## INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again–beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.

5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.

University Microfilms International

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106
18 BEDFORD ROW, LONDON WC1R 4EJ, ENGLAND

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/4636

8003801

FEREDAY, LINDA PRESNELL

# INVESTIGATION OF TEACHER BEHAVIORS AND CHARACTERISTICS RELATED TO FREQUENCY OF STUDENT DISCIPLINARY REFERRALS

*The University of Oklahoma* ED.D. 1979

University Microfilms International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106 18 Bedford Row, London WC1R 4EJ, England

Copyright 1979

by

Fereday, Linda Presnell

All Rights Reserved

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

# INVESTIGATION OF TEACHER BEHAVIORS AND CHARACTERISTICS RELATED TO FREQUENCY OF STUDENT DISCIPLINARY REFERRALS

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

BY

LINDA PRESNELL FEREDAY

Norman, Oklahoma

1979

INVESTIGATION OF TEACHER BEHAVIORS AND CHARACTERISTICS RELATED TO FREQUENCY OF STUDENT DISCIPLINARY REFERRALS

APPROVED BY

Gene Shepherd

R. L. Curry

Bruce Kidd

Gene Singleton

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

DEDICATION

This research study is lovingly dedicated to the investigator's mother and father, Bill and Gladys Presnell, for their unconditional love and acceptance of their daughter.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The investigator recognizes and is deeply appreciative to many persons who provided encouragement, guidance, and assistance throughout her graduate study and in all facets of the investigation.

Sincere appreciation and gratitude are expressed to Dr. Gene Shepherd, chairman of the doctoral committee, for his expertise and interest in directing the investigation. The investigator is especially appreciative to Dr. Shepherd for "caring." Special appreciation is extended to Dr. Robert Curry for his kind assistance during the writing of this report, and to Dr. Gerald Kidd and Dr. Gene Pingleton for their valuable contributions during the doctoral program.

Acknowledgement is gratefully made for the participation of the teachers who consented to participate in the investigation. Without their cooperation, the investigation would not have been possible. A special thanks is expressed to Mr. Robert Higgins for his unfailing support of the investigator throughout the investigation.

Gratitude is especially extended to the investigator's husband, Thomas H. DeSpain, for the many hours of listening, proofreading, and encouragement that he lovingly provided the investigator during this endeavor. A special acknowledgement is extended to the investigator's son, Todd Everett Fereday, who has provided her with insight that only a mother could experience and provides her with the sunshine of life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | | iv |
| Chapter | | |
| I. | INTRODUCTION OF PROBLEM AND PROCEDURE | 1 |
| | Overview | 1 |
| | Introduction | 4 |
| | Rationale and Need for the Investigation | 5 |
| | Statement of the Problem | 6 |
| | Purpose of the Investigation | 6 |
| | Investigation Design | 7 |
| | Data Gathering | 8 |
| | Source for Data Gathering | 13 |
| | Assumptions | 14 |
| | Definitions of Terms | 15 |
| | Constraints of the Investigation | 15 |
| | Organization of the Investigation Report | 15 |
| II. | REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE | 17 |
| | Teacher Characteristics | 17 |
| | Classroom Management | 28 |
| | Description of Instruments and Related Research | 32 |
| | Rokeach Dogmatism Scale (Form E) | 32 |
| | Pupil Control Ideology Form | 36 |
| | Interviews and Observations | 40 |
| | Teacher Referral Behavior | 44 |
| III. | CASE STUDIES | 47 |
| | Introduction | 47 |
| | Low Referring Teachers | 48 |
| | Ms. Baker | 48 |
| | Ms. Lewis | 59 |
| | Ms. Smith | 68 |
| | High Referring Teachers | 80 |
| | Ms. Hall | 80 |
| | Ms. Brown | 91 |
| | Ms. Johnson | 103 |

Chapter Page

IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA . . . . . 116

Composites . . . . . 116
Low Referring Teachers . . . . . 116
High Referring Teachers. . . . . 122
Profiles . . . . . 128
Low Referring Teachers . . . . . 128
High Referring Teachers. . . . . 130

V. SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND HYPOTHESES . . . . . 132

Summary. . . . . 132
Recommendations. . . . . 136
Hypotheses . . . . . 141

REFERENCES CITED . . . . . 143

REFERENCES . . . . . 149

APPENDIX A . . . . . 152

APPENDIX B . . . . . 155

APPENDIX C . . . . . 159

APPENDIX D . . . . . 162

# INVESTIGATION OF TEACHER BEHAVIORS AND CHARACTERISTICS RELATED TO FREQUENCY OF STUDENT DISCIPLINARY REFERRALS

## CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION OF PROBLEM AND PROCEDURE

### Overview

The investigation was an attempt to examine teacher behaviors and characteristics as they relate to frequency of student disciplinary referrals. Listed as a constraint of this investigation was the investigator's close involvement with the teachers that comprised the six case studies. As assistant principal, the investigator was responsible for adjudicating the student disciplinary referrals at Washington Middle School. The principal of Washington Middle School also acted upon discipline referrals whenever necessary and when it was convenient for him to do so. The large majority of disciplinary referrals, however, were seen by the investigator.

The investigator was a thirty-one year old Caucasian female. She had been in the field of education for nine and one-half years. She received an undergraduate degree in elementary education at a state university and a master's degree in guidance and counseling from the same university. The investigation was undertaken to complete requirements for a doctoral degree in elementary education and general administration. The work experience of the investigator was limited to the one metropolitan

school district and it included four and one-half years as an elementary classroom teacher and three years as a middle school guidance counselor. At the time of the investigation, she was in her third year of administrative experience as an assistant principal of a middle school. The 1978-79 school year was the first year that the investigator had been assigned to Washington Middle School.

Soon after being assigned to the assistant principalship, the investigator recognized that many of the disciplinary referrals were initiated by a small number of teachers. The investigation grew out of the investigator's reoccurring question: "Why do some teachers initiate many Student Disciplinary Referral Forms while other teachers rarely initiate a discipline referral?"

After data was gathered for the investigation, it was apparent to the investigator that although there was an intersection of common behaviors and characteristics between the two groups of teachers, the variance in their behaviors and characteristics was much more pronounced. Using the insight-stimulating research approach (Claire Selltiz, et al, 1976), the data did as it was intended to do - it stimulated insights. The low referring teachers each referred less than one student every three weeks to an administrator. In the course of data gathering, it was noticed that data concerning two of the low referring teachers was most often congruent. The third teacher, Ms. Baker, was oftentimes the one teacher that presented the investigator with data that was incongruent with data from Ms. Lewis and Ms. Smith (All names used in this investigation are pseudonyms). Ms. Baker's case provided insight that not all low referring teachers conduct orderly classes. In fact, individual tolerance levels of student behavior may be a variable for further study.

Although the investigator received few disciplinary referrals from the low referring teachers, she had numerous occasions of interaction with them. The incidents of interaction were most often positive. These interactions occurred during planning times in the teachers' lounge, in hallways, and before and after school.

The high referring teachers, on the average, initiated six Student Disciplinary Referral Forms to an administrator per week. As in the data gathered for the low referring teachers, it was noticed that data concerning two of the high referring teachers was most often congruent. Data concerning the third teacher, Ms. Johnson, differed most often from that of Ms. Brown and Ms. Hall.

Although the investigator received more Student Disciplinary Referral Forms from the high referring teachers, there was perhaps less contact between the high referring teachers and the investigator than with the low referring teachers. The contacts were most often initiated by the investigator in reference to a specific discipline problem that the teacher had submitted. The contacts were less casual and more business-oriented. The perceptions of the investigator indicated a more antagonistic attitude from the high referring teachers than from the low referring teachers. It was felt that this antagonistic attitude was due, at least in part, to the high referring teacher's dissatisfaction with the manner in which the Student Disciplinary Referral Forms were adjudicated (i.e. It was the perception of the investigator that high referring teachers favored a strict and inflexible standard of discipline ). Because of this attitude perceived by the investigator, it was appreciated that each of the teachers invited to participate agreed without hesitation and were most cooperative throughout the data gathering process.

## Introduction

The practicing administrator will note that there are great variations among what teachers consider serious behavior problems - those sent to the administrator's office. The administrator might conclude that some of the teachers on the faculty had either a greater skill in handling disciplinary problems than other teachers or else a greater tolerance for enduring them. It is a fact that some teachers rarely refer misbehaving pupils to the office, while other teachers repeatedly refer students from their classrooms because of "misconduct". Even the casual observer is aware that differences in teaching styles exist among teachers. Brophy and Good (1973, pp. 162-163) described four of the more commonly observed types of classrooms:

> 1. The class is in continual chaos and uproar. The teacher spends much of his day trying to establish or re-establish control, but he never succeeds for long. Directions and even threats are often ignored, and punishment does not seem to be effective for very long.
>
> 2. This class also is noisy, but the atmosphere tends to be more positive. This is largely because the teacher goes to great pains to make school fun for the students, introducing many games and recreational activities, reading stories, and favoring lots of arts and crafts and enrichment activities. There are still problems, however. Many students pay little attention during lessons and group activities, and seatwork is frequently not completed or not done carefully. Lack of attention occurs even though the teacher holds these activities to a minimum and tries to make them as pleasant as possible.
>
> 3. This class is quiet and well disciplined. The teacher has established many rules to insure this, and he monitors the students' behavior closely to see that the rules are followed. Infractions are noted quickly and are cut short with a stern warning or with punishment when necessary. The teacher spends a fair amount of time doing this, partly because he is so quick to notice any misbehavior. He appears to be a successful disciplinarian, because the students usually obey him. However, the class atmosphere is uneasy. The observer gets the feeling that trouble is always brewing just under the surface. Furthermore, whenever this teacher leaves the room, the class tends to burst into noise.

4. This class seems to run by itself. The teacher spends most of his time teaching, and very little time is spent in handling discipline problems. The students follow instructions and complete assigned tasks on their own, without close supervision by the teacher. Students involved in seatwork or enrichment activities interact with one another, so noises may be coming from several sources in the room at the same time. However, these tend to be controlled and harmonious sounds coming from students productively involved in activities, rather than disruptive noises that come from boisterous play or disputes. When noise does become disruptive, a simple reminder from the teacher is usually enough to handle the problem. An observer in this class usually senses a certain warmth in the atmosphere and goes away positively impressed.

In virtually every school, regardless of the socio-economic status of the students, an example of each of the four types of classrooms can be identified. In the middle school setting, the observer will notice the same group of students behaving in different ways in different teachers' classrooms; the same group of students that is interested and attentive in math class may be bored and restless in language arts class. Many students may be referred to the administrator consistently by one member of the teaching team, while another teacher on the same team, who teaches the same students, rarely refers a student to the administrator.

## Rationale and Need for the Investigation

Students referred to the administrator as disciplinary referrals are time-consuming for the administrator. Time spent on student disciplinary referrals is time that cannot be spent on other administrative tasks. In addition, referred students who are waiting to see the administrator are losing time in the classroom where learning may occur. Much research has been completed on classroom management (Brophy and Good, 1973) and classroom discipline (Kounin, et al, 1970). This research has dealt with how teachers managed the classroom, teacher-pupil interaction (Flanders, 1970), and techniques for dealing with discipline problems. The investigator

located only a few studies that attempted to explain the phenomenon of frequency of teacher-initiated student disciplinary referrals.

## Statement of the Problem

The investigation examined teacher behaviors and characteristics related to the frequency of student disciplinary referrals. In the same school setting, with the same students, different teachers establish disciplinary referral patterns that vary widely in the number of referrals initiated and the reasons for initiating the referrals. There are teachers who very seldom initiate a student disciplinary referral, while other teachers initiate many student disciplinary referrals for varying reasons. Referral behavior was thought of as a continuum with high referring teachers and low referring teachers at the two extremes. The investigation was concerned with the question: Are there consistencies among low referring teachers that differ from the consistencies among high referring teachers that would enhance the understanding of the phenomenon?

## Purpose of the Investigation

The purpose of this investigation was to closely examine the behaviors and characteristics of teachers who had a high frequency of student disciplinary referrals and of teachers who had a low frequency of student disciplinary referrals. The investigation was an effort to analyze a phenomenon that existed but had not been closely examined. The indepth examination of teacher behaviors and characteristics related to frequency of student disciplinary referrals led to an analysis of the commonalities and differences of the teachers representing the two referral patterns. In addition to the value of describing a phenomenon as it existed, profiles of both the teacher who initiated a high number of student disciplinary referrals and the teacher who initiated a low number

of student disciplinary referrals were developed. The investigation also led to insights that prompted recommendations and possible hypotheses for further research.

## Investigation Design

The investigation design used in this investigation was described by Selltiz, Wrightsman, and Cook (1976) as an analysis of "insight-stimulating" examples. The design was a type of exploratory research. McCormick and Francis (1958, p. 24) described exploratory studies as:

> . . .studies that are intended to be merely suggestive rather than definitive; they are expected to open up ground for more careful investigation. Most exploratory studies are at the descriptive level; that is, they simply record what is observed without any formal testing of hypotheses. They may use verbal statements only, or may cite figures, or may attempt both. Often the attempt is made to develop a hypothesis on an ad hoc basis.

The insight-stimulating examples research approach as defined by Selltiz, Wrightsman, and Cook (1976) is an intensive study of selected instances of the phenomenon in which one is interested. When working in unformulated areas where there are few findings from previous research to serve as a guide, examples have been found to be particularly valuable in stimulating insights and suggesting hypotheses for future research. Insight-stimulating examples research is not the typical case study approach in the sense of exclusively studying existing records. The insight-stimulating approach may include the examination of existing records, unstructured interviewing, participant observation, or other information gathering techniques (Selltiz, et al, 1976).

A feature that makes the insight-stimulating examples research approach an appropriate procedure for the involving of insights is the attitude of the investigator. The investigator's attitude is characterized

by alert receptivity, of seeking rather than testing. Instead of being directed by existing hypotheses, the investigation is directed by the features of the phenomenon under study. The investigation is constantly in the process of reformulation and redirection as new information is obtained. Frequent changes are made in the types of data collected as patterns begin to emerge and potential hypotheses require additional information.

A second feature of this type of research is the intensity of the investigation. Attempts are made to obtain sufficient information to characterize and explain both the unique features of the case being studied and the features which it has in common with other cases.

A third characteristic of the insight-stimulating examples research approach is the reliance on the ability of the investigator to draw together many diverse bits of information into a unified interpretation. Selltiz (1976, p. 98) states, "Social scientists who work with this approach have frequently found that the study of a few instances may produce a wealth of new insights, whereas a host of others will yield few new ideas." Selltiz, et al, identified the insight-stimulating examples research approach as especially well-suited "to the study of characteristics of individuals who fit well in a given situation and those who do not fit well" (Selltiz, et al, 1976, p. 100). A study of these characteristics will provide valuable clues about the nature of the situation.

Data gathering

The following paragraphs describe how the aforementioned investigation design was adapted to the present investigation. Keeping with the flexibility afforded by the insight-stimulating examples research

approach, data was gathered in several ways. The following methods were utilized:

1. Teacher Interviews - Each participant in the study was interviewed via a partially-structured interview. Each was asked the same basic questions, but the interview was flexible to the extent that ideas were explored and questions were generated spontaneously for some of the participants (Appendix A).

2. Instruments - Each participant was asked to complete the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale (Form E) (Rokeach, 1960). The scale was developed to discriminate between persons who could be characterized as open minded and those characterized as closed minded. The Rokeach Dogmatism Scale (Form E) was composed of forty items rated on a six point scale, ranging from "I agree very much" to "I disagree very much." For all of the statements, being in agreement was scored as closed minded and disagreement was scored as open minded. Split-half and test-retest techniques were used to establish reliabilities from .68 to .93 (Rokeach, 1960). Validity of the scale was established by using the "Method of Known Groups" (Appendix B).

The Pupil Control Ideology Form (Willower, et al, 1973) was also administered to measure the teacher's attitude toward pupil control. The Pupil Control Ideology Form consisted of twenty items on a five point scale, ranging from "Strongly agree" to "Strongly disagree." Orientations toward pupil controls were measured on a humanistic - custodial continuum. The instrument has been shown to discriminate between teachers and schools judged to be humanistic or custodial. Split-half reliabilities

have ranged from .91 to .95 in a number of samples of public school educators (Appendix C).

3. Analysis of Records - Records examined included: teaching certificates, college transcripts, classroom observations, principal's evaluations, personnel files, attendance records, and final semester grade records.

4. Analysis of Discipline Referrals - Student Disciplinary Referral Forms for the 1978-79 school year were analyzed. Among the variables examined were: number of referrals, gender of the students referred, race of the students referred, and the reasons students were referred to the office.

5. Student Interviews - During the teacher interview, the investigator asked the teacher to "choose the one student you would most like to see removed from your classroom" and to "choose the one student you would most like to retain in your classroom." The two students chosen by the teacher were described by the investigator demographically as well as academically. Students were asked to name their favorite teacher and tell why they chose that teacher. They were also asked to describe their least favorite teacher. If neither of these teachers was the participating teacher, the student was asked to express their feelings about that specific teacher. The students were given an opportunity to express their general feelings about school and to describe their ideal teacher.

6. Observation - The investigator observed the participating teachers' classrooms on two different occasions. During these observations, the investigator took notes and was specifically

alert to teachers' behaviors that related to Gage's (1972) four identified characteristics, or dimensions, of effective teachers. These characteristics included: warmth, indirectness, enthusiasm, and cognitive organization.

The following paragraphs briefly define the four characteristics identified by Gage and give some examples of teacher behaviors that the investigator noted during classroom observations as being representative of that characteristic.

a. Warmth - Teachers who could be characterized as warm tend to behave approvingly, acceptantly, and supportively; they tend to speak well of their own students and students in general, as well as people in general. They like and trust, rather than fear, people of all kinds. This characteristic has been identified by utilization of the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory, the California F Scale, and Ryans' Teacher Characteristics Schedule. During the classroom observations, the investigator was alert to teacher behaviors that represented warmth. Examples of such behavior included greeting and leave taking statements made by the teacher, amount and kinds of physical contact and use of spatial distance with students, responses made to student inquiries, and empathy shown for students' feelings.

b. Indirectness - Indirectness, as used by Gage, refers to the degree to which the teacher permits pupils to discover underlying concepts and generalizations for themselves with less, as opposed

to more, direct guidance. Teachers whose teaching can be characterized as indirect exhibit behaviors described by two of Flanders' (1963) categories. Category 3 is: "Accepts or uses ideas of student; Clarifying, building, or developing ideas suggested by a student," and Category 4 is: "Asks questions: Asking a question about content or procedure with the intent that a student answer" (Gage, 1972, p. 36). During the classroom observations, the investigator was alert to questioning patterns of teachers and to the acceptance and expanding of students' ideas. The investigator noted if the class was basically oriented toward teacher lecture or if attempts were made to utilize the inquiry or discovery method of teaching.

c. Cognitive organization - Cognitive organization reflects the teacher's intellectual grasp of what they are trying to teach. During classroom observations, the investigator noted the organization and logical presentation of the content material. Lesson plans were examined to determine if a sequence of experiences was being planned and then implemented by the teacher. Major to the assessment of cognitive organization was the question: Does the teacher seem to understand the material well enough that she can effectively guide the students to an understanding of the material?

d. Enthusiasm - Enthusiasm has been identified as a desirable characteristic for teachers. It is a characteristic of the teacher that has been shown to positively correlate with student achievement (Coats and Smedchens, 1966; Mastin, 1963). During the classroom observation, the investigator noted the amount of enthusiasm in the teacher's presentation, use of voice, facial expressions, and the teacher's body position in the classroom (i.e. Does the teacher sit at her desk, stand in front of the room, or move freely throughout the classroom space).

Source for data gathering

Washington Middle School, located in an integrated urban school system, served as the investigation site. Washington was comprised of grades 6-7-8 and had a student population of approximately 820. The teaching staff was composed of forty-two teachers, twenty-six of whom were members of academic teams. These twenty-six teachers formed the population from which the sample to be studied was selected. Each of the twenty-six teachers taught a basic academic subject to heterogeneously grouped classes.

Student Disciplinary Referral Forms were collected for the fall semester of 1978-79. Referral forms were tabulated individually for each basic academic subject teacher. A frequency distribution was constructed using total number of Student Disciplinary Referral Forms as the criteria (Appendix D). Teachers at the upper end of the frequency distribution initiated fewer student disciplinary referrals than the teachers at the lower end of the frequency distribution.

Teachers were selected through an interview process. The investigator began with the two teachers representing the two extremes of the frequency distribution and, in an individual introductory interview, invited the teachers to participate in a study of teacher behaviors and characteristics as they related to disciplinary referral patterns. During the interview, the subjects were told that the investigation concerned behaviors and characteristics of middle school teachers as they related to disciplinary referral patterns. Planned data gathering procedures were described. The teacher had the option to accept or reject the invitation to participate in the investigation. The investigator continued interviewing from alternate ends of the frequency distribution until three teachers representing a high frequency of student disciplinary referrals and three teachers representing a low frequency of student disciplinary referrals accepted the invitation to participate in the investigation. There were no refusals to participate in the investigation. Each of the three low referring teachers and each of the three high referring teachers agreed without hesitancy to participate in the investigation.

## Assumptions

For the purposes of the investigation, the following assumptions were made:

1. The teachers would refer a student to the administration when the student's behavior became more than the teachers could tolerate in the classroom environment.

2. The teachers would attempt to deal with the student's inappropriate behavior, but would determine that the behavior was more than they could effectively deal with in their capacity as classroom teachers.

3. The number and types of discipline referrals that teachers made would reflect to some extent the characteristics of those teachers.

## Definitions of Terms

The application of the following terms was in accord with the definitions, as stated below:

A Student Disciplinary Referral Form is a teacher-written communication describing a student's behavior deemed by the teacher to be inappropriate for the classroom and needing attention of the administrator for resolution.

A low referring teacher is one of the three teachers who initiated the fewest Student Disciplinary Referral Forms during the fall semester of the 1978-79 school year.

A high referring teacher is one of the three teachers who initiated the most Student Disciplinary Referral Forms during the fall semester of the 1978-79 school year.

## Constraints

The investigator functioned as the assistant principal at Washington Middle School during the time the investigation was made. Because of this involvement, it is possible that personal biases could be reflected in the investigation.

## Organization of the Investigation Report

The report of the investigation was organized into five chapters. The introductory chapter presented an overview of the investigation, introduction, rationale and need for the investigation, as well as a statement of the problem. The purpose of the investigation was presented. The investigation design was also identified and explained. Assumptions,

definitions of terms, and constraints were delineated. Chapter II was devoted to a review of the literature concerning teacher characteristics, classroom management, description of instruments and related research, and teacher referral behavior. Chapter III presented the data that was gathered during the investigation. The data was presented in the form of six case studies. The chapter was divided in two parts. The first part consisted of the case studies of the three low referring teachers. The second part of Chapter III consisted of the case studies of the three high referring teachers. Chapter IV was devoted to analysis of the data. Separate composites and profiles were presented for the low referring and high referring teachers. A summary of the investigation and recommendations and possible null hypotheses for future research were presented in Chapter V.

# CHAPTER II

# REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

## Teacher Characteristics

Historically, the appraisal of research on teaching and teacher characteristics has been negative. In 1953, a committee on the Criteria of Teacher Effectiveness rendered the verdict that "the present condition of research on teacher effectiveness holds little promise of yielding results commensurate with the needs of American education "(American Educational Research Association, 1953, p. 657). Literally thousands of studies on the subject have resulted in few facts established and few generalizations accepted (Ornstein, 1976). Brim (1958) concluded after reviewing the literature that there were no consistent relations between teacher characteristics and effectiveness in teaching.

Few researchers agreed upon which list or group of behaviors constituted a good or effective teacher. This lack of consensus has caused inconsistencies among the research findings. Biddle and Ellena (1964, p. 2) maintained that "the problem of teacher effectiveness is so complex that no one today knows what the competent teacher is." They continued that "we do not know how to define, prepare for, or measure teacher competence." Jackson (1966) asserted that the few discoveries that had been made looked pitifully small in proportion to the outlay in time and effort.

Ryans (1960) spent literally years researching teacher characteristics. The study, the most monumental undertaken, involved more than

100 separate research projects, 1,700 schools, and about 6,000 teachers (Ryans, 1960). He concluded, after the extensive studies reported in Characteristics of Teachers (1960), that teacher characteristics were probably too complex to make generalizations. He indicated that friendliness, warmth, and willingness to help others seemed to be characteristic of effective teachers.

In 1963, in the Handbook of Research on Teaching, the authors of the chapter on teaching methods reported that "teaching methods do not seem to make much difference" (Wallen and Travers, 1963, p. 484). Getzels and Jackson (1963, p. 574) stated that little was known about teacher personality and teacher effectiveness. Stephens (1967), after reviewing the literature, concluded that practically nothing seemed to make a difference in the effectiveness of instruction.

The modern era of research on teacher behaviors and student achievement began in 1957 with the work of investigators like Flanders, Medley, and Mitzel (Rosenshine, 1976).

> Fewer than twenty-five studies have been conducted on any specific variable such as teacher praise or teacher questions, and these studies are scattered across all grade levels, subject areas, and student backgrounds. The number of investigators in this field is also small. There are no more than twelve researchers or groups of researchers currently studying the relationship between classroom instruction and student achievement. (Rosenshine, 1976).

Brophy (1976) concurred with Rosenshine's assessment of the status of research concerning teacher effectiveness. He maintained that there was a need for data that teachers could use for diagnosing learning problems and making decisions about how to react to them. He added:

> Despite seventy-five years of research on the topic, relatively little is known about effective teachers. Advances in methodology and conceptualization began to make a difference in the last fifteen years or so, but this research is still in its infancy (Brophy, 1976, p. 32).

N. L. Gage (1972) defined "successful" teacher behaviors or characteristics as those that have been found through empirical research to be related to something desirable about teachers. He further explained his definition by saying:

> The 'something desirable' may be improved achievement by students or any of the various cognitive, affective, or psychomotor objectives of education. Or the 'something desirable' may be a favorable evaluation of the teacher by students, a supervisor, a principal, or someone else whose judgment is important (Gage, 1972, p. 28).

Gage (1972) questioned the pessimism about the promise of empirical research on teaching. He gave several reasons why the dismal generalizations of many reviews might not do complete justice to the research. He suggested more searching reviews of what research on teaching has to offer. Such reviews would piece together the evidence from a variety of approaches to a given problem and determine whether it supported constructive suggestions concerning the practice of teaching. Gage also called for more effective research designs in the study of teacher characteristics. He cited Bowles and Levin's (1968) criticism of the report on Equality of Educational Opportunity. They pointed out that the study used faulty statistical models in estimating the importance of several dependent variables, including the importance of school factors, in accounting for achievement. In more recent writings, both Rosenshine (1976) and Brophy (1976) supported Gage's concern for appropriate research designs.

To expand his lack of pessimism about research on teaching and teacher characteristics, Gage (1972) presented a series of operational definitions of teacher behaviors that seemed, more or less, to belong on the same dimension. The definitions were drawn from various research procedures and measuring instruments. He then cited evidence which he felt made it possible to base the inference that these characteristics were desirable

ones for teachers to possess.

One example of this dimension that Gage identified was referred to as warmth. Teachers whom Gage would refer to as warm "tend to behave approvingly, acceptantly, and supportively; they tend to speak well of their own students, students in general, and people in general. They tend to like and trust rather than fear other people of all kinds" (Gage, 1972, p. 35). Appropriate research that prompted Gage to identify warmth as a desirable characteristic for teachers included that completed by Cook, Leeds, and Callis (1951), utilizing the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (MTAI). On the inventory, the teacher responded on a five point agree/disagree scale to such statements as: "Most children are obedient," "Minor disciplinary situations should sometimes be turned into jokes," and "Most pupils are resourceful when left on their own."

A second example of research concerning warmth considered teachers' responses to the California F Scale completed by McGee in 1955. Teachers' responses to the California F Scale have been found to correlate substantially ($r = .7$) with the MTAI (Gage, Leavitt, and Stone, 1957; Sheldon, Coale, and Copple, 1959). Among the F Scale's items are: "Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn," and "Most of our social problems would be solved if we could somehow get rid of crooked and feeble-minded people."

Another example of research concerning warmth is that of Ryans (1960). From the use of the Teacher Characteristics Schedule that included such items as the following: "Pupils can behave themselves without constant supervision," and "Most pupils are considerate of the teacher's wishes," Ryans concluded that warmth was a characteristic of effective teachers.

Several research studies provided a basis for the proposition that warmth was a desirable teacher characteristic. Yee (1967) determined that warmth tended to be correlated positively with favorable assessments of the teachers by students and trained observers and with student scores on achievement tests. Specifically, Yee (1967) found that the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory was moderately consistent in showing a positive correlation with favorable mean ratings of the teachers by their pupils. Ryans (1960) concluded that the items of his inventory correlated positively with observers' ratings of elementary school teachers on all three of his teacher behavior patterns - warm, understanding, friendly vs. aloof, egocentric, and restricted; responsible, business-like, systematic vs. evading, unplanned, and slipshod; and stimulating, imaginative vs. dull, routine. McGee (1955) found that teachers' scores on the California F scale correlated .6 with previous ratings of the teachers by trained observers on dimensions relating to teacher warmth. Cogan (1958) found that descriptions of teachers by their students correlated with the amount of school work completed by the students. Gage (1972) concluded that, on the basis of the varied research, warmth seemed to be quite a defensible characteristic of desirable teacher behavior.

Additional research has been completed that also identified warmth as a desirable characteristic for teachers. Research accomplished by Brophy and Evertson (1974) and Stallings and Kaskowitz (1974) indicated that, overall, teacher praise showed consistent, positive, but low correlations with student achievement. Praise of student academic responses resulted in higher correlations than did praise of student behavior. Results concerning academic criticism were not consistent. Academic criticism was defined as "criticism following a student answer" (Rosenshine,

1976). Stallings and Kaskowitz found that criticism following an incorrect answer has positive correlations with achievement. Brophy and Evertson (1974) found significant negative correlations.

Certain studies have determined that teacher warmth is more important to certain types of students than it is to other students. Kleinfeld (1972) concluded that while warmth was generally important for all students, it was particularly important to minority students who felt unwanted or discriminated against. Kleinfeld concluded that teacher warmth was essential to teacher success with this type of student. Another study completed by St. John (1971) found that black students responded more favorably to teacher warmth than did white students. The white students were more affected by the teachers' skills.

Della Piana and Gage (1955) also confirmed that teacher warmth had differing value to different types of students. Teacher warmth was especially important in determining whether students concerned with feelings and personal relationships rejected or accepted a teacher. In contrast, students who were achievement-oriented were less concerned with teacher warmth and gave it much less weight when assessing their feelings about their teachers.

A second dimension of teacher behavior that Gage identified was indirectness. To define indirectness, Gage utilized Flanders' (1960) Category 3 and Category 4. Category 3 related to the teacher who exhibited indirectness (i.e. "accepts or uses ideas of student; clarifying, building, or developing ideas suggested by a student." Category 4 addressed questioning patterns of teachers (i.e. "asking a question about content or procedure with the intent that the student answer" (Gage, 1972, p. 36). Indirectness was also illustrated by the research on what is called "learning

by discovery" or "inquiry" learning. This research dealt with the question:

> How much and what kind of guidance should the teacher provide?. . .the degree of guidance by the teacher varies from time to time along a continuum with almost complete direction of what the pupil must do at one extreme to practically no direction at the other" (Shulman and Keislar, 1966, pp. 182-183).

The teachers who displayed indirectness realized that it was not always desirable merely to tell the pupils what they wanted them to know and understand. Instead, it was sometimes better to ask questions, encourage the pupils to become active in seeking, and use their own ideas, and encourage them to engage in some trial and error learning.

Flanders and Simon (1969) concluded from their examination of a dozen studies that the percentage of teacher statements that made use of ideas and opinions of pupils was directly related to average class scores on attitude scales of teacher attractiveness, as well as to pupil achievement. Ausubel (1963) reported, after reviewing the literature on learning by discovery, that the furnishing of completely explicit rules was relatively less effective than some degree of arranging for pupils to discover rules for themselves.

Several other studies have investigated the effects of indirectness in the classroom. Amidon and Flanders (1961) related dependency in eighth graders to teaching style. One hundred and forty students were selected because they had high scores on a test of dependence proneness. The students were assigned to one of four experimental groups: direct teacher with clear goals; direct teacher with unclear goals; indirect teacher with clear goals; indirect teacher with unclear goals. The clarity of the teachers' goals were not found to have an effect on the dependent variable, student achievement in geometry. However, it was determined

that student achievement in geometry was positively affected by a teacher who was indirect. Indirectness was measured by using Flanders' system, which included many elements of warmth (praise, use of student ideas). The author concluded that it seemed likely that indirectness, rather than the relative lack of structure, was the reason for better achievement. It should be noted that an earlier study of the same type by Flanders, in which students across the full range of dependency were included, found no difference in pupil achievement. When the two studies are considered, it may be inferred that high dependency-prone students are especially sensitive to teacher behaviors such as praise, criticism, use of student ideas, and warmth.

Another study relating to teacher indirectness was reported by Rexford, Willower, and Lynch (1972). The study showed a relationship between teachers' pupil control ideology and their classroom verbal behavior. The Pupil Control Ideology Form (Willower, 1973) was administered. Twelve secondary school teachers classified as having a custodial attitude towards pupil control were compared to twelve secondary school teachers classified as having a humanistic attitude toward pupil control. Classroom interaction was analyzed using Flanders' system. Results of the study showed that the custodial teachers were more direct than the humanistic teachers. There was, however, no significant difference in teacher talk scores between the two groups. Available research indicated that indirectness was a desirable dimension of teacher behavior.

The third characteristic, or dimension, that Gage identified was cognitive organization. He maintained that it was more difficult to define operationally and its connection with desirable outcomes, despite great plausibility, was not as well-established empirically. Cognitive

organization was defined as the kind of behavior that reflected the teacher's intellectual grasp, or "cognitive organization," of what they were trying to teach. Several investigations concerning cognitive organization have been completed. In one such investigation, teachers were tested as to whether they understood the processes and concepts or arithmetical operations (Orleans, 1952). Other studies have measured the degree to which teachers' verbal behavior reflected an understanding of the logical properties of good definition, explanation, or conditional inference (Meux and Smith, 1961). Still others have studied the degree to which the teacher or his instructional materials provide a set of subject-matter organizers. This phenomenon is also referred to as "intellectual scaffolding" (Ausubel, 1963). B. J. Chandler, et al, (1971) concluded that intellectual ability and knowledge of subject matter were important factors in judging the success of a teacher. In studies that Chandler and his associates completed, scholarship, or grade point average, correlated positively with teaching efficiency in many studies.

Enthusiasm was the fourth characteristic of desirable teacher behavior identified by Gage. In some of the studies reviewed concerning enthusiasm as it occurred "naturally," enthusiasm was rated, counted, or measured. Dependent variables included level of student achievement and evaluative ratings of the teacher by students and other observers. By far, most results indicated that enthusiasm was positively related to something desirable about the teacher.

Examples of research relating to teacher enthusiasm included one completed by Coats and Smidchens (1966). In their study, two teachers presented a ten minute lecture in a static or unenthusiastic fashion. They then repeated the same content to control groups, but in an enthusiastic

fashion. Tests immediately following the lesson indicated much greater learning from the enthusiastic lecture. Another similar study was completed by Mastin (1963). He had twenty teachers lecture on two different topics a week apart. One of the lectures was presented in an "indifferent" manner, the other in an "enthusiastic" manner. In nineteen of the twenty classes, the students' mean achievement was higher for the lesson taught enthusiastically.

Two of the characteristics identified by Gage, warmth and enthusiasm have been studied concurrently in several research studies (Baird, 1973; Kleinfeld, 1972; McKeachie, Line, and Mann, 1971; Sears, 1963; Sears and Hilgard, 1964). Reviews of the literature have shown that these two variables consistently correlated positively with student achievement. Warmer teachers and more enthusiastic teachers tended to produce greater achievement gains. Another effect that has been attributed to warmth and enthusiasm was better affective responses from students. Classrooms with warm and enthusiastic teachers tended to have more positive atmospheres.

Throughout the past three decades, attempts have been made to isolate the characteristic of the "ideal teacher." The attempts have been unsuccessful, substantiating the fact that teaching was a complex human endeavor that did not readily lend itself to classification or even mere description. In recent years, the trend of studying specific areas of teacher behavior has proven to be successful in providing insight into the process of teaching. Although a description of the teaching process is unavailable, several profiles or demographic descriptions of teachers have been developed. One such profile is presented below:

The Encyclopedia of Education (1971) presented the statement that reliable and valid studies of the characteristics of the public school

teacher were relatively rare until the 1960's. The authors of the teacher profile, William Bennett and Edsel Erickson, felt that the most comprehensive of the available studies were conducted by the National Education Association (1967; 1968; 1970), the United States Office of Education (Coleman, et al, 1966), and Herriott and St. John (1966). It was from the studies listed above that the following teacher profile was developed and presented in The Encyclopedia of Education (1971).

The average American teacher in the spring of 1967 was thirty-nine years old and had taught for twelve years, eight of which were in the same school system. Research further indicated that 13.7 percent of the nation's teachers were reared on farms, 38 percent came from communities having a population of 10,000 or less. Only 45.2 percent of the teachers came from cities of over 50,000. Teachers who had fathers in the white collar occupations numbered 47.2 percent, while 36.8 percent had fathers who were blue collar workers.

The teaching profession was probably the most perfectly integrated occupation. The national teacher ratios were 88 percent white to 11 percent black to 1 percent other non white. These ratios concurred almost exactly with the National Census figures of 1960.

Using the Coleman Report as a source, Bennett and Erickson concluded that the educational level of the parents of both non white teachers and rural teachers was lower than the educational level of the parents of white teachers and urban teachers. Mothers of teachers generally had higher educational attainment than fathers. Overall, however, neither the fathers' nor mothers' education averaged twelve years. Urban teachers' educational level overall included 67 percent that held only a bachelor's degree, 28 percent had master's degrees, and 2 percent had doctoral degrees.

## Classroom Management

Another related area where significant research on teaching has been completed is classroom management. Teaching in a classroom is one of the more independent occupations. The teacher has the opportunity to establish the climate of that room and to foster social interaction. Classroom management is a term that is used to include teacher functions variously described as discipline, control, keeping order, motivation, and establishing a positive attitude toward learning (Good and Brophy, 1973). Even for the casual observer, differences in approach to classroom management are evident. Classrooms are strikingly different in the manner in which they are conducted.

The problems of classroom management are often discussed in relation to ways of dealing with the student after he/she has misbehaved and has become a discipline problem. Research in classroom discipline by Kounin (1970) indicated that this was a symptomatic approach. In a series of studies by Kounin and his associates, many different kinds of classrooms and different kinds of teachers were studied. The studies were naturalistic in that the investigators did not try to control or influence the teachers in any way. Methods used to collect information included interviews, on-the-spot note taking, and coded video tapes of classroom interaction. The intent of the study was to determine which teacher behaviors would be correlated with which measures of student behavior. The results of several studies all pointed to the same conclusion: The teachers' methods of dealing with discipline problems were simply unrelated to the frequency and seriousness of such problems. Measures of discipline techniques failed to differentiate teachers who could not cope with discipline problems from teachers who could handle them successfully and minimize them.

The Kounin studies did, however, identify important and consistent differences between the coping and non-coping teachers. The differences were found in classroom management techniques. They were measures of teacher behaviors that increased the amount of time students spent in profitable work activities. It was determined that this led to successful resolution of minor inattention problems before they developed into major disruptions.

The differences in classroom environments has been influential in prompting extensive research concerning teacher expectations and self-fulfilling prophecy, interaction analysis, and reinforcement. Teacher expectations were discussed as early as 1948 by Merton, but it was not until the Classic Oak Hill School experiment was reported in 1968 in Pygmalion In The Classroom (Rosenthal and Jacobson), that they became widely accepted as a reality of the classroom. In the Oak Hill School experiment, teachers were told to expect sudden spurts of intellectual growth from some of their students. These students were "identified" by use of a "psychological test." Actually, the students were selected at random. Rosenthal and Jacobson reported in Pygmalion In The Classroom that the students who were identified as ready to show accelerated growth did just that. Hence, the teacher's prophecy was fulfilled (i.e. self-fulfilled prophecy - the teacher thinks it is going to happen and therefore does the necessary things to assure that it will occur).

The Oak Hill experiment was the subject of debate. Some attempts to replicate the study failed. Several noted researchers wrote articles that were negative in referring to the study (Snow, 1969; Thorndike, 1969). Rosenthal himself reviewed the Pygmalion-style literature in 1970. He reported that 33 percent of the studies that had attempted to replicate Pygmalion's results were positive. In all, there were over sixty experiments

that followed the Pygmalion design. Brophy and Good (1973) maintained that, although Pygmalion results were controversial, it did have the effect of making educators aware of teacher expectations as a reality to consider in the classroom environment.

Several years after Rosenthal and Jacobson's classic experiment, experimenters were still trying to replicate the study design. It was determined that teachers who had already formed expectations for specific groups of children or certain children were not swayed by a report of a "test." This was the result of a study completed by Jose' and Cody (1971). The length of time that the children had been in the teacher's classroom and the duration of the study were two variables that were found to determine how effective the induced expectations were in determining teacher expectations. Because teacher expectations were found to exist naturally, another group of studies developed.

Good and Brophy (1975) described two different types of research used to study classrooms. They distinguished between psychological manipulation studies that were experimental in design and naturalistic studies that were descriptive in design. The psychological manipulation studies investigated teacher-student behavior when expectations were induced. The naturalistic studies were concerned with expectations that were natural or already existed. Some of the factors that have been studied include:

1. Sex - Ayers wrote in 1968 that boys seemed to have trouble in the elementary school. Palardy (1969) completed a study that revealed that teachers who felt boys could not learn to read as well as girls did, in fact, fulfill that prophecy. Boys' achievement was lower than girls' achievement on reading tests. Intelligence tests showed no significant difference.

2. SES - Socio-economic status was determined by Yee (1968) as the single basis for grouping students. Higher class students were found to achieve higher levels than lower class students.

3. First Name Stereotyping - Garwood (1976) was able to determine that teachers developed expectations for students on the basis of their first names.

4. Physical Attractiveness - Ross and Salvia (1975) discovered that teachers held higher expectations for attractive children than for less attractive children. Grades were higher, although intelligence scores were not significantly different.

5. Ability - Achievement - Shrank (1968 - 1970) studied grouping of students. He concluded that when teachers thought grouping was by random sample, students did not gain as much in achievement as they did when they (teachers) thought grouping was by ability.

These studies have not concluded that teacher expectations are either good or bad. They can, however, produce some very positive results when the expectations are high. It has been concluded that it is desirable for teachers' expectations to be flexible rather than rigid to allow for new information to be processed in dealing with the child.

Interaction analysis and reinforcement go together in practice. Smuck and Smuck, Group Processes In The Classroom (1975) indicated that teachers tend to perpetuate the same interaction patterns in their classrooms. The teacher who does the talking and does not reward students for initiating discussion will have a classroom of students who do not initiate. Brophy and Good (1973) reported that 84 percent of classroom talk is teacher talk. Only one half of 1 percent of the classroom talk is dealing on the feeling-personal level. Jackson (1968) noted that contacts or interaction in the classroom range from 5 - 120 per hour for individual students. Jackson (1969) and Silberman (1970) studied teacher interaction with specific students by utilizing lists where teachers prioritized their students from "good to bad." Boys have been found to be the object of more interaction than girls. More of their interaction is disciplinary in nature.

Smuck and Smuck (1975) referenced twenty-six different instruments that could be used to analyze the interaction in the classroom. One of the

instruments most frequently referenced in the reading material is the Verbal Interaction Category Inventory (VICS) created by Edmund Amidon and Elizabeth Hunter (1966). It is based on the research of Flanders (1960). Utilizing VICS, several interesting behaviors have been identified in the classroom. Examples of these behaviors were reported by Brophy and Good (1973):

> Low students receive less interaction and less positive reinforcement than higher ability students. Higher ability students receive 67 percent less criticism for wrong answers than lower ability students. Higher ability students also receive twice as much praise for correct answers. Higher ability students are given longer to answer a question and are given more 'hints' or clarifying statements than lower ability students.

Brophy and Putnam (1979) addressed the failure of teacher education institutions to offer a coherent approach to classroom management. They maintained that teachers are forced to develop their own "bag of tricks" combined with bits and pieces of different educational philosophies and get by the best that they can. Brophy and Putnam (1979) concluded, after reviewing the literature in the area of classroom management, that teachers' success in managing classrooms will be determined not only by skills and techniques, but also by personal qualities. They indicated that individuals who are hostile, sadistic, sarcastic, and defensive are prone to taking student misbehavior personally or they are so authoritarian that they cannot tolerate student assertiveness or individuality. They recommended teachers' colleges and school board selection committees attempt to identify these types of individuals and keep them out of the classroom.

## Description of Instruments and Related Research

### Rokeach Dogmatism Scale (Form E)

Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale (Form E) was composed of forty items. The subjects were directed to respond to each of the forty items by writing

+1, +2, +3, -1, -2 ,or -3, corresponding respectively to "I agree a little," "I agree on the whole," "I agree very much," "I disagree a little," "I disagree on the whole," or "I disagree very much" (Rokeach, 1960, p. 73). For all statements, agreement was scored as closed minded and disagreement was scored as open minded. To arrive at the total score, the constant +4 was added to the algebraic value of each item. The converted scores were then summed, resulting in a possible range of scores from 40 to 280 (Rokeach, 1960, p. 88). The higher the score, the more dogmatic, or closed minded, the respondent.

The primary purpose of the Dogmatism Scale was to measure individual differences in openness or closedness of belief systems. The scale also served to measure general authoritarianism and general intolerance. Rokeach's concepts of open and closed mindedness referred to a basic characteristic of one's belief system designating the extent to which a person's belief system was open or closed.

The open minded individual was described by Rokeach as one who receives stimulus information without distortion, evaluates and analyzes it objectively. He then responds to the information on the basis of its own merit, unimpeded by irrelevant factors in the situation arising from within the person or from external factors.

The closed minded individual is one who distorts stimulus information and acts upon it on the basis of many irrelevant factors in the situation which arise from within the person or from external factors. The closed minded individual has difficulty differentiating information and its source, which leads to evaluating and acting on the basis of irrational forces. Rokeach uses the term "dogmatism" to refer to the general degree of closed mindedness (Rokeach, 1960, p. 57-60).

Reliability was established by using both split-half and test-retest techniques with samples of English workers, students at several universities, and individuals at a veteran's administration domiciliary. The reported reliabilities range from .68 to .93 (Rokeach, 1960, pp. 89-90).

Validity of the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale (Form E) was established by using the "Method of Known Groups." Two studies were reported by Rokeach. In one study, graduate students in psychology identified high and low dogmatic individuals among their personal acquaintances. The high dogmatic selections scored significantly above the low dogmatic choices on the Dogmatism Scale.

Rokeach's original Dogmatism Scale has received criticism. Ausubel and Tenzer (1970) wrote:

> The attributes of dogmatism as a generalized personality trait are well defined. The measurement of dogmatism is much more difficult. Most of the items on Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale bear little if any discernable relationship to the above designated attributes of dogmatism; but since they have been validated against presumably dogmatic individuals, and also exhibit reasonably high coefficients of stability and internal consistency, they apparently measure, on some purely empirical basis, a stable and generalized facet of dogmatism.

Another criticism of the scale was that it consisted of entirely positive items. Ray (1970) pointed out that this could lead to a set response. He, consequently, developed a balanced dogmatism scale made partially from items from Rokeach's scale and new negative items.

The personality characteristic dogmatism has been the subject of a variety of research studies in the past several years (Soderbergh, 1964; Rabkin, 1966; Turck, 1969; Johnson, 1969). For the purposes of these studies, dogmatism was defined as "a form of resistance to change or the degree of open mindedness or closed mindedness within a belief system" (Ayers and Turk, 1976). Several studies have concluded that open mindedness in a teacher was

an important variable in promoting a good instructional climate at all levels of learning (Charters, 1929; Wendt, 1961; Sandefur, 1970; Emlow, et al, 1963). The degree of change in dogmatism of individuals as a result of student teaching experiences and the degree of dogmatism possessed by individuals just completing a teacher training program has been the focus of other recent studies utilizing the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale (Form E) (Campbell and Williamson, 1973; Stewart, 1970; Johnson, 1969; Turk, 1969). An example of a study that related to a longitudinal follow-up of individuals who have completed a teacher training program and one or more years of experience in the classroom was completed to determine the change in dogmatism scores as measured by the Dogmatism Scale (Form E) (Rokeach, 1960). The Dogmatism Scale was administered to freshmen enrolled in Introduction to the Teaching Profession during the 1962-63, 1963-64, and 1964-65 academic years. Another response was obtained from the same subjects when they enrolled in student teaching in the 1965-66, 1966-67, and 1967-68 academic years. In the fall of 1970, 248 individuals were requested to complete the Dogmatism Scale an additional time.

Results of the study indicated that the subjects became more open minded during their four years of undergraduate training. This change in dogmatism was significant at the .001 level. The mean dogmatism scores that were gathered after the subjects had taught one or more years were 5.11 points lower than they were before the subjects had actual teaching experience. Thus it appeared that, as a group, the graduates had become more open minded as a result of their teaching experiences. However, the correlation of years of teaching experience with the dogmatism score was not significant. A comparison of scores obtained from the freshmen in 1963-64 and freshmen enrolled in 1975 indicated that the more recent freshmen were more open minded

than their corresponding counterparts of the 1960's. Ayers and Turck (1976) surmised that the general changes in our society of the past decade may have contributed to making individuals more open minded within our belief system rather than their enrollment in a teacher preparation program or teaching experience.

Pupil Control Ideology Form

The Pupil Control Ideology Form consisted of twenty items with five response categories for each item, ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." Scoring for the Pupil Control Ideology was accomplished by scoring "strongly agree" as 5, "agree" as 4, "undecided" as 3, "disagree" as 2, and "strongly disagree" as 1. Items five and thirteen were reversed. The scores for each item were added and the sum was the individual's Pupil Control Ideology Form score. The theoretical range of test scores was 20 to 100. The higher the score, the more custodial the pupil control ideology.

"Teachers who hold a custodial orientation conceive of the school as an autocratic organization with a rigid pupil-teacher status hierarchy" (Hoy and Miskel, 1978, p. 52). For this type of teacher, the flow of power and communication is unilateral and downward. Students must not question the decisions of teachers. Teachers view misbehavior as a personal affront rather than trying to understand student behavior. Teachers termed custodial perceive students as irresponsible and undisciplined persons who must be controlled through punitive sanctions. Impersonality, cynicism, and watchful mistrust characterize the classroom of the custodial teacher (Hoy and Miskel, 1978).

In contrast with the custodial teacher is the teacher who possesses the humanistic orientation. In this classroom, students learn through cooperative interaction and experience. The teacher views learning and behavior

in psychological and sociological terms and substitutes self-discipline for strict teacher control. "Humanistic orientations lead to a democratic atmosphere with open channels of two-way communication between pupils and teachers and increased self-determination" (Hoy and Miskel, 1978, p. 153). The reliability of the Pupil Control Ideology was established by calculating a split-half reliability coefficient by correlating even item subscores with odd items subscores. A Pearson product moment coefficient of .91 resulted; application of the Spearman-Brown formula yielded corrected coefficient of .95 (Willower, 1973).

The primary method used in validating the Pupil Control Ideology Form was based upon principal's judgements concerning the pupil control ideology of some of their teachers. Principals were asked to read descriptions of the custodial and humanistic viewpoints and to identify a specified number of teachers whose ideology was most like each description. The mean scores on the Pupil Control Ideology Form were compared for these two groups of teachers. A t-test of the difference of the means of two independent samples was applied to test the prediction that teachers judged to hold a custodial ideology would differ in mean Pupil Control Ideology Form scores from teachers judged to have a humanistic ideology. A one-tailed test was used. The calculated t value was 2.639, which indicated a difference in the expected direction. The difference was significant at the .01 level (Willower, 1973).

Willower, et al(1973) conducted an extensive study in 1965. They hypothesized that those directly responsible for the control of unselected client control would be more custodial in their control ideology than those less directly responsible for client control. By comparing the pupil control ideologies of teachers and principals and of teachers and counselors, the hypothesis was tested. The teachers (N = 945) had a mean Pupil Control

Ideology Form score of 58.8; the principals' (N = 181) mean score was 54.4. The difference was significant at less than the .001 level. The counselors' (N = 180) Pupil Control Ideology Form score was 52.3, making the difference between teacher and counselor means even more pronounced than between teacher and principal means. The prediction that there was a relationship between organizational position and pupil control ideology was confirmed (Willower, 1973).

A second set of predictions concerned differences between elementary and secondary school personnel with regard to pupil control ideology. Predictions that secondary teachers and principals would be more custodial in pupil control ideology than elementary teachers and principals were confirmed. The elementary teacher's (N = 468) mean score on the Pupil Control Ideology Form was 55.3. The secondary teacher's (N = 477) mean score on the Pupil Control Ideology Form was 62.3. This difference was significant at the .001 level. The elementary principal's (N = 84) mean score on the Pupil Control Ideology Form was 50.9. The secondary principal's (N = 97) mean score was 57.4. This difference was significant at the .001 level.

Willower also hypothesized that experienced teachers would be more custodial in their pupil control ideology than would less experienced teachers. Pupil Control Ideology Forms of teachers reporting more than five years experience (N = 630) were compared with those teachers with less than five years experience (N = 298). Scores were 59.7 and 56.9 respectively. This difference was significant at the .001 level.

Willower, et al (1973) utilized the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale (Form E) to compare the pupil control ideology and the degree of open and closed mindedness of educators. They predicted that closed minded educators would be more custodial in pupil control ideology than open minded educators. A

total of 973 educators completed the Dogmatism Scale. The group was composed of 376 elementary and 429 secondary teachers and 79 elementary and 89 secondary principals. Predictions were tested by those scoring in the upper quarter of each of the relevant categories being labeled closed minded and those with scores in the lower quarter were judged to be open minded. Those teachers (N = 197) classified as open minded had a mean Pupil Control Ideology Form score of 53.1. Those teachers (N = 196) classified as closed minded had a mean Pupil Control Ideology Form score of 61.5 This difference was significant at the .001 level.

Over seventy studies that included the use of the Pupil Control Ideology Form have been reported in the literature to date. These studies have focused on finding the correlates of the "control ideology" (as expressed by Pupil Control Ideology Form scores) of both teachers and administrators. The results from the Pupil Control Ideology Form, in most of the studies, related to other existing and constructed measures of dimensions of schools as organizations (Foley and Brooks, 1978). Studies that have followed the pattern outlined above include a study completed by Appleberry and Hoy (1969). Foley found that a humanistic ideology is positively related to a desirable school climate. Another way of stating their findings is: "The more custodial the orientation of the educators, the more 'closed' the organizational climates" (Appleberry and Hoy, 1969). An open environment was identified as the preferable climate for an educational organization. Helsel (Value Orientation, 1971) discovered that traditionalism in value orientation was positively associated with a teacher's custodial ideology. A significant positive relationship between openness of the instructional climate and humanism was discovered by Bean and Hoy (1974). Another study completed by Rafalides and Hoy (1971) concluded that humanistic ideology fosters what they termed "authentic" social relationships.

Interviews and Observations

The interview format that the investigator employed was developed especially for the investigation. It included thirteen different topics with varying numbers of subtopics (Appendix A). Several questions were included for descriptive reasons only; others were particularly designed to discover commonalities and differences that might exist between high referring and low referring teachers.

Selltiz, et al, (1976, p. 11) discussed exploratory and descriptive research and recommended the use of interviews and structured scales with observations:

> Without the structured scales and interview questions, we might question the reliability and objectivity of such research; and without the participant observation we would miss the richness and detail of the sojourners' lives. These methods and their results complement each other nicely.

Tsukahima further legitimated the interview as a research technique: "Interviews are a rich source of information in field research. Interviewers' on-the-scene assessments are the eyes and ears of the investigator. In cases of non-verbal communication, only they can decipher what is being communicated."

The use of the interview as a research technique has been questioned by others engaged in research. Zusman and Olson (1977) challenged the assumption that responses to interviews provide reliable information upon which to base conclusions. Phillips (1971) seriously questioned the use of interviews as a research method in his book, Knowledge From What? Theories and Methods in Social Research.

Some of the discussion in the literature concerning interviewing related to the quality of the interview data (Hyman, 1954; Phillips, 1971). One important component of high quality data was completeness. Failure to gather complete data could seriously affect the reliability of the results

and their generalizability. While all social research is affected by inadequacies in data gathering, most immediately and seriously affected are instances of applied research based upon self reports of perceptions, problems, and experiences. The interpersonal aspects of the interview situation may reduce the respondents' control over their self-presentation by creating subtle pressures to reveal information they might prefer to withhold. Kelman (1977) concluded from his research concerning the reliability of the interview as a research technique: "Interviews produce pressures that are very similar to those commonly experienced in normal social interaction" (p. 173). He found that interviews became ethically objectionable invasions of privacy only when the interviewer used coercive and manipulative tactics to induce the respondent to participate in the research project or to answer specific questions in the course of the interview that were especially threatening.

Although the interview has been subject to criticism, it has been widely employed as a research technique. "Interviews can be used with almost all segments of the population; a frequent problem in interviewing is that of limiting the responses of the verbose individual" (Selltiz, et al, 1976, p. 296). The interview has been found to be a superior technique for the exploration of areas where there is little basis for knowing either what questions to ask or how to formulate them (Selltiz, 1976).

Ryans (1960) employed interviews in his classic study of teacher characteristics. Likewise, Willower (1973) used interviewing techniques in his studies concerning the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale and the Pupil Control Ideology Form. Another example of research utilizing interviews was completed by Peterson and reported by Biddle (1964). The research was based on comprehensive interviews with a relatively small sample of public high

school teachers in a city of medium size in the Midwest. The analysis techniques were those of comprehensive interviews with emphasis on the development of insights. Techniques were qualitative rather than quantitative and concerned social patterns and processes rather than prevalence or reliability. The principal data gathering technique was an informal, conversational interview. Sessions were structured partially by topics, but were largely unstructured in the wording and order of questions.

Among the conclusions of the study were: Teachers' careers tended to fall into two or three phases. The findings implied that teachers of all ages might be effective (or ineffective) and that different types of behavior are required for effectiveness at different ages (Biddle, 1964).

The observation process employed in the investigation was described in Chapter I. Observations have been used in the study of teaching to a large extent. This method has received praise as well as criticism. Ornstein (1976) discussed the use of observations in the study of teaching. He related that the observation of teacher behavior was costly and time-consuming. He termed human overload as part of the problem. This phenomenon limits the observer and he can perceive only a fraction of what actually transpires in the classroom. The observation method gives no guarantee that the perceptions of the swift and complex interchanges are accurate. Ornstein delineated four major problems of using observation as a research method:

> (1) Observer reliability; (2) The teacher tends to put on an act while observed; (3) The presence of the observer creates a 'Hawthorne effect' (i.e. The teacher and students are aware of a visitor in the room and their behaviors change); (4) The observer becomes influenced by his own values and interpretations of what constitutes a good teacher (Ornstein, 1976, p. 206).

Flanders (1970) addressed the problem of observing representative teacher behavior. He reported a study completed by Samph. From the study Samph concluded that teachers who were being observed tended to become more responsive toward the pupils when an observer was present in the classroom. Teachers had a tendency to exhibit warm behavior and employ indirect techniques when being observed.

Berliner (1976) suggested that observing teacher behavior in the classroom might very well be the most enlightening method of studying teaching. Noting that the observatory method of research might be open to criticism, he recommended denser observation than is normally customary. He maintained that five one-hour observations of teacher behavior might not provide all of the information an investigator might want. Berliner also felt that knowing when and where to observe was a critical aspect in using observation as a research tool. Brophy and Good (1973) warned that observers have to guard against the tendency of allowing their own biases to color what they see.

A longitudinal study of teaching effectiveness of teacher education graduates incorporated direct classroom observation in its research design (Sandefur and Adams, 1976). Two direct classroom observation systems were employed: The Classroom Observations Record developed by the Ryans study (1960) and a category system of interaction analysis, a modification of the Flanders Model. A number of emphatic relationships were found between indirect and other desirable teaching behaviors. Evidence was found that the teacher's use of praise and encouragement of students are both desirable teacher behaviors. Indirect teaching behavior also correlated positively with the degree to which observers rated teachers in terms of their democratic behavior, responsibleness, and the extent to which teachers were steady, poised, and confident.

## Teacher Referral Behavior

A review of the literature provided little information in the area of teacher-initiated student disciplinary referrals. The following are descriptions of three studies that were found to relate to teacher behaviors and characteristics concerning student disciplinary referrals.

In 1974, Helsel and Willower, more than six years after the development of the Pupil Control Ideology, stated that "the study of educators' control ideology rather than their control behavior has furnished only a partial portrait. Ideology may or may not be reflected in behavior" (Helsel and Willower, 1974, p. 103).

In their investigation utilizing the Pupil Control Ideology Form, Helsel and Willower (1974) built upon the extensive earlier work on pupil control ideology in educational organizations. Specifically, it represented an attempt to define and measure pupil control behavior using the same theoretical framework that guided earlier studies of pupil control ideology and organizational climates.

A description questionnaire called the Pupil Control Behavior Form was developed. Data was drawn from forty-three schools. Correlation coefficients were calculated for the relationship between pupil control ideology and pupil control behavior. The general hypothesis was supported: "Educators' pupil control ideology was found to be positively related to their pupil control behavior" (Helsel and Willower, 1974, p. 105). The authors concluded that, while the association of ideology and behavior was significant, the variance accounted for was limited. Thus, pupil control ideology and pupil control behavior were related, but quite imperfectly.

A recent study completed by Foley and Brooks (1978) continued the focus on the relationship between control ideology and control behavior of

teachers. Central to the study was the concern with the usefulness of the Pupil Control Ideology Form as an indicator of the behavior of teachers as they attempted to control the behavior of pupils. The general question was: "Are differences in ideology reflected in differences in teacher/pupil disciplinary behavior?" (Foley and Brooks, 1978, pp. 105-106).

Actual teacher control behavior was the dependent variable in the study. The primary concern was with the teacher's control ideology and five other selected teacher variables (education, sex, grade level, parental status, experience) that could be expected to be related to the dependent variable (actual teacher control behavior). Pupil contact data was entered as an independent variable, resulting in a total of seven predictors. The independent variables were intercorrelated as well as correlated with the criterion. Scores on the Pupil Control Ideology Form had the highest simple correlation ($r = 0.56$) with the criterion. Foley and Brooks (1978) determined that sex, teacher experience, parental status, and educational level seem to be of little practical value in accounting for variance in teacher referral behavior.

The unique contribution of the Pupil Control Ideology Form to the variance accounted for by all the other independent variables was found by entering the Pupil Control Ideology scores as the last variable in a multiple regression equation. Foley and Brooks (1978) concluded that humanism in teachers is related to reporting fewer unresolvable conflicts with pupils. Pupil control ideology was found to be related to teacher behavior and in the direction earlier anticipated by Willower and Jones (1971).

Daniel Duke (1976) conducted research that compared an entire population (78) of high school discipline problem students with a control group of students who were not involved in acts of misconduct. Significant

differences were found to exist in level of parents' education, intelligence, scholastic achievement, scholastic abilities, vocational aptitude, and personality characteristics in elementary school. Duke (1976) discovered that most teachers sent students to the office when they disrupted class frequently, showed disrespect to the teacher, loitered in the halls, cheated, stole, destroyed property, or otherwise manifested misconduct. In his suggestions for further research, Duke called for more research on such topics as the consistency with which teachers enforced rules and administrators administered punishment. He maintained that it was critical that schools begin to collect data systematically if the quality of schooling and research on student behavior was to improve.

# CHAPTER III

# CASE STUDIES

## Introduction

The investigator gathered Student Disciplinary Referral Forms for the fall semester of 1978-79. Student Disciplinary Referral Forms were tabulated individually for each of the basic academic subject teachers. The three teachers who initiated the fewest Student Disciplinary Referral Forms and the three teachers who initiated the highest number of Student Disciplinary Referral Forms consented to participate in the investigation. The teachers who initiated the fewest referrals formed the group of "low referring teachers." The teachers who initiated the highest number of referrals formed the group of "high referring teachers."

Data was gathered in several ways. Each participating teacher was individually interviewed by the investigator. During the interview, the investigator followed a structured interview but remained flexible to pursue areas of interest to individual teachers. Each teacher was administered the Pupil Control Ideology Form and the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale (Form E). Records pertaining to the teachers were examined. The Student Disciplinary Referral Forms initiated by each of the teachers were analyzed by the investigator. Two students named by each teacher, one a favored student, the other an undesirable student, were interviewed and described by the investigator. Finally, each of the teachers' classrooms were observed by the investigator on two separate occasions. The investigator noted behaviors that represented four dimensions identified by Gage (1972) as being

desirable characteristics: warmth, indirectness, cognitive organization, and enthusiasm.

The data gathered is presented in the form of case studies for each of the six teachers. The first three case studies comprise the low referring teacher group. The last three case studies comprise the high referring teacher group.

## Low Referring Teachers

### Ms. Baker

Ms. Baker was a sixth grade math teacher. She also taught one class of seventh grade home economics. She ranked number one with the least number of Student Disciplinary Referral Forms sent to the administrator for the fall semester of 1978-79. She had a total of two referrals. Ms. Baker was an attractive thirty-six year old black female. Her father and mother completed high school. Her father was a contractor and her mother was a beautician with her own salon. Ms. Baker was one of four sisters. All four children in her family completed college. She was the only educator in her family. Ms. Baker was, at the time of the study, a divorcee living with her teenage daughter.

She graduated from high school in a large metropolitan city within the state. After high school, she attended a state university with a predominantly black student population and received a bachelor's degree in home economics in 1965. After graduating, she attended summer school classes at the same institution for the following four summers, completing requirements for the standard elementary certificate in the summer of 1970. In 1973, she began work on a master's degree at a university near her home. The Master of Education degree in secondary education was completed in July, 1975.

The 1978-79 school year was her thirteenth year of teaching. In this period of time Ms. Baker had taught in three different schools. She taught in two different elementary schools. Two years were spent teaching fourth grade in a segregated black school. When the teaching staff was integrated throughout the city, she taught fourth grade for five years at a largely all-white elementary school. She moved to her present position at Washington Middle School seven years ago. She said she made the change to Washington simply so she would not have such a distance to drive to work each day.

During the interview conducted by the investigator, Ms. Baker related the following information that provided insight into her feelings about teaching and the students that she taught. The first question was: "How did it happen that you became a teacher?" Ms. Baker indicated that she went to school and obtained the necessary requirements to become a teacher. She said that it was gratifying to see students grow and achieve. She indicated that some years were better than other years because sometimes the improvement in students was so obvious that it was gratifying. When the investigator asked her if she could tell what made the difference, she replied, "I really can't say. Unless, maybe you put more into it or you just work hard on a specific few people that you are just gratified at the results." The next question asked was: "Was this your first choice for a profession?" Ms. Baker quickly replied, "No!" She said she wanted to be a dress designer but was thwarted in that goal because her mother would not send her to the particular school that she had chosen to study design because it was too far out of the state. Later in the interview, Ms. Baker told the investigator that she had originally completed her master's degree with the hopes of opening a day care center. However,

lack of financial funds had been a problem, although she still had a keen interest in pursuing this idea at a later time. Since she could not attend the school she wanted, she chose as an alternative the state college. The most instrumental person in her becoming a teacher was an instructor at the college. She gave Ms. Baker help and the push necessary to encourage her to look at the bright side of things. She could not name any one specific thing that Ms. Appleton had done to influence her in the choice of teaching as a career, but she said it was a combination of many small things over a period of years.

The investigator asked Ms. Baker to talk about her best teaching experience. She related that teaching fourth grade was the best experience because the students were mature and "they work so hard and get so much done. They try hard to please and they make you feel good." She indicated that she felt they were more mature-acting than the sixth and eighth graders because they were not going through the types of physiological changes that middle school students were experiencing. She said she left elementary school because she had to drive so far to work and Washington was closer for her.

Her teaching preference was sixth grade math. She also said she liked to teach home economics, but due to a school policy that limited the grading system to either satisfactory or unsatisfactory, she would not want to teach home economics on a full-time basis. She said, "In middle school you have to give grades in order for a student to work, otherwise they don't work." She said that a student was not motivated by an S or U for work and that she really could not blame them; she added that she did not feel that she would work under those circumstances either.

The investigator offered the hypothetical situation of there being a fourth grade classroom in the present building. Would she prefer fourth grade? Ms. Baker said no - indicating that in the elementary setting a teacher had to stay with her students too long without a planning period or a break, and she preferred the present situation.

Her student preference was for a student that was well-behaved. She said that a student was able to voice his own opinion in her classroom. She said she liked a student that would let her know what he thought. She added that as long as they were not screaming, she felt that they were not talking back. She accepted this type of behavior as being desirable, whereas other teachers might feel that it was disrespectful.

Her most serious complaint about teaching was the size of the classes. Seeing children progress provided her with rewards that she said were the greatest assets of teaching. Ms. Baker chose an 89er Day when she taught in elementary school as the brightest day of her teaching experience. This day was chosen because it was a nice day and was a culminating learning activity for the students who had studied and learned a great deal about 89er Day. The darkest day of her teaching experience was when she was hit in the eye with a ruler. It was an accident during her first year of teaching. She could not think of any way that she would change her present school if given the power to do so.

In describing the various purposes of positions on the school staff, Ms. Baker described her purpose as a teacher to be a helper. She viewed the purpose of the principal as a supervisor to see if the teachers were doing their jobs. When asked to discuss the assistant principal's purpose, Ms. Baker first said, "The same as the principal." Then she added, "No, it couldn't be the same thing - I guess it's to take care of the

parents." She continued, "The way it is now, the assistant principal's job is dealing with behavior problems." She indicated that the counselors should be helping students with their problems.

Ms. Baker said that she had a set of rules for her classroom that had been written before but were not posted at that time. "Basically," she said, "we just want to live and let live." She said that the rules were talked about every so often in her classes. She said that the only reason she would send a student to the office was for fighting. She rated the discipline in the school overall as 4 on a scale of 1 - 10, with 10 being high. On the same scale, she rated the discipline in her classroom as "a good 7 or 8," saying that some days were better than others. Overall, she rated herself as a teacher as 8½ or 8-3/4 on a scale of 1 - 10, with 10 being high. She said her strongest area as a teacher was her personality. She felt that she had the ability to get along and the ability not to get along. Her weakest area was in not being a "stickler" for a seating arrangement. She said organization was a must, but she felt that a seating chart was not necessary for students to be able to learn. She felt that the administration required these things and that was why she identified it as a weak area.

In choosing the one student that Ms. Baker would like to see removed from her classroom if her classes were reorganized, she chose a black female student named Rhonda. This choice was made without hesitation. When the investigator told her that she had spoken to Rhonda that morning and that Rhonda had told the investigator that she was making an A in Ms. Baker's class, Ms. Baker said, "Well, good. I just gave her an unsatisfactory notice." A student that she would want to keep was identified as Mark, a Caucasian male student. Ms. Baker was apologetic about choosing Mark, as she hesitantly said, "I like him."

On the self-report instruments, Ms. Baker scored 44 on the Pupil Control Ideology Form. The mean teacher score on this instrument was reported by Willower (1973) as 58.8. The higher the score, the more custodial was the teacher's pupil control ideology. Ms. Baker scored below the mean score for teachers. Her score on the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale (Form E) was 146. In studies completed by Willower (1973), he determined that a score of 111.2 or lower was representative of an open minded teacher. A score of 180.2 or above was found to be representative of a closed minded teacher.

The investigator conducted classroom observations on two consecutive days during the second class period of the school day. The period began at 10:15 and was dismissed at 11:05. The class observed was sixth grade mathematics. During the observation, the investigator noted behavior that would be representative of Gage's four characteristics of effective teachers.

How teachers greet and dismiss students was recorded as an indicator of warmth. The first observation began with the class discussing an intramural softball game that they had just won. Both teacher and students were talking excitedly about how well they had done. The teacher formally began the class by saying, "First of all, we're going to review." She spoke to a specific student and said, "Turn around!" The student said, "I am." Ms. Baker replied, "No, you're not. That's why I asked you to turn around!" During the first observation, students were asked to turn around and to stop what they were doing. On the second day of observation, the teacher began the class with, "Get your folders and pencils out." Comments made to students during this class period included a reprimand to a student snapping his fingers to get the teacher's attention.

Ms. Baker yelled, "Don't pop your fingers at me!" Then she went over and helped the student with his problem. Another student was working on a problem involving decimals; she misplaced her decimal. Ms. Baker said in a loud voice, "Hey, Felicia, can you count? One, two! Move your decimal over two places." The student shrugged her shoulders and worked. Within sixty seconds, the teacher returned to give individual attention to Felicia.

Dismissing students took a little time. The first leave taking statement was: "I haven't dismissed anybody. Sit down! Take and push your chairs up. Don't move!" (They did move.) The teacher then said, "Now you can go." On the occasion of the second observation, the class was restless and talkative. Ms. Baker said, "It's about time to go. Get your desks straightened up. Leave your papers here." Then she specifically spoke to a couple of misbehaving students, saying, "Come on, fellows, hurry up." All students were told to sit down at their desks. The teacher waited until the misbehaving students were quiet. The remainder of the class applied peer pressure via stern looks and verbal admonishments. After about a minute had passed, Ms. Baker said, "Okay! People on this side of the room can pass. People in this row may go. Okay, push in your chairs."

During the observation periods, Ms. Baker displayed enthusiasm for the subject. She was very animated as she introduced the new chapter of math. When she asked questions, she gave positive reinforcement liberally in the form of "That's good!" "That's great!" She moved freely around the classroom trying to reach as many students as possible to give individual help. During the observations, the teacher did not sit down. She touched students frequently on the shoulder or the arm during her brief encounters with them.

Indirectness is a third characteristic of effective teachers identified by Gage. The investigator noted the teacher's questioning patterns as a behavior that would reflect indirectness. During the observations, it was noted that the questions the teacher asked required factual answers. There was no attempt to probe or extend answers. The following question is an example of the kind of question asked: "What would you measure liquids with?" The accepted answer was "milliliters."

Cognitive organization, Gage's fourth characteristic, was observed by examining lesson plans. The lessons presented during the observations were reflective of the teacher's plans. Ms. Baker explained to the investigator that she was one day behind the written plan because she had been absent two days before and the substitute did not present the lesson as she had planned it. Ms. Baker checked each student's work individually. This resulted in the classroom being generally chaotic, with students walking around the room.

Ms. Baker chose Rhonda as her one student that she would like to have removed from her class. Shortly after the interview with Ms. Baker, Rhonda withdrew from school, moving to another state and making it impossible for the investigator to conduct a student interview with her. Ms. Baker provided the investigator with an alternate student that she would like to have removed from her class if she were given the choice. Her selection was Johnny, a black male. During the interview with Johnny, he named Ms. Baker as his favorite teacher because she sometimes let the students have free time. He said that the students were allowed to do anything they wanted around the room. His feelings about school were summed up in the following words: "It's boring. All we have to do is work,

work, work." His ideal teacher would be fun to be around. She would let students do fun things.

Johnny's California Achievement Test (2-28-79) Total Reading score was 6.1 grade equivalent, 42 percentile, 5 stanine. His grade point average was 2.0 for the fall semester of the 1978-79 school year. He received an F in social studies. In Ms. Baker's class he received a C. Johnny's discipline record included:

1. Leaving physical education class without permission
2. Leaving math class without permission
3. Disruptive classroom behavior
4. Fighting
5. Talking excessively in class.
6. Refusing to sit where a teacher asked him to sit
7. Refusing to follow teacher's directions
8. Disruptive classroom behavior
9. Telling teacher: "You make me sick."
10. Disruptive and disrespectful behavior
11. Throwing glasses, pushing science equipment around

Mark was chosen by Ms. Baker as her favorite student. During the interview with Mark, he did not name Ms. Baker as his favorite or his least favorite teacher. When asked by the investigator how he felt about her, he replied, "I like her real well. She's modern, up-to-date. Modern, cool. She hardly ever gives anybody referrals. She gives them something else to do - like cafeteria duty." Mark said that school was important to him because he felt that he needed an education to get a good job. He was especially enamoured with Washington because the social life provided him with many opportunities to be in the center of campus

life. His ideal teacher would teach the lesson like it should be taught but would be lenient. He said an adequate discipline for hitting someone would be cafeteria duty. However, if it were really serious, a student should receive sericus punishment or suspension.

Mark's California Achievement Test (3-7-79) indicated a Total Reading score of 12.9 grade equivalent, 99 percentile, 9 stanine. His grade point average was 2.0 for the fall semester, with C's in every subject. Mark's discipline record included four referrals to the office. All four referrals were for being disruptive in the classroom.

Several existing records were examined to provide information about the teacher. These records included: Student Disciplinary Referral Forms, principal's evaluation, teaching certificates, computer grade records, and computer leave balance records.

During the interview, Ms. Baker said she would refer a student to the office for fighting. Analysis of Student Disciplinary Referral Forms submitted to the office for action included the following information:

First Semester

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Number of referrals: | 2 | |
| Reason for referrals: | Fighting in classroom | 2 |
| Race of students: | 1 white | 1 black |
| Gender of students: | 1 male | 1 female |

Second Semester

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Number of referrals: | 3 | |
| Reason for referrals: | Fighting in classroom | 2 |
| | Leaving room without permission | 1 |
| Race of students: | 3 black | |
| Gender of students: | 3 male | |

Ms. Baker was formally evaluated by the principal during the 1978-79 school year. The evaluation listed Ms. Baker as "Outstanding" in four areas: Professional practices, staff relationships, personal factors, and school committee and supervisory assignments. Ms. Baker was evaluated as "Excellent" in five areas: Teaching techniques, pupil growth, classroom environment, professional growth, and community relationships. The principal evaluated Ms. Baker as "Satisfactory" in two areas: Participation in pupil activity program and curriculum work. There were no "Needs improvement" or "Unsatisfactory" ratings listed on "The Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness, Principal's Report." The mathematical mean of the evaluation was 4.2 (5 = Outstanding; 4 = Excellent.)

Ms. Baker had a standard home economics teaching certificate, as well as a standard elementary teaching certificate. She had a total of 140 hours applied toward her undergraduate degree. She had a total grade point average of 2.69. The 140 hours included twelve hours of D, forty-one hours of C, fifty-two hours of B, and thirty-five hours of A. Subsequent to graduation, Ms. Baker completed thirty-two additional hours to obtain her elementary teaching certification. Her grade point average for those hours was 2.90. Thirty-two credit hours were completed for the master's degree in secondary education with a grade point average of 3.03.

Certain information was provided by the school district to the individual schools in the form of computer printouts. The examination of the printout listing the final grades recorded for the second semester of 1978-79 indicated that Ms. Baker did not record any F grades.

Another record examined was the computer printout provided by the district's personnel department listing leave balances and number of

days and reasons that the teacher had missed a day of work. This record included data for the 1978-79 school year through April 27, 1979. The record indicated that Ms. Baker had a cumulative leave balance of 35.50 days. A total of 8.50 days had been used as sick leave. An additional day had been used for personal business, making a total of 9.50 work days that Ms. Baker was absent from her job.

Ms. Lewis

Ms. Lewis was a seventh grade math teacher. She ranked third lowest, with four referrals, in the total number of Student Disciplinary Referral Forms sent to the administrator for the fall semester of 1978-79. Ms. Lewis was an attractive fifty-four year old Caucasian female. She grew up on a farm. Her parents were farmers with less than a high school education. Ms. Lewis was one of seven children. She was one of two who completed college. The other five children completed high school. Shortly after completing high school, Ms. Lewis was married and subsequently had three children. Her children were thirty-two, twenty-two, and twelve. At the time of the study she resided with her husband and twelve year old daughter.

In 1963, after completing her family, Ms. Lewis began her college career. She commuted to a state-supported four year college, majoring in elementary education. She completed a bachelor's degree in 1967. Ms. Lewis had completed five hours of graduate study but had no firm plans to pursue a graduate degree. Shortly after graduating from college, Ms. Lewis was hired as a sixth grade teacher at her neighborhood elementary school. She taught at this elementary school until district reorganization created the middle school. She moved with her sixth year students to Washington Middle School. The school was located in the same neighborhood

as her previous elementary school. She had taught a total of eleven years in two different schools.

During the teacher's interview with the investigator, the following information was derived. Ms. Lewis indicated that teaching was her first choice for a profession. Her decision to become a teacher was influenced by her own fifth grade teacher. Even though she delayed entry into the profession for several years, it was the realization of a dream when she became an elementary school teacher.

When Ms. Lewis was asked by the investigator to describe her best teaching experience, she expressed that this was a difficult question since basically all of her teaching experiences had been pleasant. After thinking the question over, she identified a year of teaching sixth grade math at her current middle school with a team of teachers who worked well together. She said the experience was especially satisfying because the team felt they experienced a great deal of success with their students. Her teaching preference was congruent with her current teaching assignment, seventh grade math. She preferred the student who was willing to learn. This student was described as not necessarily highly intelligent or a slow learner, but "one who will try."

During the interview, the investigator asked the teacher several questions that would provide insight into how the teacher felt about teaching and her position in the school. One such question was: "What is your most serious complaint about teaching?" Ms. Lewis did not hesitate when she responded that the paper work required by the administration placed constraints on her time. She illustrated what she meant by paper work by saying, "Accountability-type things." She would prefer to use this time to teach students. Conversely, the greatest asset of being a teacher was,

for Ms. Lewis, "having a part in a student's growth, whether it is academically or socially." The brightest day of her teaching career could not be isolated. Instead, Ms. Lewis felt that bright days were characterized by seeing a student finally grasp a concept that he had been struggling with for some time. Likewise, the darkest day was translated into days characterized by, after concentrated effort, a feeling of futility at not being able to accomplish what she felt that she as a teacher should have accomplished with her students.

If given the power to change her school, Ms. Lewis would like to provide the impetus for students to accept responsibility for their own behavior. She stated that this would improve the overall discipline of the school and would ultimately allow her freedom to teach and influence students' growth.

Important to this study was how the teacher viewed the purpose of various positions on the school staff. Ms. Lewis viewed the purpose of the principal as that of a manager; the person who was the facilitator of the curriculum. She identified the role of the assistant principal as "a support to the principal." She further delineated this position by indicating that the assistant principal was one that gave more individual help to the classroom teacher with classroom problems. Counselors were assigned a support role for the classroom teacher in Ms. Lewis's view.

The subject of discipline was approached in the interview with the following question: "Do you have a set of rules for your classroom?" Ms. Lewis told the investigator that she did have a set of unwritten rules for the classroom. She said that the students had a part in formulating these rules and they were agreed upon at the beginning of the school year. Students would be sent to an administrator as a student disciplinary referral

only when the classroom was being disrupted. On a scale of 1 - 10, with 10 being high, Ms. Lewis rated the overall discipline of Washington Middle School as 4. She ranked the discipline in her classroom as 7. Rating herself as 10 on a scale of 1 - 10, with 10 being high, Ms. Lewis said she felt that she was an outstanding teacher. She indicated that her strongest point was being able to motivate students while her weakest point was enforcing a rule with all students equally.

Concluding the interview, the investigator asked the teacher to identify two students. The teacher was given the hypothetical situation that classes were being reorganized. She was asked to choose the one student that she would most like to keep in her classroom and the one student that she would most like to have removed from her class. Ms. Lewis chose a Caucasian male named Jimmy as the student she would most like to see removed from her classroom. Jimmy, she said, had presented special problems for the team this year. She felt that Jimmy's problems were such that he could not control his own behavior. Consequently, Jimmy was disruptive in the classroom and she felt helpless to influence his behavior to any appreciable extent.

In contrast was the one student that Ms. Lewis would choose to keep in her classroom if she could choose only one. Angela, a Caucasian female, was described by the teacher as a bright girl who was also a pleasant and outgoing person who enjoyed being herself; she enjoyed learning and "was a pleasure to be around."

On the self-report instruments, Ms. Lewis scored 53 on the Pupil Control Ideology. The mean teacher score on this instrument was reported by Willower (1973) as 58.8. The higher the score, the more custodial was the teacher's pupil control ideology. Ms. Lewis scored below the mean

for teachers. Her score on the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale (Form E) was 103. In studies completed by Willower (1973), he determined that a score of 111.2 or lower was representative of an open minded teacher. A score of 180.2 or above was found to be representative of a closed minded teacher.

Classroom observations were conducted on two consecutive days during the third hour of the school day. The period began at 11:05 and dismissed for lunch at 11:35. The class observed was seventh grade mathematics. During the classroom observation, the investigator noted behaviors that would be representative of Gage's four characteristics of effective teachers: warmth, indirectness, enthusiasm, and cognitive organization.

How a teacher greeted and dismissed her class of students was recorded as an indicator of warmth. On the occasion of the first observation of Ms. Lewis, the students were making reference to the fact that it was a member of the class's birthday. The greeting statement of the teacher was: "Whose birthday is it today? Angela, are you a teenager today? Let's sing 'Happy Birthday.'" After the class sang, Ms. Lewis indirectly asked two boys to move closer into the group: "I'm going to ask Billy and Reggie to move in." On the second day of observation, the greeting statement was: "It looks like most of my absentees are from this class today. Did any of you have trouble completing the assignment for today?" The students left this class for lunch and then returned after lunch to complete the remainder of the period. The leave taking statements were similar for both days. On the first observation, the teacher dismissed the class with: "When we come back, we're going to do a little more with percentages. Close your books, please, and push your chairs in." On the subsequent observation, the leave taking statement was: "We'll finish up when we come back." Another behavior that indicates teacher warmth

was the teacher's position in relation to her students. During both observations, the students were pulled together in a close group. The teacher sat on a stool and presented material with an overhead projector. Ms. Lewis moved around the room giving help when requested.

Indirectness is another characteristic identified by Gage. The following are some of the questions Ms. Lewis asked her students: "How do you go about solving this?" She had written "20% of 250" on the overhead transparency. "How do you read this number?" She indicated ".06" on the transparency. Another type of teacher talk was characterized by these statements and questions: Ms. Lewis said, "Estralita says this is 1½. Billy says this is 1½. Suzanne, do you agree?" Suzanne responded, "Yes." The teacher then asked, "How did you arrive at that answer?"

Behaviors noted under enthusiasm included the use of much positive reinforcement for correct answers or for good attempts, even though the answer may have been incorrect. Positive reinforcers included: "Fine," "Good," "Very good," and "That was a very good try." In referring to the chapter test, Ms. Lewis said, "I am going to try very hard to be ready for the chapter test and I hope you are too! Today we are going to review." She spoke these words in an enthusiastic tone of voice.

Cognitive organization reflects the teacher's intellectual grasp of what she is trying to teach. The logical presentation of the material was of main concern to the investigator. Ms. Lewis presented the lesson in a logical sequence and with no observed difficulty or confusion on either her part or on that of the students. The lessons were a follow-up and review of a chapter that was being brought to conclusion. The lesson plans turned in to the principal on April 30 were congruent with the lessons that were in progress during the observations on May 7 and 8.

Jimmy was the student chosen by Ms. Lewis to be removed from her classroom. During an interview with Jimmy, the investigator asked him to name his least favorite teacher. He named Ms. Lewis. When he was asked why, he replied, "She's mean. She don't let you chew gum or candy. She's too strict. You can't talk or nothing." He was asked how he felt about school. His answer was: "I don't like to get up, but I want to come to school to get an education. Even though you get into trouble, you need school. You need an education." He described his ideal teacher as either a man or woman that was nice - "not so strict that it's pitiful." He added that he did not think they should just let students go free.

Jimmy's Otis-Lennon Mental Ability score (10-16-78) was 46 percentile, 5 stanine. His California Achievement Test (2-28-79) yielded a Total Reading score of 8.5 grade equivalent, 66 percentile, 6 stanine. His grade point average for the fall semester of 1978-79 was a 3.0, with his lowest grade recorded as a C in mathematics, Ms. Lewis's class. His disciplinary record consisted of ten referrals to the office. These included the following:

1. Obscene language directed at a teacher
2. Disrupting class by fussing and talking while other students were reading
3. Horseplay in science lab - turning water on at full force, resulting in a student and lab manual being soaked
4. Profanity - shouting profanity in the classroom
5. Refusing to remain seated and obey the driver of the school bus
6. Ditching class
7. Disrupting, not working, talking back to teacher
8. Insolent behavior to a teacher - called the teacher a liar

9. Fighting

10. Improper behavior on school bus - climbing over seats

Angela was chosen by Ms. Lewis to be kept in her classes if she could only keep one student. In Angela's interview with the investigator, she did not choose Ms. Lewis as either her favorite or her least favorite teacher. When specifically asked how she felt about Ms. Lewis, Angela replied, "She's okay. At the beginning of the year, I would get in bad trouble. Most of the time I got away with talking back to her. I'm not too good in math. I barely make a B." Angela said she thought school was boring. She said she didn't like having to do things. Her ideal teacher would be one who was nice toward her. This teacher would sit down and listen to her when she really needed help.

The Otis-Lennon Mental Ability score (10-16-78) for Angela was 65 percentile, 7 stanine. Her California Achievement Test scores (2-28-79) rendered a reading total of 10.3 grade equivalent, 85 percentile, 7 stanine. Her grade point average for the fall semester, 1978-79, was 3.0, with a B in every class.

Angela's discipline record included the following referrals:

1. Misbehavior during assembly

2. Misbehavior during fire drill

Several existing records were examined to provide information about the teacher. These records included: Student Disciplinary Referral Forms, principal's evaluations, college transcripts, teaching certificates, computer grade records, and computer leave balance printouts.

During the teacher interview with the investigator, Ms. Lewis said that the only reason she would send a student to the office as a

disciplinary referral was if they were disruptive in the classroom. During the 1978-79 school year, Ms. Lewis initiated twelve student disciplinary referrals. Data gathered from examination of the referrals included:

First Semester

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Number of referrals: | 4 | |
| Reason for referrals: | Disrupting the classroom | 4 |
| Race of students: | 4 black | |
| Gender of students | 3 male | 1 female |

Second Semester

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Number of referrals: | 8 | |
| Reason for referrals: | Disturbing class | 4 |
| | Putting gum on chair | 1 |
| | Three infractions of class rules | 1 |
| | Not following teacher's directions | 2 |
| Race of students: | 7 black | 1 white |
| Gender of students: | 5 male | 3 female |

Ms. Lewis was formally evaluated by the principal during the school year of 1976-77. Ms. Lewis was evaluated as "Outstanding" in nine of the major areas of teaching effectiveness. These areas included: Teaching techniques, professional practices, staff relationships, professional growth, personal factors, participation in pupil activity program, curriculum work, and school committee and supervisory assignments. In two areas Ms. Lewis was evaluated as "Excellent." These areas included: classroom environment and community relationships. This evaluation resulted in a composite of 4.8 (5 = Outstanding; 4 = Excellent.)

Ms. Lewis had a standard certificate in elementary education. Her undergraduate grade point average was 3.08. Her lowest grade was a C. She had ten hours of C, forty-seven hours of B, fifty-seven hours of A, and ten hours of S. Her five credit hours of graduate study were completed as workshops with an S grade assigned for satisfactory completion.

The school district provided the individual schools with information in the form of computer printouts. These central office records provided the source of the following information. An examination of the final semester grades given for the 1978-79 school year indicated that Ms. Lewis recorded one F grade. Another record examined was the computer printout provided by the district's personnel department, listing leave balances and number of days and reasons that the teacher had missed a day of work. This record included data for the 1978-79 school year through April 27, 1979. The record indicated that Ms. Lewis had a cumulative leave balance of 37.00 days. A total of 6.00 work days were used for sick leave during the 1978-79 school year. Another day had been used during the school year as personal business leave, making the total days absent from work 7.00.

Ms. Smith

Ms. Smith was a sixth grade language arts teacher. The 1978-79 school year was her twenty-third year to teach school. It was also the year that she chose to retire. Ms. Smith was a Caucasian female whose appearance belied the fact that she was almost sixty-four years of age. Ms. Smith came from a family of school teachers. Her mother "taught school." Her father was an early-day Oklahoman who achieved an eighth grade education. He was a mechanical-type person and was engaged in an automechanic business,

along with having a small fleet of trucks that he supervised. Her siblings included one sister and three brothers. All of the children in the family completed high school, but Ms. Smith was the only college graduate. Ms. Smith married after completing college and was the mother of three children. Her husband passed away in recent years and she lived alone.

Ms. Smith grew up in a small rural community, graduated from high school, and attended undergraduate school at a small liberal arts college for women within the state. She majored in fine arts, taking private voice and speech lessons for four years. She completed her bachelor's degree in 1935. Graduate study was completed at a nearby state college. She first completed a master's degree in special education in 1960. Further graduate study was completed for reading specialist certification.

During her twenty-three year teaching career, Ms. Smith taught in four different schools. In addition, the 1977-78 school year was spent at a state university as a resource teacher. This opportunity was provided through a cooperative program of the university and the school district. After completing her master's degree in special education, she taught educable mentally handicapped students for one year. She said she chose not to continue to teach the special education class because she found it too depressing. The remainder of her teaching career was spent teaching social studies, language arts, and speech and drama.

During the teacher interview, Ms. Smith explained how she became a teacher. She said she actually became a teacher on two different occasions. The first time was after she completed undergraduate training in 1935. At that time there were few other professional opportunities for a woman other than a career in education and she saw no other alternatives

open to her at that point in her life. She taught for a year and then married and had a family. The second time she entered the profession was after all of her children had been born. When her youngest child was eight months old, Ms. Smith had a serious illness which required major surgery. After her children were in school, she felt that she wanted to do something, as she said, "to pay my way." Her decision to become a teacher the second time was by choice rather than by default and she had remained as such from that point in time until her retirement in 1979. She cited the interaction with the students as the main reinforcement for her. She made the following statement during the interview: "There have been times that I would have taught for free. I was that excited about it and that's the truth." She attributed her own thinking as the greatest influence rather than identifying another person that influenced her to choose teaching as a profession.

Ms. Smith said her best teaching experience was a year at Jefferson High School in 1960-61. The students were so-called "average" students who, according to Ms. Smith, were bright. She taught the eighth graders social studies in two hour time blocks. She was able to give students a great deal of attention and used a multitude of materials to teach both social studies and practical English. She said that many of the students were performing as well as college-level students by the time they completed the eighth grade.

Her subject preferences to teach were language arts and speech. Eighth and ninth grade students were her level preferences. She cited maturity and eagerness as the reasons she chose this age group as being preferable. She would rather teach the "average" student who, she felt, was really the neglected student. She said this was her "soap box."

Her most serious complaint about teaching was the assignment of too many duties, such as hall duty, that did not involve using her mind in the classroom. She said that the greatest asset of teaching was "to meet youngsters ten years later and to see that you have taught them something and they still are grateful to you."

The brightest day of Ms. Smith's teaching experience involved an incident with eighth grade students. The students were completing a study of "Evangeline" and had prepared a reading exercise to be performed. As she said, "It was their day." Ms. Smith invited the assistant principal to visit the classroom during the hour to enjoy the presentation. The class began immediately after lunch. Ms. Smith had been detained in another part of the building. When she arrived in the classroom, the assistant principal was there and the students were just completing the presentation of the poetry. Ms. Smith related that the assistant principal could not believe that eighth grade students were that self-directed and self-disciplined. Ms. Smith said she was delighted and that the experience had been a highlight of her career.

The darkest day of her teaching experiences that she related to the investigator involved a confrontation with a group of students. This was an incident when Ms. Smith felt that her physical well-being was in jeopardy. A group of students approached her during the lunch hour to report that other students were stealing soda pop from a delivery truck. Ms. Smith said that she could not ignore the situation, especially since her own students had told her about the incident and had expressed their disapproval of this type of behavior. She felt that she should set an example for her students. She went over to one of the girls involved and caught her as she was going inside the hallway. The hallway was darkened

and no classrooms were on either side of the hall. It was the only time that Ms. Smith, in her teaching career, felt that she might be injured. A large group of students, one hundred or more, created a mob situation. The girl had the soda pop and Ms. Smith was keeping up with her to take her to the office. The student hit at the teacher. Two or three of the other students whom Ms. Smith knew as "trouble makers" said, "Hit old whitie, hit her!" Ms. Smith said it would not have bothered her if the girl had struck her because this was a problem that she felt she must handle. At that time, the assistant principal arrived and took control of the situation.

Given the power to change her present school, Ms. Smith said she would "take children and put them on the same level." She further explained her statement by saying that the difference in socio-economic levels was the greatest deterrent to the educational process at Washington. When the lowest and highest socio-economic levels are put together as they were at Washington, Ms. Smith said that name calling and differences in behavior and vocabulary provided an offensive situation to the parents and students who were not accustomed to that type of culture. She maintained that this one fact provided an impetus for parents to withdraw their children from public schools and enroll them in private school situations.

The investigator continued the interview by asking Ms. Smith to define the purposes of several staff positions. She defined her purpose as a teacher by first saying that "it may sound a little corny, but I have been a dedicated teacher." She said that she has had as a core interest the desire to make students better educated and to have them become better readers. The purpose of the principal was to be supportive

and to be a friend to the teacher. She said that she did not like a critical principal because she felt that a person did the best he could at that particular moment. The assistant principal was viewed in largely the same light as the principal. Ms. Smith said that if she had a problem the assistant principals had always been helpful to her, although she tried "not to overdo the problem thing." She further stated that if there was a problem in her classroom, she felt it was her responsibility to handle the problem rather than seek outside resolution of the problem. The purpose of the counselor was to help students resolve conflicts and to cooperate with teachers in helping students with their problems.

Ms. Smith had a set of rules for her classroom that had been written down in the past. She said she read them orally but did not have them written out or posted because the students knew who she was and what she stood for. She said the one reason she would have referred students on Student Disciplinary Referral Forms to the office would have been for fighting. She said that she could handle just about anything else that might have developed in her classroom.

On a scale of 1 - 10, with 10 being high, the teacher rated the discipline of her present school as 8. She rated the discipline in her classroom as 8. On a scale of 1 - 10, Ms. Smith rated herself as a teacher as 8. She said that at another time she would have rated herself higher. Her strongest area as a teacher was that she cared about students. Her weakest area was that she felt she was dictatorial.

At the completion of the interview, the investigator asked the teacher to discuss her reasons for retiring at the end of the school year. Ms. Smith said that she liked the youngsters very much but disliked the behavior of the sixth graders. She said that she had taught sixth

grade before and she felt that the students were changing; they seemed agitated. Every day was almost like starting over as a substitute. Her idea about why this situation had occurred was that the students themselves were not secure in their home situations, that they had been left to entertain themselves and had not developed the self-discipline that she felt was necessary to be good students.

When the investigator asked Ms. Smith to choose the one student that she would most like to see removed from her classroom if it were reorganized, she had no difficulty in naming a Caucasian female named Jennifer. Ms. Smith indicated that the investigator might be surprised at her choice because Jennifer was a good student and was no discipline problem. Her reason for choosing Jennifer was the fact that the student was so negative that it threatened Ms. Smith to have to deal with her. Choosing the one student that she would most like to keep if her classes were reorganized was very difficult for Ms. Smith. She said that there were many she would like to keep and that she could not put her finger on any one student. When the investigator pressed the issue by indicating that these students would be interviewed and that it would be most helpful if she could identify one student among the ones she would like to keep, Ms. Smith said she could pick one that she felt was rather delightful. She named John, a Caucasian male, as a student that she would "just as soon keep as any of them."

On the self-report instruments, Ms. Smith scored 38 on the Pupil Control Ideology. The mean teacher score on this instrument was reported by Willower (1973) as 58.8. The higher the score, the more custodial was the teacher's pupil control ideology. Ms. Smith scored below the mean for teachers. Her score on the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale (Form E) was 143. In

studies completed by Willower (1973), he determined that a score of 111.2 or lower was representative of an open minded teacher. A score of 180.2 or above was found to be representative of a closed minded teacher.

The investigator observed Ms. Smith's class on two different days during the second class period from 10:15 to 11:05. The observations were separated by a one day interval because a majority of the students were gone on a field trip on the day following the first observation. During the observations, the investigator noted behaviors that would characterize Gage's four characteristics of effective teachers. Teacher behavior in greeting and dismissing students was noted as a characteristic of teacher warmth. On the occasion of the first observation, Ms. Smith greeted each student individually, as well as the investigator, as they came in the classroom door. There was no collective greeting given the class as a whole. To begin the class, students were asked to get out their paper and pencils and to continue with the penmanship assignment. On the second day of observation, the same greeting format was followed, but time was taken at the very beginning of class to discuss the field trip that the students had taken the day before. One student had gotten lost for a short time. This student was given some personal supportive attention by the teacher. Ms. Smith related a personal experience about skunks being in a portable classroom that she had once occupied. Another student in the classroom was recognized for accomplishment in a track event.

Leave taking statements of the first observation were: "We tried. We'll try again next time. Then we will be so smart it will be terrible. You are excused." Closing the second observation the teacher said, "Keep your papers until tomorrow. Put them in your books and I'll

take them tomorrow." On both occasions, several students said, "Bye, Ms. Smith" or "See you tomorrow."

During the observations, the teacher gave directions and instruction from the front of the classroom. When students were working, she moved about the classroom. Each day Ms. Smith touched students on several occasions. When helping a student, she would pat them on the back or put her hand on their shoulder. One student went to sleep in class. Ms. Smith gently rubbed his back. When she reprimanded a student for a messy book, she gently touched the shoulder of that student. She was very liberal in using please and thank you in her requests of students. When the teacher spotted a student chewing gun, she said, "Mark, do you have a foreign substance in your mouth?" No other words were spoken to the student, but he removed the gum without hesitation. In illiciting a student's aid in leading the choral reading of a poem written on the chalkboard, Ms. Smith said, "Kendall, will you help, because you're a good leader."

Another of Gage's characteristics of effective teachers is indirectness. During the observations of Ms. Smith's classroom, several instances of indirectness were noted. When students would ask questions, Ms. Smith responded warmly, accepting their ideas, but asking for clarification. If a student was close to an answer, Ms. Smith would ask probing questions in an attempt to illicit the correct answer from the student. A student was given the opportunity to tell about reading the Shakespearean play, "Hamlet." This was the result of a challenge by the teacher to the student to read the play and report to the class. Another student gave biographical sketches of Charles and Mary Lamb, poets who were discussed by Ms. Smith in such a manner during the first observation that a student wanted to read more about the "crazy" poets.

Enthusiasm is another characteristic of effective teachers that Gage has identified. During the periods of observation, Ms. Smith moved the class along, sharing personal experiences, as well as listening to students' personal experiences. She moved about the classroom as needed. Enthusiasm about the subject matter was evident by her voice inflections and the pace at which she kept the class moving. When introducing the poetry, her enthusiasm was evident by facial and vocal inflection. Prepositions were also reviewed with obvious enthusiasm. Statements like "I know this has been hard for us to understand, but I know we can do it!" were made frequently by Ms. Smith.

Cognitive organization, Gage's fourth characteristic, was evidence by the continuity noted during the two observations. Penmanship was an ongoing assignment. The poetry changed daily but was also a re-occurring part of the class. The teacher's illustrations and comments indicated a great deal of understanding of the subject matter. Lesson plans that were turned in to the administration on the fifteenth of the month were closely congruent with the lessons that were presented during the observation period. The lesson was one day off schedule because of the field trip on the intervening day.

John was chosen as the student that Ms. Smith would "just as soon keep as any of them." During the interview with John, he identified Ms. Smith as his favorite teacher. His reasons were: "She's nice and she teaches well." He said that he liked school because it teaches him a lot and because he "just likes it." His ideal teacher would be one who helps somebody. He volunteered that Ms. Smith did that. "She gives you a lot of information on the subject."

John's most recent California Achievement Test (3-7-79) reflected the following scores: Total Reading score was 7.6, 61 percentile, 6 stanine.

John's grade point average for the fall semester, 1978-79, was 2.50. His lowest grade was a C. He received a C in Ms. Smith's class. John did not have a discipline record for 1978-79.

Jennifer was the student that Ms. Smith chose as the one she would most like to see removed from her classroom. During the interview with the investigator, Jennifer chose Ms. Smith as her least favorite teacher, saying she just did not like language arts that much. She said she liked school because she "just wants to learn." Her ideal teacher would be smart and "someone who would teach you something." Jennifer's California Achievement Test scores (3-7-79) indicated her Total Reading score as 10.6, 91 percentile, 7 stanine. Jennifer's grade point average for the fall semester of 1978-79 was 3.75. Her lowest grade was a B. She received an A in Ms. Smith's language arts class for the fall semester. Jennifer did not have a discipline record for 1978-79.

Several existing records were examined to provide information about the teacher. These records included: Student Disciplinary Referral Forms, principal's evaluations, college transcripts, teaching certificates, computer grade records, and computer leave balance printouts.

During the teacher interview, Ms. Smith told the investigator that the only reason she would initiate a disciplinary referral would be for fighting. Data gathered from examination of the disciplinary referrals included:

First Semester

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Number of referrals: | 4 | |
| Reason for referrals: | Disrupting class | 2 |
| | Hitting another student | 2 |
| Race of students: | 3 black | 1 white |
| Gender of students: | 4 male | |

Second Semester

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Number of referrals: | 4 | |
| Reason for referrals: | Disruptive behavior | 4 |
| Race of students: | 3 black | 1 white |
| Gender of students: | 1 male | 3 female |

Ms. Smith's last formal evaluation was completed in 1973-74. At that time, she was a sixth grade reading teacher at another middle school in the district. Ms. Smith received "Outstanding" ratings in five of the eleven major areas of teaching effectiveness, including: Teaching techniques, pupil growth, classroom environment, professional practices, and personal factors. Ratings of "Excellent" were given for the remaining six areas, including: Staff relationships, professional growth, participation in pupil activity program, community relationships, curriculum work, and school committee and supervisory assignments. This evaluation resulted in a mean rating of 4.45 (5 = Outstanding; 4 = Excellent.)

Ms. Smith had a standard elementary teaching certificate, a special education certificate, and a reading specialist certificate. An analysis of Ms. Smith's transcripts indicated that she was a slightly better-than-average student during her undergraduate training from 1932-1936. She had six hours of A, fifty-eight and one-half hours of B, and eighty-three hours of C for a total of 147.5 credit hours. This resulted in an undergraduate grade point average of 2.47. Graduate study required to renew her teaching certificate and to complete the master's of teaching degree included forty-six credit hours. These hours included twenty-seven hours of A and nineteen hours of B, resulting in an overall grade average of 3.59. Since completing her master's degree, Ms. Smith had participated in additional workshops and seminars in areas of interest, including reading and psychology.

The central office provided individual schools with records via computer printouts. One such printout included a listing of all final grades given. An examination of final semester grades indicated that Ms. Smith recorded no failing grades.

Another record that was examined was the computer printout listing leave balances and number of days and reasons that the teacher had missed a day of work. This record included data for the 1978-79 school year through April 27, 1979. The record indicated that Ms. Smith had a cumulative leave balance of 87.50 days. A total of 10.50 days had been used during the 1978-79 school year as sick leave. Another day had been used for personal business leave, making the total days absent from work 11.50.

## High Referring Teachers

### Ms. Hall

Ms. Hall was a tall, neatly dressed, thirty-two year old black woman. At the time of the study, she was teaching seventh grade science at Washington Middle School. Her family background included a mother who completed two years of college and worked as a technician for the Internal Revenue Service and a father who completed a bachelor's degree and worked in a public relations office. She had one brother who had completed one and one-half years of college and worked as a laborer. During her freshman year in college, Ms. Hall married her present husband. He was, at the time of the investigation, a physician completing a residency in psychiatry. She was the mother of two elementary school-age children.

Ms. Hall grew up in a metropolitan city in the Midwest. She attended a large state university during her freshman year, 1964-65. She then married her husband, who was in military service. They were assigned

to a military base within the state. Ms. Hall continued her college career at a small state-supported four-year college, graduating with a Bachelor of Arts degree in history in 1972. After moving to the metropolitan area, Ms. Hall became involved in Teacher Corps and completed a Master's Degree in elementary education in May of 1975 at a state university.

Her teaching experience was limited to teaching science at Washington Middle School. She had taught for four years. During her two year involvement with Teacher Corps, she taught social studies.

During an interview with the investigator, Ms. Hall related information that gave insight about her feelings regarding teaching. She said she became a teacher because she wanted a career to "fall back on" if she needed to go to work. It was not her first choice as a profession. She began her college career in pre-law and was, at the time of the interview, still intent on obtaining a Juris Doctorate at a future time. She could not isolate any one person that was influential in her becoming a teacher but instead cited circumstances as being the reason she chose teaching as a profession.

Her best teaching experience could not be identified. She told the investigator that teaching was day-to-day for her and that some days were better than other days. Her teaching preferences included science as a subject preference, seventh grade as the level preference, and a student who came to class prepared and wanting to learn as her student preference.

Ms. Hall identified lack of parental support as her most serious complaint about teaching. She said that parents did not give the students the idea that school was the place to go to better themselves. The greatest asset of teaching was identified by Ms. Hall as seeing a student "really

proud" of something they had done. Her brightest day of teaching could not be identified. Instead, she said that when she saw former students that were progressing and doing well, she felt good about having had a part in their success. Likewise, she could not identify her darkest day of teaching. Ms. Hall described a year when she team-taught with another teacher in an open classroom with sixty students as being the dark year of her teaching experiences. She said she was put in the position of being the disciplinarian for the total group because the other teacher was scared of the students and the students knew it.

If she were given the power to change her school, she would have had everyone involved with the school to be stricter with the students. In some way, she wanted to make the students become more aware of their actions and the consequences of their behavior.

The investigator continued the interview by asking Ms. Hall to define the purpose of several staff positions. She defined her purpose as a teacher by renaming herself as a facilitator. She said she didn't consider herself a teacher of facts but a facilitator to show students how to get the material that they needed in order to learn what they wanted to learn. She said she did not do a lot of lecturing. Instead, her students did a lot of things on their own and she preferred to show them how to get to that point. She identified the purpose of the principal as a major facilitator. The principal was the person that the teachers should go to if they needed materials or support to enhance the school's program. The role of the assistant principal was described as "a listener of the problems between the teachers and the students." In addition, Ms. Hall said the assistant principal should be a disciplinarian and a monitor of everything that was going on in the school. The role of the counselor was

viewed as a helping role. "Ideally," Ms. Hall said, "counselors would counsel with students and then follow through." In practice, she felt that the counselors spent most of their time doing pencil and paper-type duties.

The investigator asked Ms. Hall if she had a set of rules for her classroom. She said she did have a set of rules and they were written at the beginning of the school year. The rules were read to the students orally and presented in written form on a transparency. She said she would send a student to the office for fighting, disruptive behavior, and talking back to the teacher. She added that these were the major reasons. She defined disruptive behavior as a student being out of his seat without permission or really being disruptive to the classroom process. On a scale of 1 - 10, with 10 being high, Ms. Hall rated the discipline of Washington Middle School as 5. She rated the discipline in her classroom as 5.

On the same rating scale of 1 - 10, with 10 being high, Ms. Hall rated herself as a teacher as "about a 6." She identified her strongest area as being sympathetic toward the needs of the students. Her weakest area was being short-tempered with the students.

During the interview, the investigator presented the teacher with a hypothetical situation. If all of her classes were to be reorganized, she could pick one student that she would most like to see removed from her classroom and one student that she would most like to see retained in her classroom. Ms. Hall chose Brian, a Caucasian male, as the student she would most like to see removed from her classes. She chose Wendy, a Caucasian female, as the student she would most like to retain in her classes.

On the self-report instruments, Ms. Hall scored 46 on the Pupil Control Ideology Form and 113 on the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale (Form E). The mean teacher score on the Pupil Control Ideology was reported by Willower (1973) as 58.8. The higher the score, the more custodial was the teacher's pupil control ideology. A score of 113 on the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale is close to the mean score for open minded teachers (111.2) reported by Willower (1973). The higher the score , the higher the degree of closed mindedness.

The investigator observed Ms. Hall's classroom on two consecutive days during the first class period of the day. This period began at 9:15 and ended at 10:10. During the observations, the investigator noted behaviors that would characterize Gage's four characteristics of effective teachers. Teacher behavior in greeting and dismissing students was noted as a characteristic of teacher warmth. On the occasion of the first observation, the greeting statement of the teacher was: "Okay, if you haven't gotten one yet, you can come up and get a weather book. Laurie, this is not a beauty shop." At the beginning of the second observation, the teacher said, "Okay, let's get started. Open to page fifteen." Leave taking statements for the first observation were preceded by the teacher waiting until the class was quiet before she would dismiss them. The students were protesting that they would be late to their next class. After the students had sat at their desks for more than two minutes, Ms. Hall dismissed them by saying, "Leave your books on the table." To end the class period on the second day of observation, Ms. Hall said, "Okay, you can go."

Another behavior that was noted as an indicator of warmth was the teacher's position in the classroom. During both observations, the teacher sat in a student chair close to the front of the classroom. Student-

teacher dialogue, an indicator of warmth, was also an area that the investigator made note of during the observation. During the periods of observation, the teacher told two different students to "shut up." Several times during the observations, the teacher stopped the lesson by saying something similar to this statement that the investigator recorded: "Folks! We're doing an assignment." During the course of the classroom observations, Ms. Hall frequently called out students' first names to get their attention back to the lesson. There was no touching of the students observed and no individual help given to the students.

During the second observation, the teacher informed the students that if they were talking they would receive an F for their daily grade. The teacher would occasionally call out a student's first name during the class period and would indicate that she was recording an F for their grade.

Another characteristic of effective teachers identified by Gage was indirectness. During the observations in Ms. Hall's classroom, the students were reading orally from a paperback book written by a local meteorologist. After a section had been read orally, the teacher directed the students to record facts verbatim from the book. There was one instance when the teacher referred to a previous investigation about pressures. The application that she made was that some of the destruction caused by tornadoes was caused by the abrupt pressure reduction near the tornado center that causes the pressure inside the structure to be higher than on the outside. The teacher made the explanation. She did not ask the students to add to her explanation nor did she encourage questions about the phenomenon. This was the only observed instance of any teaching procedure that could possibly be related to indirectness.

Enthusiasm was a third characteristic identified by Gage. During the observation, the investigator observed no enthusiasm for the current lesson or the class in general. A notable condition existed during the observation. The subject being studied was the state's violent weather. During the first classroom hour observed, a violent electrical storm was in progress. Although this was the first day to study the subject and to begin the new books, the teacher made no reference to the storm and made no introduction to the book that the students were going to be reading. Instead, the only reference that was made to the weather occurring at that time was a plea from several students sitting by the windows that the windows be closed. Ms. Hall did not verbally acknowledge the pleas, but she later closed the windows. The investigator noted that there was no students' science work displayed in the classroom. The room was in disorder, with books and papers placed haphazardly around the room. Some of the science equipment was on the cabinets. Writing on the chalkboard was several days old.

Cognitive organization was a characteristic described by Gage as relating to how well a teacher understood the subject matter that they were teaching and their ability to relate that subject matter to their students. Lesson plans that were submitted to the administrator April 30, 1979, were not followed during the observations on May 2 and 3. Material was presented in such a manner that the teacher's understanding was not observable. Students read orally from the book and then recorded facts verbatim from that book. At one point during the observation, Ms. Hall reprimanded the class for talking and required them to copy an entire paragraph from the book.

Brian was the student chosen by Ms. Hall to be removed from her classroom. Brian was a Caucasian male student. During the interview with

the investigator, Brian did not choose Ms. Hall as either his favorite or least favorite teacher. When asked specifically how he felt about Ms. Hall, Brian said, "She's okay. I like her. I don't like science, but I like her." Brian said that he thought school was okay. He said he did not really dislike it. His ideal teacher was described as "one that doesn't get on to you for every little thing you do."

Brian's most recent Otis-Lennon Mental Ability Test (10-17-78) placed him at the 48 percentile, 5 stanine. The California Achievement Test (2-28-79) indicated that Brian was reading at the 6.5 grade level and was placed at 39 percentile, 4 stanine. Brian's grade point average for the first semester of 1978-79 was 1.00. His lowest grade was a D. In Ms. Hall's science class he made a D. During the 1978-79 school year, Brian was referred to the office as a disciplinary problem four times. The reasons for referral were:

1. Taking screws out of the bus seats and throwing them out the window
2. Failure to follow teacher's directions to come to the office for throwing snowballs
3. Not working in class
4. Poor attitude

Wendy was the student that Ms. Hall chose as the one student she would like to keep if her classes were reorganized. During the interview with the investigator, Wendy did not choose Ms. Hall as either her favorite or least favorite teacher. When specifically asked how she felt about Ms. Hall, she replied, "I like her. I think she's real nice." Wendy said she liked school because if she did not go to school there would not be anything to do. Her ideal teacher would be one who was nice and willing to

help students. Also, Wendy expressed her opinion that a teacher should let students do fun things every once in awhile.

Wendy's most recent Otis-Lennon Mental Ability Test (10-16-78) placed her at the 85 percentile, 7 stanine. The California Achievement Test (2-28-79) indicated that Wendy's reading level was a 12.9 grade equivalent. This grade equivalent was the upper extreme of the test's limits. Wendy did not have a discipline record for the 1978-79 school year. Wendy's grade point average for the first semester of the 1978-79 school year was 4.0.

Several existing records were examined to provide information about the teacher. These records included: Student Disciplinary Referral Forms, principal's evaluations, college transcripts, teaching certificates, computer grade records, and computer leave balance printouts.

During the teacher interview, Ms. Hall told the investigator that she would send students to the administrator as a disciplinary referral for fighting, talking back to the teacher, and disrupting class. Information gathered in an examination of the Student Disciplinary Referral Forms submitted during the 1978-79 school year included:

First Semester

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Number of referrals: | 26 | |
| Reason for referrals: | Disrupting class | 11 |
| | Fighting | 5 |
| | Picking or hitting at another student | 3 |
| | Leaving class without permission | 2 |
| | Tardy | 2 |
| | Writing in textbook | 2 |
| | Arguing or talking back to teacher | 1 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Race of students: | 19 black | 7 white |
| Gender of students: | 16 male | 10 female |

Second Semester

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Number of referrals: | 33 | |
| Reason for referrals: | Fighting | 12 |
| | Leaving room without permission | 5 |
| | Playing, not working | 5 |
| | Defiant, refusing to follow teacher's directions | 4 |
| | Talking while another student was reading | 2 |
| | Playing with paperwads | 1 |
| | Turning on water full force | 1 |
| | Taking faucet off, "causing water to spray everywhere" | 1 |
| | Tardy | 1 |
| | Cutting class | 1 |
| Race of students: | 24 black | 9 white |
| Gender of students: | 23 male | 10 female |

Ms. Hall was formally evaluated by the principal during the 1977-78 school year. She was rated "Outstanding" in five areas. These areas included: Professional practices, staff relationships, personal factors, community relationships, curriculum work. Six areas were recorded as "Excellent." These included: Teaching techniques, pupil growth, classroom environment, professional growth, participation in pupil activity program, and school committee and supervisory assignments. The evaluation resulted in a mathematical mean of 4.45 (5 = Outstanding; 4 = Excellent).

Ms. Hall had a standard elementary teaching certificate and qualified for a secondary teaching certificate in social studies. An examination of her undergraduate transcript revealed that Ms. Hall had fifty-four hours of A and seven hours of F recorded in her 137 semester credit hours applied to her undergraduate degree. Her total grade point average was 2.91. Her graduate grade point average was 3.45.

The central office of the school district provided the individual schools with certain information in the form of computer printouts. One such printout provided the number of F grades assigned by individual teachers. For the spring semester of 1978-79, Ms. Hall recorded eighteen F's for final grades.

Another computer-prepared record indicated the leave balances of the staff at Washington Middle School. The printout examined by the investigator was current through April 27, 1979. Ms. Hall had a cumulative leave balance of 5.50 days. During the year of the study, she had used 7.00 days of sick leave and 1.00 day of personal business leave, making a total of 8.00 days that she had been absent from work during the 1978-79 school year.

Other pertinent data that was in Ms. Hall's file included a memo from the principal asking her to refrain from keeping students in the classroom as a disciplinary measure, thus forcing them to be late to lunch. There was also a "Guest Teacher Report" included in the file that indicated the dissatisfaction on the part of a substitute teacher. The written comment was: "These classes are not disciplined." There was a reply written by Ms. Hall to the substitute teacher's charge: "I have no confidence in this substitute teacher as far as disciplining my classes go. I do not want this substitute teacher substituting for me again."

Ms. Brown

Ms. Brown was a fifty-six year old Caucasian female. Her attractive appearance was enhanced by expensive clothing and jewelry. At the time of the investigation, she was teaching seventh grade science at Washington Middle School. Her family background included a high school educated father who was in the oil business and a mother who had completed some college hours but who did not work outside the home. She had one sister who lacked five hours completing a college degree. Her sister had never worked outside the home. Ms. Brown had been divorced for fourteen years. She had four adult children.

Ms. Brown grew up in a small town within the state. After graduating from high school, she attended a large state university. In 1944, she graduated from the university with a Bachelor of Arts degree in vocational home economics. In 1976, Ms. Brown completed requirements for the elementary teaching certificate at a nearby state university. She said she lacked five hours of having a master's degree. Ms. Brown had attended several workshops at various colleges and universities within the state dealing with subjects that interested her, but she had no interest in obtaining a graduate degree.

After she received her bachelor's degree, she obtained a teaching position in a rural community located in a remote part of the state. A family friend was the superintendent of schools. Later, this family friend became a prominent figure in state education. Ms. Brown related the feeling that she had when she first arrived at the rural town for her first teaching assignment as being one of unbelief. She was used to dressing in hats, high-heeled shoes, gloves, and expensive clothing. She immediately became aware that she did not fit the stereotype of the rural school teacher.

Nevertheless, she said she loved the experience and taught there for three years. She said that a highlight of that experience was that her word was law and whatever she said was followed.

Ms. Brown indicated that her parents were appalled at her choice of a career and wanted her to join her father in the oil business instead. After her third year of teaching, she married a man from the metropolitan area and moved back to the city. She taught one additional year of vocational home economics at a small school outside the city. After the fourth year of teaching, she became a homemaker and had four children in the ensuing years.

Fifteen years later, Ms. Brown found herself financially comfortable but very upset with her husband. She subsequently divorced him. After a psychologically devastating period, her former superintendent and friend, now a state education official, almost forced her to begin teaching again. The position was in a new elementary school in a suburban area. Although Ms. Brown had not had any training in elementary education and did not have appropriate certification, she was hired for the fall term as a teacher to help open a new elementary school. At this time, she began work on elementary certification at a nearby state college. After two years of teaching at the elementary school, she resigned, citing the driving distance of fifty miles per day as undesirable. She was then solicited by the city school system to teach in an elementary school within three miles of her home. She taught there for four years.

At the end of four years, she said that several of the teachers were required to leave the school in order to help open a nearby elementary school the next year. The principal did not want to make the decision about who was to stay, but, instead, left the decision to the teachers. Ms.

Brown did not like the ambiguity of this situation. She said, "I like to know where I am and where I am going at all times." Knowing that the school district was in the process of integrating its teaching staffs, Ms. Brown applied for a transfer to an all-black elementary school. She did this, as she said, "to get it behind me." Her theory was that all teachers would have to spend some time in an integrated school. Knowing that she would have been assigned to one school or the other was not an acceptable situation for Ms. Brown. She said she could not stand being on the fence. She taught two years in the segregated school. She said she loved the experience, mainly because the principal was so direct with her. She said she liked a principal that told her where she was and how she was doing at all times. If she was wrong, she wanted the principal to call her into his office and tell her what she was doing wrong.

After two years, the district implemented a new integration plan, moving sixth grade teachers and students to middle schools. Ms. Brown could have stayed at the school as a fifth grade teacher, but she said she was not willing to teach any grade lower than sixth grade. She said she was basically a high school teacher. Ms. Brown chose to teach at Washington Middle School, a school within a mile of her home. She was given the choice of teaching science or social studies. She said she chose teaching science because she did not "give a damn" about what happened in the past. Ms. Brown had taught a total of twenty-one years in six different schools at the elementary, middle, and high school levels.

Ms. Brown related that she became a teacher by choice. The person most instrumental in her choosing teaching as a career was a sixth grade teacher. Ms. Brown said that the sixth grade teacher took an interest in her and gave her a good foundation for the rest of her schooling. She said

that she decided early in life that she wanted to help others as she had been helped.

The investigator asked the teacher to describe her best teaching experience. Ms. Brown said that her favorite teaching experience had been her current position at Washington until the 1978-79 school year. She cited problems with one specific team member and difficulties with the administrator as being conflicts that had made the year less pleasant than she had previously experienced. She felt that there was a lack of cooperation among the total staff and that each person was doing his own job at the expense of a united effort. Ms. Brown's teaching preferences were teaching math at the middle school level to average students. The preferences were congruent with her present assignment except for the subject area.

The investigator asked Ms. Brown to discuss her most serious complaint about teaching. She said that the non-involvement of parents was her greatest concern at the moment. The greatest asset of teaching was, to Ms. Brown, the rewarding feeling that she received from helping others. Ms. Brown was unable to identify the brightest day of her teaching career. She attributed this to the fact that the present year had been so "hellish" that she was at a loss to remember the bright days of her previous years. Her darkest day of her teaching experience occurred when she was teaching sixth grade in an elementary school. During a tornado drill, a new student, that Ms. Brown described as having a short attention span and who was "unable to read or do anything," did not follow her directions, but started leaping over other students. Ms. Brown said she lost her temper and slapped the student in the face. She added that she did get the student's attention at that point. Immediately after the tornado drill, the teacher approached the principal to inform him of the incident. She then telephoned

the student's mother and informed her of the incident and apologized for losing her temper and behaving in a manner that she perceived as unprofessional. She said that the mother was very understanding and was most supportive. Ms. Brown expressed regret for the incident and said she had wished many times that it had not occurred. Given the opportunity to change her school, Ms. Brown said she thought that there could be better cooperation between the teachers and the administration.

During the interview, the investigator asked Ms. Brown to identify purposes of various staff members. She said the purpose of the teacher was to teach subject matter. She felt the purpose of the principal was to lead or direct, to give the staff the guidelines or "hand-me-downs" from the board of education. The assistant principal was succinctly described as a "disciplinarian." The counselor was viewed as one who counsels and helps a child see his own worth and good.

The subject of discipline was approached in the interview by the following question: "Do you have a set of rules?" Ms. Brown replied that she did have a set of rules and that they were written in her lesson plan book. Students were made aware of the rules by the teacher reading them to the class at the beginning of the school year and periodically throughout the year. Some of the reasons that the teacher would initiate a Student Disciplinary Referral Form included: obscene language, obscene gestures, uncooperativeness, not being able to get along, some type of altercation. On a scale of 1 - 10, with 10 being high, Ms. Brown rated the discipline in her present school as 4. She rated the discipline in her classroom as 6. On the same scale, the teacher rated herself as a teacher as a 10. She named two areas that she felt were her strengths: The ability to work on committees and the ability to work with students. Her weakest area was

identified as the inability to get along with her present team members. In the ensuing discussion, Ms. Brown indicated that actually only one teacher was upset and that she and the remaining two team members cooperated well with one another. She further made it clear to the investigator that the current year was the only year that she had experienced difficulty in relating to her team members.

The investigator presented the teacher with the hypothetical situation of reorganizing her classes. She was asked to choose the one student that she would most like to have removed from her classes and also the one student she would most like to retain in her classes. Ms. Brown had difficulty in choosing a student to remove. After consideration, she chose a black male student named Kenneth. She said her relationship with Kenneth in the hallways was excellent, but that he did not make any effort in the classroom to achieve anything. The student she would most like to keep was Troy, a black male. Ms. Brown said that Troy was a nonperformer too, but that she "just kept hoping."

On the Pupil Control Ideology, Ms. Brown scored 58. Her score on the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale (Form E) was 139. The mean teacher score on the Pupil Control Ideology was reported by Willower (1973) as 58.8. The higher the score, the more custodial was the teacher's pupil control ideology. Willower (1973) also reported results of studies completed with teacher's scores on the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale (Form E). He reported a mean score of 111.2 for open minded teachers and a mean score of 180.2 for closed minded teachers.

The investigator completed two observations in Ms. Brown's classroom. The observations, separated by five days, were completed during the third class period, 11:10 - 11:35. The class was a seventh grade science class. This class period was interrupted by a lunch break.

During the observations, the investigator noted behaviors that were reflective of Gage's four characteristics of effective teachers.

Gage identified warmth as a characteristic of effective teachers. Greeting and leave taking statements of the teacher were noted as an indicator of teacher warmth. Ms. Brown's greeting statements on the occasions of the observations were: "Will you sit down, please?" and "Get in your chairs!" "May I have your undivided attention, please!" Leave taking statements were recorded when the students left the classroom to go to lunch. On the occasion of the first observation, the teacher said, "Put your pencils down." No other direction was given and the students left the classroom. The second observation was concluded by the teacher saying, "Leave your material where it is and we will take up later."

Another behavior noted as an indicator of warmth was the teacher's position in the classroom in relation to the students. Ms. Brown's classroom was a science laboratory. Wooden tables appropriate for four students, rather than individual student desks, provided the seating for the students. On the days that the investigator observed Ms. Brown's class, students were spread throughout the classroom. At the beginning of both class periods, the teacher positioned herself behind a vacant table at the front of the classroom. During the first observation, the teacher remained in this position. During the second observation, after about ten minutes, the teacher moved to one side of the classroom and stood by a student's desk, leading the class from that position. Limited movement around students' desks was observed when the teacher was checking work of the students. Verbal reinforcement was also noted as an indicator of teacher warmth. The teacher gave few verbal reinforcers that could be called positive. A few answers were acknowledged with "Good." The verbal reinforcement most often given was "Okay."

Indirectness was another characteristic of effective teachers identified by Gage. During the class periods observed, the students were using lab manuals and textbooks. The teacher led the class in reading questions from the lab manual, looking for the answer in the textbook and recording the answer in the lab manual. Virtually all of the student-teacher dialogue was of this nature. The following dialogue was the closest that the teacher and student dialogue came to reflecting indirectness or inquiry:

Teacher: "What is located off of the coast of Alaska?"

Student: "Water."

Teacher: "What kind of water?"

Student: "An ocean."

Teacher: "What ocean?"

Student: "The Pacific."

Teacher: "Okay!"

A third characteristic of effective teachers identified by Gage was enthusiasm. During the observations, the investigator did not observe enthusiasm about the subject or the class in general by either the teacher or the students. There was no student work displayed in the classroom. The students appeared conditioned to the modus operandi of the classroom.

Cognitive organization was the final characteristic that Gage identified for effective teachers. An examination of lesson plans submitted to the administration on April 30, 1979, revealed that they were appropriate for the activities presented in the classroom on May 10 and May 15. There was negligible expansion of ideas or clarification of concepts observed in Ms. Brown's classroom. There were no examples or personal illustrations to indicate to what degree the teacher understood the concepts.

During the teacher interview, Ms. Brown identified Kenneth, a black male student, as the student she would like to see removed from her classroom. She described Kenneth as a student who put forth little effort. During the interview with the investigator, Kenneth identified Ms. Brown as his least favorite teacher. He said, "She don't like to help me with my work that much. If you do one little thing, she is on your case." Kenneth said he liked school, adding, "It's all right." He did not have any thoughts on how to describe his ideal teacher.

Kenneth had a 1.00 grade point average for the fall 1978-79 semester. His lowerst grade was an F. He made two F's for semester grades. He received an F in Ms. Brown's class. Kenneth's most current California Achievement Test (2-28-79) showed that his Total Reading score was 5.7 grade equivalent, 39 percentile, 3 stanine. Kenneth's discipline record included six referrals to the administrator's office. Reasons that he was referred included:

1. Refusing to cooperate with teacher
2. Arguing with another student
3. Stealing
4. Laughing and talking in class
5. Poor attitude
6. Vulgar language

If Ms. Brown's classes were reorganized, she most wanted to retain Troy, a black male student. The teacher described Troy as a non-performer, but one she kept hoping would begin to work. During an interview with the investigator, Troy identified Ms. Brown as his least favorite teacher. He said that he had to do a lot of work in her class and that he got behind in his work. "In general," Troy said, "school is okay. I'm ready to come

back when it's the end of summer." He described his ideal teacher as strict, but fair.

Troy's Otis-Lennon Mental Ability score (10-16-78) was 23 percentile, 4 stanine. His California Achievement Test (2-28-79) Total Reading score was 2.9 grade equivalent, 2 percentile, 1 stanine. Troy's grade point average was 1.50 for the fall semester of 1978-79. His lowest grades were D's. He received a D in Ms. Brown's science class. Troy's discipline record for the 1978-79 school year included two referrals to the administrator. One referral was for loud arguing and the other for hitting another student with drumsticks.

Several existing records were examined by the investigator to gain insight about the teacher's behaviors and characteristics. These records included: Student Disciplinary Referral Forms submitted to the administrator, principal's evaluations, teaching certificates, college transcripts, number of F's given, leave balance records, and other information found in the principal's files.

During the teacher interview, Ms. Brown told the investigator that she would initiate a Student Disciplinary Referral Form for the following reasons: obscene language, obscene gestures, uncooperativeness, not being able to get along, and some type of altercation. An analysis of the student disciplinary referrals that Ms. Brown made was reflected in the data below:

First Semester

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Number of referrals: | 37 | |
| Reason for referrals: | Not working | 11 |
| | Chasing, running, laughing during classtime | 6 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Leaving room without permission | 5 |
| | Blowing objects, shooting paperwads | 4 |
| | Hitting or popping another student | 4 |
| | Talking back to teacher | 3 |
| | Putting ink on another student | 1 |
| | Vulgar language | 1 |
| | Eating in class | 1 |
| | Tardy | 1 |
| Race of students | 28 black | 9 white |
| Gender of students: | 30 male | 7 female |

Second Semester

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Number of referrals: | 39 | |
| Reason for referrals: | Disrupting class | 13 |
| | Shooting water from syringe | 5 |
| | Not working | 4 |
| | Tardy | 3 |
| | Putting pantyhose on head | 2 |
| | Unmanly advance to a female student | 1 |
| | Copying | 1 |
| | Throwing paperwads | 1 |
| | Running in class | 1 |
| | Vulgar language | 1 |
| | Leaving class without permission | 1 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Talking back to teacher | 1 |
| | Throwing shoes across room | 1 |
| | Playing with basketball | 1 |
| | Wasting tape - wrapping around finger | 1 |
| | Writing vulgar notes | 1 |
| | Popping party popper | 1 |
| Race of students: | 25 black | 14 white |
| Gender of students: | 29 male | 11 female |

Ms. Brown was evaluated by the principal of Washington Middle School during the 1978-79 school year. The evaluation was reported on "The Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness, Principal's Report." The form showed that Ms. Brown was rated "Outstanding" in two areas: Staff relationships and school committee and supervisory assignments. "Excellent" ratings were recorded for eight areas: Teaching techniques, pupil growth, classroom environment, professional practices, personal factors, participation in pupil activity program, community relationships, and curriculum work. "Satisfactory" was recorded for the area of professional growth. The evaluation yielded a mathematical mean of 4.5 (5 = Outstanding; 4 = Excellent.)

Ms. Brown had a vocational home economics teaching certificate. She also had a standard elementary teaching certificate. An examination of her undergraduate transcript indicated that she had five hours of A, thirty-five hours of B, sixty-five hours of C, thirty-two hours of D, and thirteen hours of F. This made a total of 150 hours attempted for the undergraduate degree, with a resulting grade point average of 2.09. A graduate transcript was not available for examination.

The school district's central office provided the individual schools with certain pertinent information in the form of computer printouts. One such printout was of the final grades given at the end of each semester. An examination of the data indicated that Ms. Brown recorded thirteen F's for final semester grades.

A computer printout was also examined to determine the number of days Ms. Brown was absent from work. The information included the 1978-79 school year through April 27, 1979. Ms. Brown's cumulative leave balance was 5.00 days. She had used 7.00 days of sick leave during the school year.

Another item that was in Ms. Brown's file was a disability certificate from a doctor. The certificate was dated April 4, 1979. The document stated that Ms. Brown was suffering from high blood pressure and was advised to take a week off from her regular duties to try to bring it under control.

Ms. Johnson

Ms. Johnson was a fifty year old Caucasian female who taught seventh grade mathematics. Her mannerisms and neat appearance created an attractive image for a middle school teacher. Ms. Johnson's family background included parents who did not complete high school. Her father died when she was ten years old; her mother was a housewife. Two younger sisters completed her family. Ms. Johnson was the only member of her family to complete college and pursue a career. Her present family included her husband and two teenage sons.

Ms. Johnson completed high school in a small town within the state and then began college at a nearby state-supported teacher's college. She graduated from in 1950, receiving a Bachelor of Arts degree in education with a major in math and a minor in physical education. Graduate study

included nine hours completed in a National Science Workshop. After completing these nine hours, Ms. Johnson made the decision not to pursue a graduate degree, citing her responsibilities as a mother as the determining factor.

Ms. Johnson moved frequently in her career as a result of her husband's job. She had taught a total of fourteen years in five different schools. In addition, she substitute taught for two years. She credited the two years of substitute teaching with giving her the background to be able to cope with the middle school students of today. In her teaching career she had taught both elementary and middle school age students.

During the investigator's interview with Ms. Johnson, she told how she chose teaching as a career. She said that she went to a small state college that offered little more than an undergraduate degree in education. She felt that an education degree was respectable for a woman and seemed to be a logical choice for her. Later, she worked for an insurance company as an underwriter and had liked it very much. After she had children, she chose to re-enter the teaching profession so that her hours would coordinate with those of her children. She could not choose one person who was instrumental in her becoming a teacher. She said she drifted into the field of education.

Ms. Johnson identified the years that she taught third grade as her best teaching experience. She said that the parental support was very strong and the students were highly motivated. The investigator asked Ms. Johnson about her teaching preferences. She indicated that she preferred teaching mathematics. Then she added that she loved teaching third grade also. Third grade was the level that Ms. Johnson would prefer to teach. A good average student who wanted to learn was her student preference.

Ms. Johnson's most serious complaint about teaching was the number of students who did not care about learning. She illustrated her point by telling about a conference that she recently had with a bright student's parents. The student was failing math but was not putting forth any effort to correct the situation. Ms. Johnson expressed frustration with this type of student. The greatest asset of teaching was that her work day coincided with that of her teenage sons. She also mentioned that it was rewarding when students that have been in her classes in the past came back to visit her and expressed appreciation for her efforts in teaching them.

The brightest day in her teaching career was recalled as a day when Ms. Johnson was teaching the unique properties of the number nine. After explaining to the students that when multiplying nine with a multiplier of two through nine, the sum of the digits of the product equals nine in every instance, an "average" student came up to Ms. Johnson's desk. With eyes reflecting his amazement, he said, "Isn't nine a magnificent number?" The teacher said that she would never forget that day. It was truly the joy of learning personified. This incident happened at Washington Middle School in a seventh grade math class. In prefacing her answer to the investigator's question about her darkest day in her teaching career, Ms. Johnson said that she would not have to go very far back for that experience. Then she related a day a "few years ago" when there was very nearly a riot at Washington Middle School. She also mentioned the year that she spent in an open classroom situation with one hundred eighth graders and two other teachers as a "year of darkest days."

In response to the question, "What improvement would you make if you were given the power to change this school?" Ms. Johnson said, "Oh,

where do I start?" She then rephrased the question and said, "Even bigger than this school, make it an academic institution that needs changing." She felt that students who do not want to learn should be given alternative opportunities, such as vocational training, as early as the middle school level.

Ms. Johnson described the purposes of the positions of school staff in the following manner. She said that the purpose of the teacher was to teach academics. She added that teaching academics was not the exclusive purpose of a teacher, but that it was the main purpose. The principal's purpose was described as one who coordinated and was the authority or head or the school. She further expressed concern about the use of democracy in running the school, saying that she felt everyone should have an opportunity to voice his opinion, but that the principal should make the final decisions. Ms. Johnson summed up the principal's purpose by saying, "I want someone who lets the buck stop there. If you want to know how something is, you go to the principal." The purpose of the assistant principal was viewed as "primarily discipline" and to act in lieu of the principal when the principal was unavailable. The counselor's purpose was ideally to try to "keep students in school and happy." Ms. Johnson felt that the counselors, in reality, shuffled papers and did book work. She indicated that there were times she would have liked to send a student to the counselor for a conference, but felt that it would have been to no avail. In several of these instances, she said she would look for an official reason to send students to the assistant principal on a Student Disciplinary Referral Form. Ms. Johnson had a set of written rules in the form of a checklist. Students were made aware of these rules and if they broke a rule, they were given a check mark. Three check marks for an individual student in one day resulted in a Student Disciplinary Referral Form.

When asked why she would send a student to the administrator for discipline, Ms. Johnson referred to the checklist as little things that kept eating away at discipline in the classroom. In addition to the three check procedure, the teacher said she would refer students to the administrator for the following reasons: fighting, stealing, impertinence to the teacher, as well as not working in the classroom.

The investigator asked Ms. Johnson to rate the discipline of the total school on a scale of 1 - 10, with 10 being high. Ms. Johnson prefaced her answer by saying it was difficult to compare Washington with any other school because she had not been anywhere else in such a long time. She then rated the school-wide discipline as "about average, a 5 or 6." On the same scale, she rated the discipline in her classroom as 6 or 7, stating that she felt that there were very few truly outstanding teachers. She identified her strongest area as knowledge of subject matter and concern that students learn the subject matter. She said that if a student did not want to learn, then she tried to keep them from disrupting the rest of the classroom. In discussion of her previous statement, Ms. Johnson said she gave students D's if they worked very hard and gave D-'s to indicate that the student could not do the work but that he had tried. She further explained that she gave students grades of F even if they could not possibly do the work if they did not put forth effort. She stated that she had mixed feelings about giving F's. She said she hated to give a student a D or D- if he had a 35 grade average, but hated even more to give a student an F and have him promoted to the next grade. Ms. Johnson said she would like to see a procedure that would place, rather than promote, students to the next grade if they made F's in courses. Also, she felt that education had an obligation to business to make it known that the student

had not achieved at an acceptable level by providing some type of differentiation of diplomas and/or notations on transcripts. She viewed her weakest area as a teacher as being impatient with students who would not work or behave properly.

The investigator presented the teacher with the hypothetical situation of classroom reorganization. Ms. Johnson was asked to choose one student she would want to request to be removed from her class and to choose one student she would most want to retain in her class. The student she would choose to have removed was a Caucasian female student named Stacy. Ms. Johnson said Stacy was a student who had ability but would not work. She was also a behavior problem in the classroom to the extent of always doing little things for which Ms. Johnson had to reprimand her. The student she would most like to retain in her classroom was a Caucasian male student named Brian. Brian was an ideal student, according to Ms. Johnson. She described his behavior as "nearly perfect" and his academic ability as "excellent." A classroom full of Brians would be a delight to teach, according to Ms. Johnson.

On the Pupil Control Ideology, Ms. Johnson scored 54. The mean teacher score on this instrument was reported by Willower (1973) as 58.8. The higher the score, the more custodial was the teacher's pupil control ideology. Ms. Johnson scored below the mean score for teachers. Her score on the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale (Form E) was 120. In studies completed by Willower (1973), he determined that a score of 111.2 or lower was representative of an open minded teacher. A score of 180.2 or above was found to be representative of a closed minded teacher.

The investigator observed Ms. Johnson's seventh grade math class on two consecutive days. The observations took place during the second

class period of the day, 10:10 - 11:05. During the observations, the investigator noted behaviors that could be related to Gage's four characteristics of effective teachers. These characteristics included: warmth, enthusiasm, indirectness, and cognitive organization.

Warmth is a characteristic associated with teacher greeting and leave taking statements. On the occasion of the first observation, Ms. Johnson's greeting statements were directions to the class. These included: "Let's get ready. Ladies, it's math time. If you have personal correspondence, put it out of the way." After the roll call, the teacher addressed some individual concerns. One student asked for a clinic pass. Ms. Johnson gave him a band-aid and showed concern for his injured finger. She told another student that she had his hat and would return it to him at 3:30 that same day. The second observation began when the teacher said, "Let's find a seat. We're going to check papers and then see a filmstrip." A student had her hand raised. Ms. Johnson said, "If it's an emergency, I will answer you; if not, I'd rather not." The student put her hand down and the teacher proceeded to call the roll. After she checked attendance, she asked the class members if anyone had a question.

Leave taking statements were: "Straighten up your desks and pick up the paper on the floor. Make sure you do your assignments," and "Let's get ready to go." Another behavior noted by the investigator that reflected teacher warmth and acceptance was how the teacher dealt with incomplete assignments. During the observation, the teacher allowed the students to grade their own papers. They reported their grades to the teacher orally. If the student did not have a paper, Ms. Johnson said, "I will re-record a zero until you have your paper and use my teacher's manual to check it. When you give me a grade, I will record it in place of the zero."

During the grading process, there was no lecture or individual reprimanding of students. The teacher's position in relation to her students changed frequently during the observation. She began the class at her desk. The class was subdivided into two groups. Students were encouraged to move into the group rather than sit at an isolated desk. At various times during the observation, the teacher sat on the edge of her desk, sat next to a student at a student desk, stood by a group of students' desks, and sat with a student while she gave individual help. She moved freely about the room checking student work as requested.

Ms. Johnson's classroom was in very neat order with books neatly arranged in bookshelves. The bulletin boards did not have any examples of student math work, but did have student art work attractively displayed. Also considered a behavior reflecting teacher warmth was positive reinforcement of the student answers. The teacher used "Good" and "Right" most often as positive verbal reinforcers.

Gage identified indirectness as a characteristic of effective teachers. During the observation, the investigator observed both the types of questions that the teacher asked and the way she accepted student answers. On several occasions, the teacher asked a student to try again to complete the question appropriately. An example of an indirect, or inquiry-type, question heard by the investigator was: "How much do you weigh on the earth if you weigh ten pounds on the moon?" The student did not respond correctly, prompting Ms. Johnson to expand and rephrase the question so that the student could answer the question properly. In another instance, the teacher asked a question and the student responded. Ms. Johnson said, "That's close, but not quite right. Do you want to add anything to that?"

A third characteristic identified by Gage was enthusiasm. The

investigator observed a very organized, well-structured math class. The teacher was enthusiastic about the subject matter. Her movement about the classroom and an enthusiastic voice when introducing the lesson were both noted as reflecting enthusiasm.

The final characteristic of Gage's four characteristics of effective teachers was cognitive organization. The teacher had the class of fifteen students divided into two math groups. She worked with each group individually. Her explanations of the subject matter were well-received and seemed to be understood by the students. They asked for clarification and seemed satisfied with the answer they received. Ms. Johnson utilized film strips to introduce new concepts dealing with the metric system. Lesson plans submitted to the administration April 30, 1979, were congruent with the activities and assignments initiated during the observations on May 3 and 4, 1979.

Stacy was Ms. Johnson's student that she would like to have removed from her classes if they were reorganized. In an interview with the investigator, Stacy named Ms. Johnson as her least favorite teacher. She said that she really was unsure why she disliked Ms. Johnson; she just didn't like her that much. She said, "She's just not that friendly." Stacy also volunteered that she did not like math. She said that school was "okay." Stacy clarified her response by adding, "I like it some days and some days, I don't. Some days I'm happy, some days I'm not." Her ideal teacher was described as one who would talk to students a lot, that would be firm, and would have a "nice attitude."

Stacy was a transfer student to Washington Middle School during the second semester of the school year. Mental ability scores were not available. The California Achievement Test (2-28-79) indicated that she

was reading at the 6.8 grade equivalent. Her grade point average was 1.00 for the second semester. Her lowest grade was an F in math, Ms. Johnson's class. Stacy's discipline record for the school year included two disciplinary referrals to the office of the administrator. One of the referrals was written by Ms. Johnson for three infractions of class rules: talking, feet on table, no materials. The other referral was for being tardy four times to science class in a three week period.

The student Ms. Johnson would most want to retain in her classroom was Brian. Brian did not choose Ms. Johnson as his favorite or his least favorite teacher. When the investigator asked Brian how he felt about Ms. Johnson, he said, "She's a good teacher. I like her." Brian had a positive feeling about school. He said an education was very important to him because he planned to go to college.

Brian's Otis-Lennon Mental Ability Test (10-16-78) placed him at the 89 percentile, 8 stanine. His score on the California Achievement Test (2-28-79) showed him reading at the 11.3 grade equivalent. Brian's grade point average for the first semester was 3.75. His lowest grade was a B in science. He made an A in Ms. Johnson's math class. Brian did not have a disciplinary referral record for the 1978-79 school year.

Several existing records were examined to provide information about the teacher. These records included: Student Disciplinary Referral Forms, principal's evaluations, college transcripts, teaching certificates, computer grade records, and computer leave balance printouts.

During the teacher interview, Ms. Johnson listed the following reasons that she would initiate a Student Disciplinary Form. These reasons included: fighting, impertinence to a teacher, and stealing. In addition, Ms. Johnson indicated that she used a checklist of small infractions that,

when added up, caused a discipline problem. Students were given checks in each of their classes for infractions of the rules. When they received three checks in one day they were sent to the office as a disciplinary referral. Items on the checklist included: disrespect and horseplay during the flag salute, tardy, talking during announcements, out of seat without permission, no materials, not working, talking and disturbing class, and chewing gum. An analysis of the Student Disciplinary Referral Forms submitted to the administrator by Ms. Johnson revealed the following information:

First Semester

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Number of referrals: | 28 | |
| Reason for referrals: | Three checks | 17 |
| | Talking or arguing | 4 |
| | Vulgar notes | 2 |
| | Impertinence | 2 |
| | Obscene language | 1 |
| | Kicking a student | 1 |
| | Refusing to write sentences as a punishment for chewing gum | 1 |
| Race of students: | 25 black | 3 white |
| Gender of students: | 15 male | 13 female |

Second Semester

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Number of referrals: | 60 | |
| Reason for referrals: | Three checks | 34 |
| | Impertinence | 11 |
| | Arguing | 3 |
| | Disrupting class | 2 |
| | Leaving class without being dismissed | 2 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Stealing | 2 |
| | Fighting | 2 |
| | Not working | 1 |
| | Obscene language | 1 |
| | Snowballs | 1 |
| Race of students: | 44 black | 16 white |
| Gender of students: | 37 male | 23 female |

Ms. Johnson was evaluated by the principal of Washington Middle School during the 1978-79 school year. The following is an analysis of the evaluation form. Ms. Johnson was rated as "Excellent" in nine areas. These areas included: Teaching techniques, professional practices, staff relationships, professional growth, personal factors, participation in pupil activity program, community relationships, and school committee and supervisory assignments. She recorded "Satisfactory" for pupil growth, classroom environment, and curriculum growth. The mathematical mean of the evaluation was 3.72 (5 = Outstanding; 4 = Excellent; 3 = Satisfactory.)

Ms. Johnson had a secondary mathematics teaching certificate. She did not have a valid elementary certificate in the state in which she was currently residing at the time of the investigation. An examination of her undergraduate transcript indicated that she had a total of 126 credit hours. There were thirty-four hours of A, sixty-three hours of B, twenty hours of C, eight hours of D, and one hour with a grade of Passing. This yielded a grade point average of 2.98. Graduate work consisted of nine hours completed at a state university during a National Science Foundation Workshop.

The school district's central office provided the individual schools with certain pertinent information in the form of computer printouts. One such printout was of the final grades given at the end of a semester. An

examination of this data indicated that Ms. Johnson had given eleven F's for the final semester of 1978-79. Computer printouts also provided a record of teacher attendance and leave balances. The printout examined included information as of April 27, 1979. Ms. Johnson had a cumulative leave balance of 16.00 days. During the 1978-79 school year, she had used 4.00 days of sick leave and 1.00 day of personal business leave. The total number of days absent from work was 5.00 days.

# CHAPTER IV

# ANALYSIS OF DATA

## Composites

### Low Referring Teachers

The three teachers who initiated the fewest number of Student Disciplinary Referral Forms comprised what was referred to as the "low referring" teachers. The following is an overview of their characteristics and behaviors. From this overview, a profile of the low referring teacher was developed. Both commonalities and differences of the three low referring teachers were extrapolated from the data that had been collected and reported in preceding writing.

Each of the low referring teachers was a female. One of the teachers was black; the other two were Caucasian. Their ages were sixty-four, fifty-four, and thirty-six. The family backgrounds of each of the three low referring teachers would be accommodated within the lower middle to middle class socio-economic group. Only one of the teachers came from a family of teachers. All of the teachers had at one time been married; one was currently married, one was a widow, and one was a divorcee. Each of the three teachers had children of her own.

The educational backgrounds included two teachers who held master's degrees with additional college credit hours and the remaining teacher had five graduate credit hours. Each of the three low referring teachers had taught more than one subject area. Number of years taught varied from eleven to thirteen to twenty-three.

Two of the three low referring teachers chose teaching as a career for the first choice. The remaining teacher chose it as a second choice. One teacher's desire to pay her own way and to make a contribution to society was her greatest influence in becoming a teacher. Two of the teachers named former teachers as being most influential in their choice of teaching as a career. The best teaching experience was directly related to student achievement for each of the low referring teachers. The experience was related to the middle school student for two of the teachers and, for the third teacher, the best teaching experience was in an elementary school.

Teaching preferences were congruent with their present teaching assignments, except for a change in grade level for one of the teachers from sixth to eighth grade. Student preference for two of the teachers was a student that could be called average but who tried to achieve. The third teacher cited the well-behaved student as her student preference.

The most serious complaint about teaching involved tasks or duties that took away from teaching time for two of the low referring teachers. Class size was the other complaint given. All three of the teachers cited having a positive influence on student growth as the greatest asset of teaching.

One of the three teachers could not isolate the brightest day of her teaching experience, but chose to characterize days when she saw learning occurring with her students as her bright days. One of the teachers chose an incident that illustrated that students had developed self-discipline and self-direction in her class. The remaining teacher chose a specific culminating learning experience of her students as her brightest day. Darkest days of their teaching experiences were similar in nature to the

brightest days. One of the three teachers could not isolate the darkest day of her teaching experience, but chose to characterize days when she felt that her efforts to help students master a concept were futile. Another teacher chose an incident involving students that were not exercising self-discipline to the extent that it was necessary for her to intervene. The incident was physically threatening for the teacher. The third teacher cited a specific incident when she was hit in the eye with a ruler.

If given power to change their school, two of the teachers would make changes that they perceived would ultimately improve the discipline of the school. The remaining teacher did not have any recommendations for changing the school.

In reviewing the purposes of staff positions, all three teachers viewed their purpose as a teacher as a helping role. One of the teachers left it simply "as a helper." Another teacher cited student guidance and teaching subject matter as her two areas of responsibility, while the third referred specifically to helping students to become better readers as a primary purpose for the teacher. All three of the teachers viewed the principal as a supervisor or facilitator for teachers. The assistant principal's role was identified as supportive of the principal, with some emphasis given to helping teachers with specific student problems. The counselor was identified as one who should support the classroom teacher by helping students resolve their conflicts.

Each of the teachers said she had a set of rules for her classroom that were not written, but two of the three said the rules had been written before. Each teacher gave only one behavior for which they would write a student disciplinary referral. Fighting was identified by two of the teachers and disturbing the class was listed by the other teacher as behavior that would warrant a Student Disciplinary Referral Form.

On a scale of 1 - 10, with 10 being high, discipline of the school was rated 4 by two teachers and 8 by the third teacher. The teachers rated the discipline in their classrooms as 7.5, 8, and 7. They rated themselves as teachers as 8.5, 8, and 10.

The low referring teachers identified their strongest areas as teachers in three different ways. One said she cared for students. Another said that her strongest area was the ability to motivate students, while the third teacher identified her personality as her strongest area. They identified their weaknesses by each naming a different area: not requiring seating charts, being dictatorial, and unequal enforcement of rules with all students.

Scores on the Pupil Control Ideology Form were 38, 44, and 53. The lower the score, the more humanistic is the ideology of the teacher. Scores on the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale (Form E) were 103, 146, and 143. The higher the score, the more closed minded is the respondent.

During the classroom observations conducted by the investigator, behaviors that would be reflective of Gage's four characteristics of effective teachers were noted. Behaviors that were observed to reflect the warmth of the teacher included greeting and leave taking statements. Each of the three low referring teachers made efforts to relate to the students with warm greeting statements, as opposed to immediate attention to an academic task. These warm greeting statements included dialogue with the class about a ball game, a field trip, as well as singing "Happy Birthday" to a class member. Leave taking statements of two of the teachers would be classified as depicting warmth. These leave taking statements were summations of the day's work and a challenge to keep working. During both observations, the third teacher exercised authority at dismissal time to get the students organized so they could leave the classroom.

Each of the three low referring teachers were "touchers" of their students. When giving individual help to the students, they would often touch an arm or a shoulder during the process. The teachers moved about the classroom during the observation rather than remaining in a stationary position. All three low referring teachers were liberal in their use of verbal positive reinforcement.

Indirectness was observed in the questioning patterns of two of the teachers. These teachers used probing questions to encourage their students to expand, defend, and clarify their responses. Student participation was encouraged in each of the classrooms.

Enthusiasm by the teacher was evidenced in each of the three classrooms. Teachers introduced the lessons and gave positive reinforcers to the students for correct answers. Cognitive organization was noted in each of the observations that the investigator made. The lesson plans were congruent with lessons presented in the classroom. The teachers seemed at ease with the material presented and were able to transfer this knowledge to their students.

When the low referring teachers were asked to name a student that they would like to have removed from their classrooms, two of the teachers named a female; the third named a male. The three students varied in their academic avhievement from moderately below grade level (4.9 grade equivalent for a sixth grade student to 6.7 grade equivalent for a seventh grade student) to well above grade level (10.6 grade equivalent for a sixth grade student.) Each of the three students had made passing grades in the nominating teacher's class. One student had received a C, another a B, and the third student had received an A.

When called upon to name the student they would most like to keep, the teachers named two male students and one female. These students were

all above grade level in their academic achievement. Each student had received a passing grade in the respective teacher's classroom for the 1978-79 fall semester. One student had received a C, another student a B, and the third student had received an A.

During student interviews, one of the favored students named the low referring teacher as his favorite teacher. The remaining two students expressed accepting views of the low referring teacher who had named them. Two of the students chosen by the low referring teachers as students they would like to see removed from their classrooms chose the nominating teacher as their least favorite teacher. The third student chose the nominating teacher as his favorite.

An examination of records indicated the low referring teachers had a combined total of twenty-five student disciplinary referrals for the 1978-79 school year. The principal's evaluation was between "Excellent" and "Outstanding" for each of the three teachers. Mathematical means of the evaluations were: 4.81, 4.45, and 4.20 (5 = Outstanding; 4 = Excellent). Each of the low referring teachers had a standard elementary teaching certificate. One of the teachers was also certified to teach home economics; another had reading specialist certification, as well as special education certification.

The low referring teachers received undergraduate degrees from three different state-supported colleges and obtained grade point averages of 3.03, 2.69, and 2.47. One of the three low referring teachers recorded one F grade given to a student for a final semester grade in 1978-79. A total of twenty-seven days were used by the three teachers as leave during the 1978-79 school year. Three of the days were used for personal business; twenty-four of the days were used as sick leave. Individual teacher's leave totals were 10.50, 9.50, and 7.00.

High Referring Teachers

The three teachers who initiated the highest number of Student Disciplinary Referral Forms comprised what was referred to as the "high referring" teachers. The following is an overview of their behaviors and characteristics. From this overview a profile of the high referring teacher was developed. Both commonalities and differences of the three high referring teachers were extrapolated from the data that was collected and reported in preceding writing.

Each of the high referring teachers was a female. One of the teachers was black; two were Caucasian. Their ages were fifty-six, fifty, and thirty-two. Their family backgrounds included one teacher who was raised in an upper middle class home and two whose families would be accommodated within the lower middle to middle class socio-economic group. Two of the high referring teachers had parents who had completed college credit hours. Each of the three teachers was the first teacher in her immediate family. Each of the three high referring teachers had been married; one was a divorcee and two were married at the time of the study. All had children of their own.

Educational backgrounds included one teacher who held a master's degree. The remaining two teachers had achieved graduate credit hours above their bachelor's degree, but they did not have an interest in obtaining a graduate degree. Two of the high referring teachers had taught in several schools; one teacher had taught in six different schools and another in five different schools. The third teacher had taught in her present assignment the full four years of her teaching experience. Years of experience ranged from twenty-one to fourteen to four.

Information derived from the interview included the following: One of the teachers chose teaching as a career for her first choice. The other two high referring teachers chose teaching as a convenience. Two of the teachers did not name any one person as being instrumental in their choosing teaching as a career. The third teacher named a sixth grade teacher as being instrumental in her choosing teaching as a profession.

One of the teachers did not identify her best teaching experience, saying that teaching was day-to-day for her. Another teacher identified her present position as her best experience, but was dissatisfied with the experience of the current year. The third teacher identified teaching third grade as her best experience. Teaching preferences of the three high referring teachers were congruent with the present teaching assignment of one of the teachers. The second teacher preferred to teach math rather than science; the third teacher preferred third grade to middle school age students. Each of the three teachers indicated preference for the average student who wanted to learn.

Two of the high referring teachers cited lack of parental support as their most serious complaint about teaching. The third teacher said her most serious complaint was the number of students who did not care about learning. She also related this to lack of parental support. Two of the three teachers identified the reward of helping students achieve as the greatest asset of teaching. The remaining teacher identified her working hours as the greatest asset of a teaching career. Two of the teachers could not identify the brightest day of their teaching assignment. One teacher identified a specific student's joy of learning as the brightest day of her teaching experience. The darkest day of their teaching experiences related to discipline. One of the teachers lost her temper and slapped a

student. Two of the teachers identified teaching in open classrooms in a team situation as being a year of dark days.

If they had been given the power to change their school, one of the teachers would have had everyone involved with the school to be stricter with the students. Another would have made the school more of an academic institution. The third teacher would increase the cooperation between the teachers and the administration.

In reviewing the purposes of the staff positions, each of the three high referring teachers referred to teaching subject matter, or providing the proper environment for the learning of subject matter, as their primary responsibility. Also, each of the three teachers agreed regarding the purpose of the role of the principal. They viewed the principal as a leader or supervisor who was in charge of the school. The role of the assistant principal was identified as a disciplinarian by each of the three teachers. The role of the counselor was ideally viewed as a helping role, but was pragmatically described by two of the teachers as a pencil-and-paper role.

Each of the three teachers said they had a written set of rules. Two of the teachers listed five main reasons they would initiate a Student Disciplinary Referral Form; the remaining teacher named three reasons she would refer students to the administrator. One of the teachers rated the discipline at Washington School as a 4; the other two teachers rated the discipline at Washington as 5 and as a 5 or 6. This was based on a scale of 1 - 10, with 10 being high. On the same scale, two of the teachers rated the discipline in their classrooms higher than that of the total school. They rated the discipline in their classrooms as a 6 and a 6 or 7. The third teacher rated the discipline in her classroom the same as in the school on the whole, a 5. When asked to rate themselves as teachers, one of the

high referring teachers rated herself as a 10; another rated herself as a 6 or 7, stating that she felt there were very few outstanding teachers. The third teacher gave herself a rating of 6. The three teachers identified three different areas as their strongest one: One teacher said her ability to work on committees and to work with students were her strongest areas. The second teacher said her strongest area was knowledge of subject matter and the ability to teach that subject matter. The remaining teacher identified her strongest area as being sympathetic toward the needs of the students. Two of the high referring teachers identified their lack of patience with students as their weakest area, while the third teacher viewed her inability to get along with her present team of teachers as her weakest area.

Scores on the Pupil Control Ideology were 58, 54, 46. The lower the score, the more humanistic is the ideology of the teacher. Scores on the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale (Form E) were 113, 120, 139. The higher the score, the higher is the degree of closed mindedness as opposed to open mindedness.

During the classroom observations conducted by the investigator, behaviors that would be reflective of Gage's four characteristics of effective teachers were noted. Behaviors that were observed to reflect the warmth of the teacher included greeting and leave taking statements. Each of the three high referring teachers greeted their classes without observable warmth. The statements were more of an order than a greeting. Examples of these greeting statements included: "Will you sit down, please?" "Okay, if you haven't gotten one yet, you can come up and get a weather book." and "Let's find a seat. We're going to check papers and then see a film strip." There was an observable warmth from one of the three teachers

who gave a student a band-aid and made some attempts to communicate on a personal level with the students in her class.

Leave taking statements for each of the three teachers were also void of warmth. These statements included: "Leave your material where it is and we will take up later." "Straighten up your desks and pick up the paper on the floor. Make sure you do your assignments." One of the teachers would not dismiss the class until everyone was quiet. After a period in excess of two minutes, she dismissed the class by saying, "Leave your books on the table."

During the observations, two of the three teachers remained fairly stationary in their position in the classroom. One of the three teachers moved about the classroom checking student work and working with individual students and groups of students. One of the teachers made an attempt to bring the students together into a more compact group. In the other classrooms, students sat scattered throughout the classroom. Verbal reinforcers were limited to words like "good" and "okay" for the high referring teachers. There was no observable touching of students by the three teachers. Touching was considered an indicator of teacher warmth.

Indirectness, a second of Gage's characteristics, was observed in the questioning patterns of one of the teachers. The other two teachers did not utilize the inquiry approach to any observable extent. A third characteristic of effective teachers was enthusiasm. One of the teachers displayed enthusiasm in the presentation of the subject matter. Enthusiasm was also evidenced in the attractive appearance of the classroom: student art work was displayed; books and papers were orderly. Two teachers displayed no observable enthusiasm. The students read orally in class and recorded answers in notebooks or lab manuals. Their classrooms were in a disorderly condition.

Cognitive organization was a fourth characteristic that Gage identified as being indicative of effective teachers. The investigator examined lesson plans previously turned in to the administrator. Lesson plans for two of the three teachers were congruent with the lesson presented in the classroom on the days of the observations. It was observable that one of the teachers exhibited cognitive organization. The teaching techniques used by the other two teachers, reading orally and recording data, made it difficult for the investigator to determine the extent of cognitive organization possessed by the teachers.

When the high referring teachers were asked to name a student that they would like to have removed from their classroom, two of them named male students; the other teacher named a female. Each of the students were below grade level. Two of the students were assigned F grades for the first semester of 1978-79 by their nominating teacher. The remaining student was assigned a grade of D by his nominating teacher. During student interviews, two of the least-favored students chose the high referring teacher that had nominated them as their least favorite teacher. The third student expressed acceptance of the teacher that had nominated him.

When asked to name the student they would most like to keep in their classrooms, two of the teachers named male students; the third teacher named a female. Two of these students had received a passing grade for the first semester of 1978-79 from the respective teachers. Two had received A's and the third had received a D. During the student interviews, none of the favored students named a high referring teacher as a favorite teacher. One of the favored students named his nominating teacher as his least favorite teacher. The remaining two students expressed acceptance of the teacher.

An examination of existing records indicated that the high referring teachers had a combined total of 223 student disciplinary referrals for the 1978-79 school year. The principal's evaluations were between "Excellent" and "Outstanding" for two of the teachers and between "Satisfactory" and "Excellent" for the remaining teacher. The mathematical means of the evaluations were 3.72. 4.45, and 4.50 (5 = Outstanding; 4 = Excellent; 3 = Satisfactory.) Each of the three high referring teachers originally completed bachelor's degrees in secondary education. Two of the three were teaching with standard elementary teaching certificates. The third teacher had a secondary teaching certificate in math.

The high referring teachers each received their undergraduate degrees from three different state-supported institutions of higher learning and obtained grade points of 2.09, 2.91, and 2.98. One of the three teachers had a graduate degree. The other two had graduate credits. Each of the high referring teachers recorded F's for final semester (1978-79) grades. One teacher recorded eleven F's, another thirteen F's, and the third teacher recorded eighteen F's. A total of 20.00 days were used by the high referring teachers as leave. Personal business leave accounted for 2.00 of the days and 18.00 days were used as sick leave. Individual teacher's leave totals were 5.00, 7.00, and 8.00 days.

## Profiles

### Low Referring Teachers

The profile of the low referring teacher was described as being a female who came from a lower middle to middle class socio-economic background. She had children of her own. Her teaching experiences had been in more than one subject at more than one grade level. Her best teaching experience was related to student achievement. The low referring teacher

expressed satisfaction with her current teaching assignment. She felt that the greatest asset of teaching was the opportunity to have an influence on student growth.

The low referring teacher viewed her purpose as a teacher as a helping role. She saw the purpose of the principal's role as that of a supervisor to oversee the total operation of the school. The assistant principal's purpose was viewed as support and an extension of the principal's role. The counselor's position was viewed as a helping role.

The low referring teacher had an unwritten set of rules for her classroom. She identified only one major reason why she would initiate a Student Disciplinary Referral Form. The reason differed among the three low referring teachers. On a scale of 1 - 10, with 10 being high, she rated the discipline in her classroom at least a 7 and rated herself as a teacher at least an 8.

Her Pupil Control Ideology Form score was 53 or below. This score was below the means reported by Willower (1973): 58.8; elementary teacher: 55.3; secondary teacher: 62.3. The higher the score, the more custodial is the pupil control orientation of the teacher (Willower, 1973). The low referring teacher's score on the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale (Form E) was 146 or below. This score compared with Willower's (1973) means as follows: Teacher: 146.4; open minded teacher: 111.2; closed minded teacher: 180.2. The low referring teacher cannot be termed open minded or closed minded.

The low referring teacher greeted the students in her classes with a warm greeting statement. During the class period, she frequently touched students. She also frequently changed positions in the classroom. She displayed enthusiasm and cognitive organization during classroom observations.

The low referring teacher preferred students who scored above grade level on academic achievement tests. The same students expressed

acceptance of the low referring teacher. The low referring teacher rarely assigned an F for a final semester grade.

She had a mean score of 4.20 or above (5 = Outstanding; 4 = Excellent) on the Evaluation of Teacher Effectiveness, Principal's Report. The low referring teacher had an elementary teaching certificate.

High Referring Teachers

The profile of the high referring teacher was described as being a female. She was the first teacher in her immediate family. She had been married and had children of her own. She preferred the average student who was willing to work. The most serious complaint about teaching identified by the high referring teacher was the lack of parental support. She identified a student disciplinary-related incident as her darkest day of teaching.

The high referring teacher identified the teaching of subject matter to students as her purpose as a teacher. The principal's purpose was viewed as the supervisor in charge of the school. The role of the assistant principal was viewed as a disciplinarian. The counselor was assigned a helping role by the high referring teacher.

The high referring teacher had a written set of rules for her classroom. She identified three or more major reasons for initiating a Student Disciplinary Referral Form. The reasons differed among the teachers. On a scale of 1 - 10, with 10 being high, the high referring teacher rated the discipline in the total school lower than the discipline in her classroom. On the same scale, she rated herself as a teacher as at least a 6 (6, 6 or 7, and 10).

Her Pupil Control Ideology Form score was 58 or below. This score is below the means reported by Willower (1973) for the overall teacher (58.8) and for the secondary teacher (62.3). It is above the mean for

elementary teachers (55.3) (Willower, 1973). The higher the score, the more custodial was the pupil control orientation of the teacher. The high referring teacher's score on the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale (Form E) was 139 or below. The score compares with Willower's (1973) means as follows: Teacher: 146.4; open minded teacher: 111.2; closed minded teacher: 180.2. The high referring teacher cannot be termed open minded or closed minded. During classroom observations, the high referring teacher did not greet students with a warm greeting statement or dismiss them with a warm leave taking statement. She was not observed touching students in any manner.

The high referring teacher received her undergraduate degree in secondary education. She frequently assigned F's as students' final semester grades. The student that she chose as the one she would most like to retain in her classroom if it were reorganized did not choose her as his/her favorite teacher.

# CHAPTER V

# SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND HYPOTHESES

## Summary

From each of the composites of the low referring teachers and the high referring teachers, commonalities were extrapolated from these data and profiles for the low referring and high referring teachers were developed. Criterion used to identify a commonality was congruence of the data for all three teachers. If only two teachers' data were congruent, this was not considered a commonality.

From the low referring and high referring teachers' profiles, commonalities among the high and low referring teachers were identified, as well as the differences between the two groups of teachers. Again, the same criterion was used. A commonality was data that were common with all six teachers. A difference was, however, a commonality for the one group of teachers, but differed with the commonality for the other group of teachers.

Data gathered during the study indicated that the low referring teachers and the high referring teachers had certain commonalities. Each of the six teachers studied was female. This commonality was not considered significant since only five of the twenty-six teachers who were possible candidates for a case study were male. The remaining twenty-one basic subject teachers were female. Each of the teachers had been or was married at the time of the study and was a parent.

Each of the six teachers recognized the role of principal as being the supervisor of the school and agreed that the counselor's role was that of a helper. The low referring and high referring teachers each had a set of rules for their classrooms. Both high referring and low referring teachers rated the discipline in their classrooms higher than the discipline in the school as a whole. Each of the six teachers' scores on the Pupil Control Ideology Form was below the composite teachers' (58.8) and the secondary teachers' mean (62.3) (Willower, 1973). Likewise, all of the scores on the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale (Form E) were below the teachers' mean score of 146.4 (Willower, 1973). The scores did not allow the investigator to conclude that either group of teachers was more humanistic than the other or more open minded than the other.

Data gathered during the investigation indicated that, as well as commonalities, certain distinct differences existed between the low referring teachers and the high referring teachers. For the low referring teachers, their best teaching experience was related to student achievement. There was no common theme to the high referring teachers' experiences. The most serious complaint of teaching identified by each of the high referring teachers was the lack of parental support given school officials in dealing with students. This complaint was not mentioned by any one of the three low referring teachers.

Another difference that surfaced during the investigation was the differences in the perceptions of the purposes of certain staff positions. Low referring teachers expressed the thought that they were helpers for students. They mentioned their academic responsibilities, as well as their guidance role in working with students. The high referring teachers stated that their purpose as a teacher was to tend to the academic, or subject matter, aspect of the school's program. Two opposing views were

presented of the assistant principal's purpose. The low referring teachers viewed this role as a supportive one for the principal and, in fact, as an extension of the principal's role. The high referring teachers spoke of the assistant principal as a disciplinarian.

Although each of the low referring teachers said that they had a set of rules for their classrooms, they did not maintain a written set of rules. The high referring teachers said that they did maintain a written set of rules for their classrooms. Each of the low referring teachers identified only one reason that they would initiate a Student Disciplinary Referral Form. Two of the teachers named fighting as their reason, while the third low referring teacher named behavior disruptive to the classroom as her reason for initiating a Student Disciplinary Referral Form. High referring teachers each named three or more major reasons for initiating Student Disciplinary Referral Forms. During the 1978-79 school year, low referring teachers initiated twenty-five Student Disciplinary Referral Forms. In the same time period, high referring teachers initiated 223 Student Disciplinary Referral Forms - almost nine times as many as the low referring teachers.

Low referring teachers greeted the students in their classes with warm greeting statements, while high referring teachers bypassed warm greeting statements by giving students directions about the lesson for the day. During the classroom observations, low referring teachers were observed touching students on several occasions. High referring teachers were not observed touching students.

There was a difference in the number of F grades assigned to students for final semester grades. Low referring teachers, as a group, assigned a total of one F for a final semester grade in 1978-79. High

referring teachers assigned a total of forty-two F's as final semester grades during the 1978-79 school year. High referring teachers had used a total of twenty days of leave for the time period studied while low referring teachers had a total of twenty-seven days of leave during the same time period.

Several variables that the investigator felt might discriminate between the two groups of teachers failed to do so. Whether a teacher was originally trained in elementary or secondary education did not seem to make a difference in the frequency of student disciplinary referrals. Student preferences were also found to be a non-discriminator between the high referring and low referring teachers. Each of the six teachers expressed a preference for the average student, but when asked to choose a student they would like to keep in their classrooms, they chose students of varying academic abilities and achievement.

Scores on the Pupil Control Ideology Form were felt to be a possible identifier for the two groups of teachers. In actuality, they were found to vary within each of the two groups. Although Willower's (1973) norms were established in 1967, it was felt that a trend would be established for each of the two groups with one group achieving consistently lower scores than the other group. The same result was expected on the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale (Form E). Neither of these trends were manifested in the data gathered.

Students' perceptions of the teachers also failed to distinguish between the high and low referring teachers. Also, only one of Gage's four characteristics of effective teachers, warmth, differentiated between the two groups of teachers. Indirectness, cognitive organization, and enthusiasm may indeed by discriminators, but the investigation did not verify them.

Teaching experience failed to distinguish the low referring from the high referring teachers. Originally, the investigator felt that younger

teachers tended to initiate fewer disciplinary referrals. This was not substantiated by the data.

The investigator felt that these variables should not be totally discounted in later studies and that future researchers should remain alert to their possible applicability to describing teachers' student disciplinary referral behavior.

## Recommendations

The differences between the low referring teachers and the high referring teachers provided insights which led to several recommendations for further study. Each recommendation is followed by a brief description of the investigator's perceptions of these insights.

1. Additional research is needed to determine if there is correlation between teacher referral patterns and student achievement.

During the interview with the investigator, the low referring teachers each related an experience concerning student achievement as their best teaching experience. The high referring teachers did not mention student achievement when they discussed their best teaching experience. High referring teachers viewed their purpose as a teacher as one who was responsible for the academic growth of students.

In the literature, teacher effectiveness is almost always discussed in relation to student achievement (Rosenshine, 1976; Brophy, 1976). If, indeed, a correlation between teacher effectiveness and teacher referral behavior patterns could be established, it is all the more expedient that more research should be completed in this area.

2. Research should be completed to determine if a teacher's perception of the degree of support which they are given by others affects the frequency of student disciplinary referrals that they initiate.

During the interview, each of the high referring teachers assigned the role of disciplinarian to the assistant principal, while the low referring teachers felt that the assistant principal's role was an extension of the principal's role of supervisor. Each of the high referring teachers related the lack of support from parents as their major complaint about teaching. It was the perception of the investigator that the high referring teachers felt that, although they were trying to do their jobs, they received little help in the form of reinforcement from the students' parents or from the administrator of the school. The attitude of the high referring teachers was one of being overwhelmed with the problem of discipline and yet feeling like they were the only ones who really tried to discipline students.

> 3. Consideration should be given to research directed to ascertaining any possible relationship between teacher referral patterns and teachers' perceptions of their roles in the classroom.

Insights that led to the above recommendation included those described for Recommendation 2. In addition, each of the low referring teachers mentioned that they perceived their role to be a helper, as well as a teacher of subject matter. It was the perception of the investigator that low referring teachers were more willing to help a student work out his/her problem rather than to initiate a Student Disciplinary Referral Form. They, in effect, made a student's problem their problem. The high referring teacher seemed less willing to work with a student to modify his/her behavior. Instead, they sent the student with a problem to the administrator for resolution.

> 4. Research should be performed to determine if there is a relationship between the number and behavior content of rules that a teacher establishes in her classroom and the frequency of student disciplinary referrals initiated by a teacher.

During the teacher interview, the investigator was made aware that the high referring teachers each maintained a written set of rules for their classrooms. The low referring teachers did not maintain a written set of rules. Brophy and Good (1973) addressed the concept of rules in the classroom. They maintained that rules should be kept to a minimum and should be clearly needed. It was the perception of the investigator that many of the rules in the high referring teachers' classrooms were an end rather than a means to an end. An analysis of the Student Disciplinary Referral Forms supported this insight. High referring teachers initiated referrals for many different reasons (e.g. fighting, talking back, tardy, out of seat, chewing gum, talking). The low referring teachers' reasons for referring students to the administration were much less diverse (e.g. fighting, disrupting class).

5. Consideration should be given to individual tolerance levels as it relates to the manner in which a teacher reacts to student misbehavior in the classroom.

During classroom observations, the investigator became aware that one teacher in each of the two groups conducted her class in quite a different manner than the remaining two low referring or high referring teachers. Ms. Baker, a low referring teacher, conducted a rather loosely-run class with some sarcasm and loud talking. Students were oftentimes observed out of their seats or turning around visiting with their neighbors. Ms. Baker referred a total of five students for the 1978-79 school year.

Ms. Johnson, a high referring teacher, was the extreme opposite of Ms. Baker. Her classroom was observed to be quiet and efficiently run. In fact, the investigator felt that the student behavior and activities observed in Ms. Johnson's classroom were highly reflective of a well-organized and planned teacher. Ms. Johnson initiated a total of eighty-eight Student Disciplinary Referral Forms for the 1978-79 school year.

Studies completed by Kounin (1970) concerned student behavior in the classroom. The studies concluded that teacher behaviors that increased the amount of time students spent in profitable work activities and that led to successful resolution of minor inattention problems before they developed into major disruptions were the most significant factors in controlling the number of incidents of student misbehavior. No major discipline problems were observed in Ms. Baker's or Ms. Johnson's classrooms, but there was a significant observable difference in the climate of their classrooms.

The difference in the number of Student Disciplinary Referral Forms, 223 for high referring teachers as compared to twenty-five for low referring teachers, also provided an insight that perhaps individual tolerance levels was a variable for further study. Each of the low referring teachers indicated only one reason that they would initiate a Student Disciplinary Referral Form. The high referring teachers indicated three or more reasons that they would initiate a Student Disciplinary Referral Form. This fact increased the speculation of the investigator that individual tolerance levels may affect the frequency of Student Disciplinary Referral Forms.

6. Research should be conducted to determine any possible relationship between teacher warmth and teacher referral patterns.

A very clearly-defined difference between high and low referring teachers was observed by the investigator. High referring teachers were not characterized as warm teachers. They rarely touched students and did not employ warm greeting statements to begin their classes. The high referring teachers described their purpose as a teacher was to teach subject matter, while the low referring teachers related that their major responsibility was to help students. This difference in attitude provided the investigator

with insights that warmer teachers are perhaps more helping teachers and that this kind of teacher refers students to the administrator with less frequency. Several studies relating to teacher warmth were reviewed in Chapter II (Brophy and Evertson, 1974; Stallings and Kaskowitz, 1974; Rosenshine, 1976; Kleinfield, 1972). Generally, teacher warmth has been determined to be an important characteristic for teachers and teacher effectiveness (Gage, 1972). Further study of teacher warmth as it relates to teacher referral patterns will add to the understanding of warmth as a desirable teacher characteristic.

7. A study concerning teacher grading patterns as they relate to teacher referral patterns may be of value.

During the data gathering process, the investigator discovered that the low referring teachers seldom assigned an F for a final semester grade. Only one F was assigned among the three teachers. In contrast, the high referring teachers assigned a total of forty-two F's for a final semester grade. This insight may also be related to individual tolerance levels.

Another fact that was noticed by the investigator was that two of the high referring teachers had F's on their undergraduate transcripts. Low referring teachers did not have any F's on their transcripts. The behavior of assigning F's reinforced the investigator's insights that the high referring teacher is less willing to accept the problem student and share some of his/her problems in an attempt to solve them in an acceptable manner. Again, the perception of the investigator was that the high referring teacher seemed to be intent on doing what they felt was right by allowing the student to accept the logical consequences of his/her behavior. They seemed unwilling to "give" a student something. They appeared reluctant to be flexible in meeting individual student needs, but rather chose

to adhere to some arbitrary standard that they felt was appropriate. If grades are indeed a reflection of student growth, any relationship between grades and teacher referral patterns would seem to be valuable.

8. It is recommended that further research be conducted to determine if there is a relationship between number of days a teacher is absent from work and teacher referral patterns.

There was a seven day difference in the number of days that the low referring and high referring teachers were absent from work. The high referring teachers were absent a total of twenty days and the low referring teachers were absent a total of twenty-seven days. At the beginning of the investigation, the investigator felt that this would be reversed. Ms. Smith, a low referring teacher, retired at the end of the 1978-79 school year. At the end of the year, she experienced several illnesses and was absent more days than the investigator felt would have been normal for her. Further study would provide information for determining if teacher absences are in any way related to teacher referral patterns.

## Hypotheses

Possible null hypotheses that may be generated from the above recommendations might include the following:

Hypothesis 1. Teachers' student disciplinary referral patterns have no significant effect on student achievement.

Hypothesis 2. There is no significant difference between high referring teachers' perception and low referring teachers' perception of the support of others.

Hypothesis 3. There is no significant difference between high referring teachers' perception and low referring teachers' perception of their role in the classroom.

Hypothesis 4a. There is no significant difference between the behavior content of rules established by high referring and low referring teachers.

Hypothesis 4b. There is no significant difference between the number of rules established by the high referring and the low referring teachers.

Hypothesis 4c. There is no significant difference in the frequency of student disciplinary referrals initiated by teachers who maintain a written set of rules contrasted with teachers who do not maintain a written set of rules.

Hypothesis 5. There is no significant difference in the incidences of student misbehavior in the classrooms of low referring teachers compared to the incidences of student misbehavior in the classrooms of high referring teachers.

Hypothesis 6. Teacher warmth has no significant effect on the number of student disciplinary referrals initiated by the teacher.

Hypothesis 7. There is no significant difference between the grading patterns of high referring teachers and low referring teachers.

Hypothesis 8. There is no significant difference between high referring and low referring teachers in the number of days absent from work.

# REFERENCES CITED

## REFERENCES CITED


American Educational Research Association Committee "Criteria of Teacher Effectiveness" Journal of Educational Research, 46, 1953, 641-658.

Amidon, E. and Flanders, N. "The Effects of Direct and Indirect Teacher Influence on Dependent-prone Students Learning Geometry" Journal of Educational Psychology, 52, 1961, 286-291.

Amidon, E. and Hunter, E. Improving Teaching: The Analysis of Classroom Verbal Interaction (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966.)

Appleberry, J.B. and Hoy, W.K. "Pupil Control Ideology of Professional Personnel in 'Open' and 'Closed' Elementary Schools" Educational Administration Quarterly, 5, 1969, 74-85.

Ausubel, D.P. and Tenzer, A.G. "Components of Neutralizing Factors in the Effects of Closed Mindedness on the Learning of Controversial Material" American Educational Research Journal, 7, 1970, 267-273.

Ayers, J. "A Study of the Validity of the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire in Predicting High School Academic Achievement" Educational Psychological Measurement, 29, 1968, 479-484.

Ayers, J.B. and Turck, M.J. "Longitudinal Study of Change in Teacher Dogmatism" College Student Journal, 10, 1976, 84-87.

Baird, L. "Teaching Styles: An Exploratory Study of Dimensions and Effects" Journal of Educational Psychology, 64, 1973, 15-21.

Bean, S. and Hoy, W. "Pupil Control Ideology and Instructional Climate in the Classroom" The High School Journal, 57, 1974, 61-69.

Berliner, D.C. "A Status Report on the Study of Teacher Effectiveness" Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 13, 1976, 369-382.

Biddle, B. and Ellena, W. "The Integration of Teacher Effectiveness" B.J. Biddle and W.J. Ellena (eds.) Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness )New York: Holt, 1964.)

Brim, O., Jr. Sociology and the Field of Education (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1958.)

Brophy, J. "Reflections on Research in Elementary Schools" Journal of Teacher Education, 27, 1976, 31-34.

Brophy, J. and Evertson, C. Process-Product Correlations, The Texas Teacher Effectiveness Study: Final Report (Austin, Texas: The University of Texas, 1974.)

Brophy, J. and Good, T. Teacher-Student Relationships: Causes and Consequences (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974.)

Chandler, B., Powell, D., and Hazard, W. Education and The New Teacher (New York: Dodd, Mead, 1971.)

Charters, W. "The Commonwealth Teacher Training Study" (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929.)

Coats, W. and Smidchens, U. "Audience Recall as a Function of Speaker Dynamism" Journal of Educational Psychology,57, 1966, 189-191.

Deighton, L.C. (ed.) The Encyclopedia of Education (New York: Mac Millan, 1971.)

Della Piana, G. and Gage, N. "Pupil's Values and the Validity of the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory" Journal of Educational Psychology, 46, 1955, 167-178.

Duke, D. L. "Who Misbehaves? - A High School Studies Its Discipline Problems" Educational Administration Quarterly, 12, 1976, 65-85.

Flanders, N. Analyzing Teaching Behavior (Reading Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1970.)

Flanders, N. and Havumaki, S. "The Effect of Teacher-Pupil Contacts Involving Praise on the Sociometric Choices of Students" Journal of Educational Psychology, 51, 1960, 65-68.

Flanders, N. and Simon, A. "Teacher Effectiveness" in R.L. Ebel (ed.) Encyclopedia of Educational Research, (Fourth edition) (New York: Mac Millan, 1969, 1423-1436.)

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

Gage, N.L. (ed.) (1963) Handbook of Research on Teaching (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.)

Gage, N.L. Teacher Effectiveness and Teacher Education: The Search for a Scientific Basis (Palo Alto, California: Pacific Books, 1972.)

Gage, N.L., Leavitt, G.S. and Stone, G.C. "The Psychological Meaning of Acquiescence Set for Authoritarianism" Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 55, 1957, 98-103.

Garwood, S. "First Name Stereotypes as a Factor in Self-Concept and School Achievement" Journal of Educational Psychology, 68, 1976, 482-487.

Getzels, J.W. and Jackson, P.W. "The Teacher's Personality and Characteristics" in N.L. Gage (ed.) Handbook of Research on Teaching, (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.)

Good, T.L. and Brophy, J. Looking in Classrooms (New York: Harper and Row, 1973.)

Helsel, A.R. "Value Orientation and Pupil Control Ideology of Public School Educators" Educational Administration Quarterly, 7, 1971, 24-33.

Hoy, W. and Miskel, C. Educational Administration: Theory, Research and Practice (New York: Random House, 1978.)

Hyman, H. Interviewing in Social Research (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.)

Jackson, P. "The Way Teaching Is" in Sand, O. and Bishop, L. (eds.) The Way Teaching Is (Washington D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1966, 7-27.)

Jackson, P. Life in Classrooms (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.)

Jackson, P., Silberman, M., and Wolfson, B. "Signs of Personal Involvement in Teachers' Descriptions of Their Students" Journal of Educational Psychology, 60, 1969, 22-27.

Johnson, J.L. "Change in Student Teacher Dogmatism" The Journal of Educational Research, 62, 1969, 224-226.

Jose', J. and Cody, J. "Teacher-Pupil Interaction As It Relates to Attempted Changes in Teacher Expectancy of Academic Ability and Achievement" American Educational Research Journal, 8, 1971, 39-49.

Kelman, H. "Privacy Research with Human Beings" Journal of Social Issues, 33, 1977, 169-195.

Kleinfeld, J. "Instructional Style and Intellectual Performance of Indian and Eskimo Students: Final Report" Project No. 1-J-027, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1972.

Kounin, J. Discipline and Group Management in Classrooms (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.)

McKeachie, W., Lin, Y., and Man, W. "Student Ratings of Teacher Effectiveness: Validity Studies" American Educational Research Journal, 8, 1971, 435-445.

Mastin, V.E. "Teacher Enthusiasm" Journal of Educational Research, 56, 1963, 385-386.

Merton, R. Social Theory and Social Structure (New York: Free Press, 1949.)

Meux, M.O. and Smith, B.O. "Logical Dimensions of Teaching Behavior" (Urbana: University of Illinois, Bureau of Educational Research, 1961.)

Orleans, J. "The Understanding of Arithmetic Processes and Concepts Possessed by Teachers of Arithmetic" (New York: Board of Education, Division of Teacher Education, 1952.)

Ornstein, A.C. "Can We Define A Good Teacher?" Peabody Journal of Education, 53, 1976, 201-207.

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

Phillips, D. Knowledge From What? Theories and Methods for Social Research (Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1971.)

Rabkin, L.Y. "The Dogmatism of Teachers" The Journal of Teacher Education, 17, 1966, 47-49.

Rafalides, M. and Hoy, W. "Student Sense of Alienation and Pupil Control Orientation of High Schools" The High School Journal, 54, 1971, 101-111.

Ray, J.J. "The Development and Validation of a Balanced Dogmatism Scale" Australian Journal of Psychology, 22, 1970, 253-260.

Rexford, G., Willower, D., and Lynch, P. "Teachers' Pupil Control Ideology and Classroom Verbal Behavior" Journal of Experimental Education, 40, 1972, No. 4, 78-82.

Rokeach, M. The Open and Closed Mind (New York: Basic Books, 1960.)

Rosenshine, B. "Enthusiastic Teaching: A Research Review" School Review, 78, 1970, 499-514.

Rosenshine, B. "Recent Research on Teaching Behaviors and Student Achievement" Journal of Teacher Education, 27, 1976, 61-64.

Rosenthal, R., Jacobson, L. Pygmalion In The Classroom: Teacher Expectation and Pupils' Intellectual Development (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.)

Rosenthal, R. and Rubin, D. "Pygmalion Reconsidered" in J. Elashoff and R. Snow (eds.) Pygmalion Reconsidered (Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1970.)

Ross, P. and Salvia, J. "Attractiveness and School Achievement" Journal of School Psychology, 15, 1977, 60-64.

Ryans, D.G. Characteristics of Teachers (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1960.)

Sandefur, J.T. "An Illustrated Model for the Evaluation of Teacher Education Graduates" (Washington; American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1970.)

Sandefur, J., Adams, R. "An Evaluation of Teaching: An Interim Research Report" Journal of Teacher Education, 27, 1976, 71-76.

Sheldon, M., Coale, J., and Copple, R. "Concurrent Validity of the Warm Teacher Scales" Journal of Educational Psychology, 50, 1958, 37-40.

Shulman, L. and Keislar, E. (eds.) Learning By Discovery: A Critical Appraisal (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966.)

Silberman, C. Crisis In The Classroom: The Remaking of American Education (New York: Random House, 1970.)

Smuck R. and Smuck, P. Group Processes In The Classroom (Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown, 1975.)

Snow, R. "Unfinished Pygmalion" Contemporary Psychology, 14, 1969, 197-199.

Soderbergh, P.A. "Dogmatism and the Public School Teacher" The Journal of Teacher Education, 15, 1964, 245-251.

St. John, N. "Thirty-six Teachers: Their Characteristics and Outcomes for Black and White Pupils" American Educational Research Journal, 1971, 8, 635-648.

Stallings, J.A. and Kaskpwitz, D.H. Follow Through Classroom Observations (Menlo Park, California: Stanford Research Institute, 1974.)

Stephens, J.M. The Process of Schooling (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.)

Thorndike, R. "Review of Rosenthal and Jacobson, Pygmalion In The Classroom" American Educational Research Journal, 5, 1968, 152-157.

Tsukahima, R. "Merging Fieldwork and Survey Research In The Study of a Minority Community" Journal of Social Issues, 33, 1977, 133-144.

Turck, M.J. "A Look at Dogmatism at Tennessee Technological University: The Tennessee Tech Journal, 4, 1969, 1-7.

Wallen, N.E. and Travers, R.M.W. "Analysis and Investigation of Teaching Methods" in N.L. Gage (ed.) Handbook of Research on Teaching (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.)

Wendt, E. "Teaching As A Creative Process" Peabody Journal of Education, 39, 1961, 3-8.

Willower, J., Eidell, T.L., and Hay, W. The School and Pupil Control Ideology (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1973.)

Willower, D. and Jones, R. "Control in an Educational Organization" in J. Roth and V. Ness (eds.) Studying Teaching (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971.)

Yee, A.H. "Is the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory Valid and Homogeneous?" Journal of Educational Measurement, 4, 1968, 151-161.

Zusman, M. and Olson, A. "Gathering Complete Responses From Mexican-Americans by Personal Interview" Journal of Social Issues, 33, 1977, 46-55.

# REFERENCES

REFERENCES


Bloom, R.B. "The Destructive Teacher - Who Is Responsible?" Journal of Teacher Education, 27, 1976, 162-164.

Bowles, S. and Levin, H.M. "More on Multicollinearity and the Effectiveness of Schools" Journal of Human Resources, 3, 1968, 393-400.

Chandler, B., Powell, D. and Hazard, W. Education and the New Teacher (New York: Dodd, Mead, and Company, 1971.)

Cogan, M. "The Behavior of Teachers and the Productive Behavior of Their Pupils" Journal of Experimental Education, 27, 1958, 89-105.

Helsel, R.A. "Status Obeisance and Pupil Control Ideology" Journal of Educational Administration, 9, 1971, 38-47.

Hillson, M. and Hyman, R. Change and Innovation in Elementary and Secondary Organization (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971.)

Johnson, O.G. Tests and Measurements in Child Development: Handbook II, Volume 2 (San Francisco: Jossey and Bass, 1976.)

Jones, P. and Garner, A.E. "A Comparison of Middle School Teachers' Pupil Control Ideology" Clearing House, 51, 1978, 292-293.

Kuhlman, E. "Dogmatism and Deference: The Relationship Between Bureaucratic Orientation and Personality Type" Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 22, 1976, 179-189.

McGee, H.M. "Measurement of Authoritarianism and Its Relation to Teachers' Classroom Behavior" Genetic Psychology Monographs, 52, 1955, 89-146.

Nachtscheim, N. and Hoy, W. "Authoritarian Personality and Control Ideologies of Teachers" Alberta Journal of Education, 22, 1976, 173-178.

Rokeach, M. The Nature of Human Values (New York: The Free Press, 1973.)

Schatzman, L. and Strauss, A. Field Research: Strategies For A Natural Sociology (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1973.)

Sears, P. The Effect of Classroom Conditions on the Strength of Achievement, Motive, and Work Output of Elementary School Children (Washington, D.C.: HEW Cooperative Research Project No. OE873, 1963.)

Sears, P. and Hilgard, E. The Teacher's Role in the Motivation of the Learner in Theories of Learning and Instruction Sixty-third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I, 1964.

Symington, D.J. and Fensham, P.J. "Elementary School Teachers' Closed Mindedness, Attitudes Toward Science and Congruence With A New Curriculum" Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 13, 1976, 441-447.

Thompson, G. "Discipline and The High School Teacher" Clearing House, 49, 1976, 408-415.

Travers, R.M.W. (ed.) Second Handbook of Research on Teaching (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973.)

Yee, A.H. "Is The Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory Valid and Homogeneous?" Journal of Educational Measurement, 4, 1968, 151-161.

# APPENDIX A

## INTERVIEW FORMAT

# TEACHER INTERVIEW

1. How did it happen that you became a teacher?

   a. Was this your first choice for a profession?
   b. Who was most instrumental in your becoming a teacher?

2. Family background

   a. Parents' occupations and education
   b. Siblings: Ages, education, and occupations

3. What is your educational background?

   a. High school
   b. Undergraduate
   c. Graduate

4. Teaching experience

   a. How many years have you taught?
   b. How many different schools have you taught in?
   c. Briefly describe your best teaching experience.

5. What is your teaching preference?

   a. Subject area
   b. Level
   c. Type of student

6. What is your most serious complaint about teaching?

   a. What is the greatest asset of teaching?
   b. What improvement would you make if you were given the power to change your school?

7. Describe one of the brightest days of your teaching experience.

8. Describe one of the darkest days of your teaching experience.

9. How do you view your purpose as a teacher?

   a. What do you view the purpose of the principal as?
   b. What do you view the purpose of the assistant principal as?
   c. What do you view the purpose of the counselor as?

10. Choose the one student you would most like to see removed from your classroom.

11. Choose the one student you would most like to keep if your class were reorganized.

12. On a scale of 1 - 10, how would you rate the discipline in this school?
    On a scale of 1 - 10, how would you rate the discipline in your class?

    a. Do you have a set of rules? Are they written?
    b. What are some of the reasons you would send students to the office?

13. On a scale of 1 - 10, how do you rate yourself as a teacher?

    a. What is your strongest area?
    b. What is your weakest area?

# APPENDIX B

## ROKEACH DOGMATISM SCALE

# ROKEACH DOGMATISM SCALE

The following is a study of what the general public thinks and feels about a number of important social and personal questions. The best answer to each statement below is your personal opinion. We have tried to cover many different and opposing points of view; you may find yourself agreeing strongly with some of the statements, disagreeing just as strongly with others, and perhaps uncertain about others; whether you agree or disagree with any statement, you can be sure that many people feel the same as you do.

Mark each statement in the left margin according to how much you agree or disagree with it. Please mark every one.

Write +1, +2, +3 or -1, -2, -3, depending on how you feel in each case.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| +1: | I agree a little | -1: | I disagree a little |
| +2: | I agree on the whole | -2: | I disagree on the whole |
| +3: | I agree very much | -3: | I disagree very much |

1._____ The United States and Russia have just about nothing in common.

2._____ The highest form of government is a democracy and the highest form of democracy is a government run by those who are most intelligent.

3._____ Even though freedom of speech for all groups is a worthwhile goal, it is unfortunately necessary to restrict the freedom of certain political groups.

4._____ It is only natural that a person would have a much better acquaintance with ideas he believes in than with ideas he opposes.

5._____ Man on his own is a helpless and miserable creature.

6._____ Fundamentally, the world we live in is a pretty lonesome place.

7._____ Most people just don't give a "damn" for others.

8._____ I'd like it if I could find someone who would tell me how to solve my personal problems.

9._____ It is only natural for a person to be rather fearful of the future.

10._____ There is so much to be done and so little time to do it in.

11._____ Once I get wound up in a heated discussion I just can't stop.

12._____ In a discussion, I often find it necessary to repeat myself several times to make sure I am being understood.

13._____ In a heated discussion, I generally become so absorbed in what I am going to say that I forget to listen to what the others are saying.

14._____ It is better to be a dead hero than to be a live coward.

15._____ While I don't like to admit this even to myself, my secret ambition is to become a great man, like Einstein or Beethoven or Shakespeare.

16._____ The main thing in life is for a person to want to do something important.

17._____ If given the chance, I would do something of great benefit to the world.

18._____ In the history of mankind there have probably been just a handful of great thinkers.

19._____ There are a number of people I have come to hate because of the things they stand for.

20._____ A man who does not believe in some great cause has not really lived.

21._____ It is only when a person devotes himself to an ideal or cause that life becomes meaningful.

22._____ Of all the different philosophies which exist in this world, there is probably only one which is correct.

23._____ A person who gets enthusiastic about too many causes is likely to be a pretty "wishy-washy" sort of person.

24._____ To compromise with our political opponents is dangerous because it usually leads to the betrayal of our own side.

25._____ When it come to differences of opinion in religion, we must be careful not to compromise with those who believe differently from the way we do.

26._____ In times like these, a person must be pretty selfish if he considers primarily his own happiness.

27._____ The worst crime a person could commit is to attack publicly the people who believe in the same thing he does.

28._____ In times like these, it is often necessary to be more on guard against ideas put out by people or groups in one's own campe than by those in the opposing camp.

29._____ A group which tolerates too much difference of opinion among its own members cannot exist for long.

30._____ There are two kinds of people in this world: those who are for the truth and those who are against the truth.

31._____ My blood boils whenever a person stubbornly refuses to admit he's wrong.

32._____ A person who thinks primarily of his own happiness is beneath contempt.

33._____ Most of the ideas which get printed nowadays aren't worth the paper they are printed on.

34._____ In this complicated world of ours, the only way we can know what's going on is to rely on leaders or experts who can be trusted.

35._____ It is often desirable to reserve judgement about what's going on until one has had a chance to hear the opinions of those one respects.

36._____ In the long run, the best way to live is to pick friends and associates whose tastes and beliefs are the same as one's own.

37._____ The present is all too often full of unhappiness. It is only the future that counts.

38._____ If a man is to accomplish his mission in life, it is sometimes necessary to gamble "all or nothing at all."

39._____ Unfortunately, a good many people with whom I have discussed important social and moral problems don't really understand what's going on.

40._____ Most people just don't know what's good for them.

# APPENDIX C

## PUPIL CONTROL IDEOLOGY FORM

# PUPIL CONTROL IDEOLOGY FORM

Instructions:

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

SA - Strongly Agree, A - Agree, U - Undecided, D - Disagree, SD - 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 . . . . . SA A U D SD

7. Pupils should not be permitted to contradict the statements of a teachers in a 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 profane language in school, it must be considered a moral offense . . . . . SA A U D SD

15. If pupils are allowed to use the lavatory without getting permission, this privilege will be abused. . . . . SA A U D SD

16. A few pupils are just 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 D

## FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENT DISCIPLINARY REFERRAL FORMS INITIATED BY BASIC TEACHERS FIRST SEMESTER, 1978-79

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENT DISCIPLINARY REFERRAL FORMS INITIATED BY BASIC TEACHERS AT WASHINGTON MIDDLE SCHOOL FIRST SEMESTER, 1978-79

| Basic Teachers | Number of Referrals |
|---|---|
| A (Baker) | 2 |
| B (Smith) | 4 |
| C (Lewis) | 4 |
| D | 5 |
| E | 5 |
| F | 5 |
| G | 7 |
| H | 7 |
| I | 7 |
| J | 8 |
| K | 8 |
| L | 9 |
| M | 10 |
| N | 10 |
| O | 11 |
| P | 11 |
| Q | 12 |
| R | 13 |
| S | 17 |
| T | 17 |
| U | 18 |
| V | 20 |
| W | 25 |
| X (Hall) | 26 |
| Y (Johnson) | 28 |
| Z (Brown) | 37 |
| TOTAL | 326 |