENCE AS AN EDUCATOR (As of the end of this academic year)
   ( ) 0 - 5 ( ) 6 - 10 ( ) 11 - 15 ( ) 16 - 20 ( ) 21 and over

9. LEVEL OF ACADEMIC PREPARATION
   ( ) Bachelor's Degree
   ( ) Bachelor's Degree plus additional credits
   ( ) Master's Degree
   ( ) Master's Degree plus additional credits
   ( ) Doctor's Degree
   ( ) Other (Specify) _____

10. I HAVE SOUGHT CONTINUED PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION DURING THE LAST:
   ( ) 0 - 2 Years
   ( ) 3 - 5 Years
   ( ) 5 - 8 Years
   ( ) 9 and over years
   ( ) Other (Specify) _____

11. AS A MIDDLE SCHOOL EDUCATOR, MY PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION FOR WORKING WITH THE 10-14 YEAR OLD STUDENT IS:
   ( ) Adequate for the job
   ( ) Additional training pertaining to 10-14 year old students would be helpful
   ( ) A certification program specifically for educators working with 10-14 year old students is needed
   ( ) Other (Specify) _____

FORM PCI INFORMATION

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

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
1. It is desirable to require pupils to sit in assigned seats during assemblies.	SA	A	U	D	SD
2. Pupils are usually not capable of solving their problems through logical reasoning.	SA	A	U	D	SD
3. Directing sarcastic remarks toward a defiant pupil is a good disciplinary technique.	SA	A	U	D	SD
4. Beginning teachers are not likely to maintain strict enough control over their pupils.	SA	A	U	D	SD
5. Teachers should consider revision of their teaching methods if these are criticized by their pupils.	SA	A	U	D	SD
6. The best principals give unquestioning support to teachers in disciplining pupils.	SA	A	U	D	SD
7. Pupils should not be permitted to contradict the statements of a teacher in class.	SA	A	U	D	SD
8. It is justifiable to have pupils learn many facts about a subject even if they have no immediate application.	SA	A	U	D	SD
9. Too much pupil time is spent on guidance and activities and too little on academic preparation.	SA	A	U	D	SD
10. Being friendly with pupils often leads them to become too familiar.	SA	A	U	D	SD
11. It is more important for pupils to learn to obey rules than that they make their own decisions.	SA	A	U	D	SD
12. Student governments are a good "safety valve" but should not have much influence on school policy.	SA	A	U	D	SD
13. Pupils can be trusted to work together without supervision.	SA	A	U	D	SD
14. If a pupil uses obscene or profence language in school, it must be considered a moral offense.	SA	A	U	D	SD
15. If pupils are allowed to use the lavortory without getting permission, this privilege will be abused.	SA	A	U	D	SD

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
16. A few pupils are just young hoodlums and should be treated accordingly.	SA	A	U	D	SD
17. It is often necessary to remind pupils that their status in school differs from that of teachers.	SA	A	U	D	SD
18. A pupil who destroys school material or property should be severely punished.	SA	A	U	D	SD
19. Pupils cannot perceive the difference between democracy and anarchy in the classroom.	SA	A	U	D	SD
20. Pupils often misbehave in order to make the teacher look bad	SA	A	U	D	SD

APPENDIX B

CORRESPONDENCE

Oklahoma State University

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
AND HIGHER EDUCATION

STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA 74078
309 GUNDERSEN HALL
(405) 624-7244

Dear (Superintendent):

I am principal of Sequoyah Middle School in Edmond, and I'm also a doctoral student in the Educational Administration Program at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater. My study is under the direction of Dr. Ken St. Clair. I'm interested, both as a practioner and as a researcher, in looking at middle schools in Oklahoma to determine to what extent the needs of students are being met in the area of student control.

This study will examine attitudes of certified personnel in regard to student control. This information may be helpful in the development of personnel through pre-service and/or staff development programs which may be focused specifically on the needs of those working with youngsters in the 10-14 age category. This study will consist of only one instrument, the Pupil Control Ideology Form (PCI), which has been used in many studies since 1967. It is a very short questionnaire consisting of only 20 items.

It would be extremely helpful to those of us in middle school education to have information pertaining to this topic since student control seems always to be an area of interest. Your permission for the school/s in your district to be a part of the study would be greatly appreciated. The name of the district, as well as the participating school/s will be held in confidence and not disclosed in the study. A copy of the study will be available upon request.

Respectfully,

Sandra Brothers
Principal, Sequoyah Middle School
and OSU Doctoral Student

Oklahoma State University

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
AND HIGHER EDUCATION

STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA 74078
309 GUNDERSEN HALL
(405) 624-7244

7911 Lakehurst Drive
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73120
February 8, 1985

Dear Middle School Principal:

This is a follow-up to contact made with your superintendent who has given permission for you and your certified staff to be included in a research project. The project is in educational administration through Oklahoma State University and is under the direction of Dr. Ken St. Clair. Enclosed is a questionnaire which is designed to secure:

(1) Opinions concerning certain aspects of teacher-pupil relationships

The questionnaire will be sent to nine (9) middle schools of various sizes across the state. The study will include only middle schools and will include all certified staff: teachers, counselors, and administrators. The time required to complete the questionnaire should be approximately fifteen (15) minutes. The goal is honest opinions from each participant. Responses will be strictly confidential, and no individual or school will be named in any report of the research.

If this meets with your approval, would you provide me with a staff roster, and I will then prepare packets for each individual in your school. These packets will be sent to you to place in each person's school mailbox. Each of your staff, including yourself, should complete the questionnaire and mail it directly to me in the return envelope provided.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated and is essential to the success of the study.

Respectfully,

Sandra Brothers

Sandra Brothers, Doctoral Student and
Principal, Sequoyah Middle School
Edmond, Oklahoma 73034

SB/Encl. (3)

Oklahoma State University

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
AND HIGHER EDUCATION

STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA 74078
309 GUNDERSEN HALL
(405) 624-7244

Dear

The assistance you and your staff gave in completing and returning the questionnaire for my study is sincerely appreciated. An explanation which might be shared with the staff about the questionnaire is that it had been standardized in the form which you received. In order to accomplish some of my objectives, it was necessary to leave the questions as they had been originally developed. I appreciate the tolerance demonstrated by many who had some question about appropriate answers. I know some of the questions were stated rather poorly, so once again I say "thank you" !

Another reassurance on the confidentiallity of the information; no person or school site will be reported or revealed in the report. The questionnaires were numerically coded in order to accomplish this task.

The rate of return was excellent, and this will certainly contribute to the credibility of the study. Thank you for all your help.

Sincerely,

Sandra Brothers
Sequoyah Middle School
Edmond, Oklahoam 73034

Oklahoma State University

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
AND HIGHER EDUCATION

STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA 74078
309 GUNDERSEN HALL
(405) 624-7244

7911 Lakehurst Drive
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73120
February 14, 1985

Dear Middle School Educator:

The enclosed questionnaire, which will take less than ten minutes to complete is being sent to you as a part of a study on teacher-student relationships in Oklahoma middle schools.

I would greatly appreciate it if you would complete the form and return it in the enclosed stamped envelope at your earliest convenience. Your response will be confidential, and no person or school will be identified in any part of the research report.

Your cooperation will be appreciated, and it will contribute to the success of the study.

Respectfully,

Sandra Brothers

Sandra Brothers, Doctoral Student and
Principal, Sequoyah Middle School
Edmond, Oklahoma

SB/Encl. (2)

VITA

Sandra Jo Brothers

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: PUPIL-CONTROL IDEOLOGY AND MIDDLE SCHOOL CONCEPT IMPLEMENTATION IN SELECTED OKLAHOMA MIDDLE SCHOOLS

Major Field: Educational Administration

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Wilson, Oklahoma, September 27, 1938, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Orban Wolfe.

Education: Graduated from Wilson High School, Wilson, Oklahoma, in 1956; received Bachelor of Science in Education degree from University of Oklahoma in 1963; received Master of Education degree from University of Oklahoma in 1968; completed requirements for Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University in December, 1985.

Professional Experience: Elementary Teacher and Counselor, Oklahoma City Public Schools, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, 1963-79; Elementary Principal, Edmond Public Schools, Edmond, Oklahoma, 1979-80; Middle School Principal, Edmond Public Schools, Edmond, Oklahoma, 1980 to present.

Professional Organizations: Phi Delta Kappa, Cooperative Council of School Administrators, Oklahoma Middle Level Association, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, National Association of Secondary School Principals, Oklahoma Association of Secondary School Principals.