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There is a range of information on effective teaching of disadvantaged students, with educators supporting either the home or school, as the variable with the greatest impact. What are the opinions of classroom teachers on this topic?

In this exploratory study, Group 1 teachers included all those who ranked the impact (on their ability to effectively teach disadvantaged students), of the home variables: parental involvement, dialects of English, socioeconomic status as 3, 4, and 5 and the school variables: teaching methodology and teacher expectations, as 1 and 2. All others were in Group 0. Scores of these two groups of teachers on 30 questions were compared. Points were awarded for awareness of information that confirms school variables as having greatest impact. Teachers who scored high on the questions tended to rank school variables as having greatest impact, thus indicating a possible link between awareness and ranking. A random sample of 251 teachers at inner city schools in Metropolitan Toronto completed and returned the questionnaires.

Teachers generally agreed that socioeconomic status had the least impact on their teaching of disadvantaged students. Yet one home factor, parental involvement, was ranked as having greater impact than the school variables by 38% of the teachers. Less parental involvement and the use of nonstandard dialects of English, are the visible signs of membership in the lower class. It is argued that by ranking parental involvement as first or second in impact, teachers were in effect expecting poor
students' parents to behave like middle class parents. Teachers' answers revealed disagreement and confusion. Most teachers who had taken a university course on parental involvement ranked it as a 1 or 2.

The majority of teachers reported that the information they obtained during their teacher training, on the five home/school variables was inadequate in helping them effectively teach disadvantaged students. The proposed conceptual framework linked the emphasis on parental involvement over the last 30 years to desegregation and immigration in North America and Britain. It is recommended that teachers be provided with information that emphasizes the importance of school variables.
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CHAPTER  I

THE PROBLEM AND ITS SETTING

Background

Nineteen hundred ninety was International Literacy Year. In Canada the 1987 Southam Literacy Survey had given the figure of more than 4.5 million illiterates as many as 1 in 5 Canadian-born citizens (Clamp, 1990). The situations in Britain and the United States of America were not much better (Coleman, 1990).

A large percentage of those classified as illiterates were the educationally disadvantaged or academic underachievers. Within the Canadian context students from a Caribbean background were often so classified; they were frequently achieving below grade level and left school inadequately prepared for success in the Canadian society (Samuda, 1980). Since the 1960s there has been an increase in the number of immigrants from the Caribbean who have settled in Canada (Christiansen, 1982). The majority of the newcomers have settled in Ontario, especially the Metropolitan Toronto area.

The government of Canada headed by Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau, changed the immigration laws in the 1960s so that many people from Third World countries, could for the first time immigrate in large numbers to Canada. This resulted in sudden obvious changes in the composition of the population. Visible minorities (African, African Caribbean, and Asian) outnumbered Europeans especially British citizens as the main ethnoracial groups of immigrants (Anderson & Grant, 1990).

In 1971 the Prime Minister introduced a bill that projected Canada as a multicultural society in a bilingual framework. The intention was for each ethnic group
to be seen as important and distinct in the Canadian mosaic (Mallea & Young, 1984). While the federal government in Ottawa continued to practice its open door policy in immigration and to promote the ideas of multiculturalism, many of the provinces were not prepared for the changes required especially in the areas of education and training (including professional development) of teachers. Since education was the responsibility of the provincial government teachers continued to teach and to apply the same requirements to this multicultural student body, as they had to the previous predominantly monocultural student body (Anderson & Grant, 1990).

Because the educational system was not prepared to deal with this sudden influx of new different students, they were evaluated, Samuda (1980) argued, on the basis of culturally biased tests and expectations. The majority of students did not meet these arguably middle class Anglo-Saxon standards and were therefore streamed to the lower levels (D'Oyley, 1976).

The importance of the problem became more obvious as the frustration level of parents of Caribbean students especially in Toronto, kept rising. The parents of these students stated that racism lay behind these poor outcomes. The groups also started blaming each other: parents blamed the schools; school personnel criticized the culture and parents of students. Articles were emphasizing the negative features of the situation, that is, the lack of academic achievement of Caribbean students as a group, without providing recommendations that would prove successful.

Everyone from university professors, school board researchers to the general public claimed to know the solutions to the problem of under achievement. But they disagreed. So debates continued among the experts on what the requirements were for academic success, or basic literacy for all students. Opinions varied as to solutions with five topics being frequently debated. The main issue was seen as whether home or school variables were most important for functional literacy. However, the
widespread academic failure of students from particular groups continued. Noticeably absent from the majority of these findings and articles were the opinions and active involvement as researchers, of teachers themselves. What does a representative sample of teachers who are actively involved with students on a daily basis think about this topic of effective education of disadvantaged students? Certainly their perception on the matter should be presented since they could provide workable solutions to the problem of illiteracy.

Researchers Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1990) recommended the involvement of teachers, those possessing credible first-hand educational knowledge and experience on the topic of under-achievement of students. A major identifying sign of a professional group is its active participation and involvement in any decision making that affects its work. Yet there was debate about whether teachers were semi-professionals or a professional group. As one reviewed the research process involving students and teachers over recent decades, teachers' involvement was mainly limited to implementing research findings (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1990). More active involvement of teachers as participants and researchers may contribute to clarification of their status. Further, their perceptions can obviously be expected to influence educational outcomes.

Statement of the Problem

In this exploratory study the ranking choices of inner city teachers on the impact of five home/school variables on their ability to effectively teach disadvantaged students, were used to form two groups. Comparisons were made of the mean scores of these two groups on answers they provided to specific questions about the five variables.
Subproblems

1. The first subproblem dealt with descriptive statistics on teachers' rankings and ratings, of these five home/school variables: Parental involvement, standard and nonstandard dialects of English, and socioeconomic status of students (the three home variables), and teaching methodology and teacher expectation, (the two school variables).

   Teachers who ranked or rated a home variable as 3, 4 or 5 and a school variable as 1 or 2 were placed in Group 1. Those teachers who ranked a school variables as 3, 4, or 5 or a home variable as 1 or 2 were placed in Group 0.

2. The second subproblem dealt with the assessment of teachers' answers and scores to specific questions about these five home/school variables: (1) parental involvement, (2) standard and nonstandard dialects of English, (3) socioeconomic status of students, (4) teaching methodology and, (5) teacher expectation of students' learning. Each of the 30 answers was scored 1 or 0.

3. The third subproblem compared means obtained from answers to the 30 questions provided by the two groups of teachers. Teachers' placement in either of two groups was based on the choices they made when ranking the impact of the five variables of the study on their ability to effectively teach disadvantaged students.

Research Questions

Did teachers rank the three home related variables (parental involvement, standard/nonstandard dialects of English, and socioeconomic status of students) as having greater impact than the school related variables (teacher expectations and teaching methodology) on their ability to effectively teach disadvantaged students?

Was teachers' awareness concerning the range of opinion about the variables
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revealed in their answers to questions on the sources they accessed and the information they obtained?

Did the teachers with the higher mean scores on questions about the five home/school variables, also rank the school variables 1 and 2 and the home variables as 3, 4, and 5?

Definitions and Delimitations

In this exploratory study many of the terms used have been interpreted in various ways by different writers. The following delimitations and definitions were included in this section because it was realized that the ranges of meanings of some terms were very broad.

The term inner city was used not to suggest central location, but areas of settlement of newer ethnocultural groups and poor neighborhoods.

In the study the word philosophy was limited to thought structures (knowledge, beliefs, attitudes) about students and teaching. The teacher’s thought process (planning, interactive decision-making, and reflection) was not studied. The emphasis was on teachers’ expectations, perceptions, or their opinions on the topics discussed.

Teaching methodology as used in this study, referred to questions on ways in which lessons were presented. It took account of how or whether the different learning styles were considered.

This study did not include teachers of grades beyond the elementary level; usually the grades kindergarten to grade five, with some boards including the sixth grade. For this study a teacher who taught any grade from kindergarten to grade six could have been a participant in the study.

In this study functional literacy referred to mastery of the basic minimum requirements for reading and mathematics for each grade level. The above average or
excellent levels of achievement were not requirements for literacy.

This study focused on students from Caribbean backgrounds; these were Africans whose mother tongue or first language was a dialect of English whether standard or a non-standard dialect of English. English language in its standard and non-standard dialect forms, was the language discussed as one of the home variables.

Disadvantaged students referred to those who in the opinion of professionals in the educational system, have academic, socioeconomic, cultural, racial, or linguistic conditions that were viewed as hindering them from succeeding academically. These are students of at least average intelligence who still achieve less than their academic potential. This group does not include physically or mentally handicapped students.

Socioeconomic status as used in this study referred to class membership: lower, middle, or upper class according to the income and occupation. The group identified in this study was usually economically disadvantaged or the students were children of parents of the lower class, that is, parents with incomes at or below the poverty line. The majority of the students referred to also lived in government assisted housing.

This study focused on teachers’ perceptions or opinions. Therefore a teacher’s view of the meaning of a term when he or she was filling in the questionnaire was the meaning that was of most importance.

Opinions differed as to the meaning of parental involvement. In this study minimum expectations as defined by Canadian society were emphasized: for example, parents attending Meet the Teacher Night, going to parent-teacher conferences, and supervising completion of home-work assignments. Some visibility at the school level was expected although home involvement in school-related matters such as home and school associations, were not included as signs of parental involvement. As stated in the assumptions on parental involvement there are some home functions that are basic, and each parent or guardian is expected to perform them. Some cultures require more
than the basic expectations for parents. Visits to the school by the parents for occasions other than disciplinary matters are seen as evidence of parental involvement in the education of their children. In this study perspectives on parental involvement included information on a global scale and not just North American views.

Assumptions

The need to list the following assumptions became more obvious during the pilot studies, for instance when the issue was raised of unconscious teacher's bias, as a possible reason for under-achievement among certain groups of students. Because of the broad applications that some of the terms used in the study could have, stating the following assumptions served to focus attention on areas that could be investigated so as to contribute to positive change in the education of students. The conceptual framework as described in Chapter III also relied on the following assumptions:

1. Was that teachers generally were in the profession because they loved and accepted all children regardless of the child's race or ethnic group. It was assumed that teachers were not consciously or intentionally racist.

2. Was that parents generally were fulfilling the usual non-academic requirements of providing the child with adequate meals, making sure the child attended school regularly, and ensuring adequate rest and sleep for the child each night. The type of parental involvement that was under study included visitation to the school for such things as Meet the Teacher Night and parent-teacher conferences.

3. Was that teachers were influenced by their environment in the formation of their philosophy or thought structure (knowledge, beliefs, and attitudes) in their view of children's ability to master functional literacy (Rodriguez, 1983; Swann, 1985).

4. Was that because of social stereotypes about the disadvantaged that were held by some White English speaking, Anglo-Saxon type communities (in Canada,
U.S.A., and Britain) teachers may have inappropriate perceptions of individuals in
groups labeled as disadvantaged (Coelho, 1988; Edmonds, 1979; Taylor, 1983).

5. Was that teachers were not aware of the range and often opposing opinions
that different experts advocated about disadvantaged students (Wittrock, 1986).

Further Definitions of Terms

The purpose of this study was to compare Metropolitan Toronto Public
Elementary School Teachers' ranking of the impact of five home/school variables on
their perception of their ability to effectively teach disadvantaged students in a
multicultural society, and their scores on questions about these variables. As suggested
by Long (1985), when a thorough review of the literature fails to produce previous
similar studies, the investigator should conduct an exploratory study, which would not
include hypotheses.

Because of the variables involved in this study and the review of literature
revealing no definitive agreement on the interpretation of most of the terms and
variables used, it was necessary to provide references and quotations with respect to
definitions of the terms used, so that the meanings applied in this specific study can be
understood (Heller, 1992). This resulted in a greater listing of definitions and
clarifications than usual or that the researcher would have liked to provide. However,
the need for clarity and mutual understanding of terms used made a long list of
definitions necessary. Seven of the most important terms used in this study are defined
in the following paragraphs.

A review of the literature reveals many different definitions for the term,
disadvantaged; for example, “The disadvantaged child is the one whose personal
characteristics and family background are such as to create difficulties at school and
In this study disadvantaged students were different from the typical middle class student, but not deficient. The term educationally disadvantaged group usually refers to minority (that is, African, African Caribbean, and Asian) groups; households in poverty; those with single-parents or poorly educated mothers; and groups of a non-English speaking background (Pallas, Natriello & McDill, 1989, p. 17). The majority of functional illiterate students are considered to be disadvantaged.

No generally accepted definition of functional literacy presently exists (Southham Literacy Survey, 1987). Those who can barely read are called basic illiterates, while those whose skills are below the level needed for independent functioning in everyday life are called functional illiterates. In this study functional literacy is considered to be achieved when the minimum learning objectives for each grade in mathematics and language arts have been achieved. This definition is similar to that for effective teaching.

Each language or dialect is complete and effective as a means of communication among those who know the language or dialect. English as a second language is not examined in this study; the emphasis is on standard and non-standard English or the dialects of English as spoken by West Indians and African Americans. Standard English is defined as the dialect of English that is taught in schools, heard on television, or used in official printed materials. The other dialects of English are defined as nonstandard.

As used in this study teaching methodology refers to the manner in which a lesson is taught by the teacher. It involves consideration for the learning styles of the students. The topic of brain research is very important in relation to teaching methods. In this study the focus on methods of instruction also relates to information on right brain/left brain or hemisphere dominance. Teaching from whole to part and part to whole are important aspects of the methodology of the teacher.
As with literacy, there was some difficulty in defining the meaning of the term philosophy as used in relation to effective teaching. One’s philosophy as used in this study refers to thought structures which are based on one’s knowledge, beliefs, and attitudes in relation to a given topic. The word expectation was used in place of philosophy frequently in this study. It basically relates to what one thinks will happen or one’s opinion. In this study it relates to a teacher’s opinion of each student’s ability to achieve functional literacy at each grade level.

An important aspect in this exploratory study was the analysis of teachers’ answers to specific questions about each variable. On the questionnaire the word knowledge which was defined as information that can be recalled about a subject was used. This awareness could have been gained from factual sources, opinions, beliefs, and any other means that can be accessed to gain information.

Socioeconomic status (SES) was one of the home based variables that frequently occurs in the literature in relation to literacy and has been defined above. Students from the lower socioeconomic class included not only visible minority students but also poor whites. In this study the majority of the students lived in or very close to Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority homes. This fact was used by most of the school boards as a means of identifying the economically disadvantaged.

Importance of the Study

The level of illiteracy in Canada estimated as one in every five adults (Clamp 1990), was a very strong argument for the completion of any study that had the potential of positively contributing to improving learning among the educationally disadvantaged. It was possible that high teacher expectations for all groups of students in combination with appropriate teaching methodology and information could help to change the high illiteracy rate in Canada.
As the research studies and articles were reviewed the absence, among researchers of practitioners, that is, teachers conducting studies or writing articles on this vital topic was very evident. Recently professors (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1990), and researchers have realized that it is important in education for those who are actively involved with students to make their contribution to effective schools and teaching. Teachers for far too long have simply been participating as subjects of studies. Dr. Fullan, (personal communication, 1992) the dean of the School of Education for the University of Toronto recognized this need when he intimated that a major contribution of this study was the provision of information on what teachers think about the topics discussed. He emphasized that there was a need for such information.

The area of teacher expectancy or thinking process was one that could only be fully understood from an experiential base. According to Wittrock (1986), teacher behavior alone (excluding their beliefs, knowledge, and attitudes) was not adequate in explaining the teaching/learning process.

This study explored the possible relationship between opinions (answers to questions and perceptions (ranking of variables). One of the important contributions of this exploratory study was the comparison between awareness or information that teachers possessed, as measured by their answers to specific questions, and their perception of the impact (rankings) of the five home/school variables. This study attempted to link information on five variables (an independent variable) with rankings of impact of the variables. Such a link may be significant. For example, if those teachers who ranked the two school variables as most important (top two rankings) for effective teaching of disadvantaged students, also scored significantly higher in answers to questions on the variables (means of this group higher) than those who ranked any of the three home variables in the top two positions, then educators' perceptions may change with the provision of appropriate information. The variables
that have been most frequently identified as influencing the learning outcomes of disadvantaged students were investigated in this study. Although these five variables had been studied previously, this study was especially important in the holistic approach that it took. No other study was found that addressed all these variables and conjointly obtained teachers' opinions as to their impact. Since teachers are the main implementers of changes in the curriculum at the school level (they act as change agents), it is important that their opinions be considered when decisions are made. A major function of research is to increase the body of knowledge. This study attempted to do that by providing a representative sample of teachers' opinions on the topic of effective teaching of disadvantaged students.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Overview

What has the literature stated on the topic of teachers’ perception about effectively teaching disadvantaged students in a multicultural society?

In this exploratory study, the ranking choices of inner city teachers on the impact of five home/school variables on their ability to effectively teach disadvantaged students, were used to form two groups. Comparisons were made of the mean scores of these two groups on answers they provided to specific questions about the five variables.

The fifth assumption in Chapter I stated that teachers were generally unaware of the wide range and type of information, available on the topic of academic underachievers. A speculation of this study was that those teachers who were aware, of such information as indicated by their higher scores would also rank the school variables as most important for effective teaching of students. This chapter therefore presents the views of other writers whose opinions may not have been readily available. Justification for the inclusion of some information on the questionnaire for the study was also provided by the review of literature. Hence in the absence of studies with similar goals and content, the literature review focused on presenting some of the information supporting the view that schools can make a difference in the education of disadvantaged students.

The review was generally organized according to the five variables and the conceptual framework of the study. The first section provided an historical
perspective. Information on three words that were used extensively in the study were discussed: disadvantaged students, effective schools, and multiculturalism. This was followed by information on the five variables as they appeared in the questionnaire. The home variables were parental involvement, dialects of English, and socioeconomic status. The last two sections reviewed the school variables: teaching methodology and teacher expectations. The chapter concludes with a summary.

An extensive review of the literature failed to produce any studies that closely related to the one this researcher conducted. There were numerous studies on some of the variables individually; however, none of the studies examined all five variables together or more importantly, focused on teachers’ perceptions or opinions about these variables. Studies also examined these variables on a school wide basis or as a social issue in society, not on the basis of their application in individual classrooms. According to Coleman (1990), there was what he called a gentleman’s agreement: since studying teachers required their willingness to take part, their participation was more easily obtained if, in the process of the study teachers were not evaluated in relation to students’ learning.

Extensive critique of previous similar studies, which is a main reason for literature review was not applicable in this situation. However, there were numerous articles on the respective areas that related to the variables in this study, these were discussed in this chapter. The requirement for inclusion of studies and articles in this review was the information that they provided on the variables of the study. Some of this information was used to develop a questionnaire for the study, that is, the accuracy of each question included in the questionnaire was supported by the research or opinions of experts that were included in the review.

It was suggested in Chapter I that a possible reason for failure to arrive at solutions to the problem of illiteracy among disadvantaged students, was the lack of
involvement of those people who should know from practical experience what the real situation was, that is, teachers, parents and, experts who closely identified with the disadvantaged group. This identification of experts with the disadvantaged group could be because they were once members of that group themselves, having belonged to the lower socioeconomic class, or that they possessed the cultural and/or racial characteristics of the majority of the present members of the disadvantaged group. As stated by Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1990), these groups were the very ones who were usually excluded from active involvement in research studies. Frierson (1990), provided many reasons why output from African researchers were on the decline. But the input of these educational leaders was vital, since many of them have been there and personally understand what the disadvantaged as a group need to get out of the academic failure trap. These educators may not have been able to conduct extensive research studies. Perhaps they were too busy, at the local level, demonstrating that all students can learn. However, they do provide a vast resource of articles, books, and speeches.

This review of literature examined much of that information that may not be readily available to the general public and teachers. Easily accessible printed matter, for whatever reasons, have not always provided the total picture or represented opinions of experts with different points of view. For one to make an educated decision that is fair and objective it is vital to have all types of information or the range of opinions available. Hence this review of literature presented, as well, that other side, that is not easily available, in addition to the numerous articles that are readily available. The latter most often put forward the view that the home variables are vital for academic success of disadvantaged students. A widespread sampling of differing opinions and evidence seem desirable because of the lack of empirical studies that holistically addressed the major variables of concern and included teachers' views of the importance of the five
variables.

The historical background was reviewed especially in relation to changes and its impact on the schools and teachers. The availability of this information to teachers was also reviewed in this chapter.

As explained in the limitation section of Chapter I, the literature reviewed was limited to one group of disadvantaged students who, as a group possessed the three home variables frequently mentioned in the literature: nonstandard dialect of English, lower socioeconomic status, and lack of parental involvement with the school. The review of literature, where applicable, focused on African American and African Caribbean children living in North America or Britain, whose first language was English or a dialect of English.

Historical Setting

Some historical background information was essential for an understanding of the conceptual framework of this study. Coleman (1990) stated that the 1960s produced an increased emphasis on home variables (input variables), especially parental involvement. The United States of America and Britain were included in this section of the review because the experiences of Africans in these three countries (Canada included), were similar in many ways (Anderson 1990). Canada was the last of the three to have a large influx of students from West Indian background enter the school systems. Much research on this topic has not been completed in Canada, therefore it was necessary to include the studies and articles from countries with similar cultural history, outside of Canada. More importantly, Canada has been known to follow the example of the other two English speaking nations. It was hoped that a presentation of the situation in these countries will assist decisions makers in Canada from allowing the educational situation of disadvantaged students to deteriorate.
In this section of the review of literature, the emphasis is on the sudden change in the composition of the population of schools in all three countries: Great Britain, Canada and the U.S.A. These societies moved from a mono or unicultural emphasis to a multicultural one apparently without adequate preparation by the respective governments and school systems.

**United States of America**

Although African-Americans had lived in America for more than 300 years, it was not until the desegregation laws were introduced, less than three decades ago, in the 1960s, that integration of public schools occurred on a nationwide basis. Even though some integration of public schools had occurred before this time in some sections of the United States of America, it was not until the increase in civil rights issues, and the consequent decisions of the courts that desegregation occurred on a nationwide basis. Lewis (1983) recounted that the Brown decision made it illegal for dual schooling systems to be promoted and maintained by the state, if race was the basis for this separation.

However, the decade following the 1950s saw only limited changes. In the latter part of 1960, because of the increase in civil rights activity, the courts began to require massive desegregation. Many schools used tracking or ability grouping to continue segregation. Lewis (1983) stated that the government then required statistics on the student composition of schools by grades and this helped in remedying one type of segregation.

The movement by African Americans into the cities and Whites out had often resulted in de facto segregation between school districts (Coleman, 1975). As in Canada, the presence of non-Caucasians within the public school system in an integrated manner in the U.S.A. only occurred within the last two decades, since the
late 1960s. Immigration statistics also showed an increase in the arrival of African Caribbean people during this period.

Hale (1982) wrote extensively on the African American child in the American educational system and the need for educators to better understand the culture and society's impact on their education. Hale defined an ethnic group as comprising a people who had a common history and generally shared a language, religion or racial identity (p. 26). Social class was usually derived on the basis of the nuclear family's income and occupation. For the African American, it was important that the impact of the extended family be recognized in defining social class. Beliefs and values of several generations were very important since in many African families the present nuclear family may be middle class but grew up lower class. Obviously, such a family will be influenced by the values of both classes. Hale emphasized that educators need to consider attitudes that are shaped by one's ethnic culture (p. 28). The author argued that it is vital in trying to understand the African American child that the context within which the child lived and moved (environmental factors) be considered. Usually this was done in a negative manner implying, poor child, what can we do to help, look at where he lives. Hale showed that the African American child exists in a culture made up of African retentions and the American experience. This American experience included oppression of African American people. In understanding African American children it was important to be aware of the perspective of culture and cognition. Data showed that culture patterns influenced the way information was perceived, organized, processed and utilized (Hale, p. xiv). Hale collected data from play experiences of preschoolers. In that study, the use of culture as a means of better understanding human behavior was clearly illustrated. Hale (1982) stated that a holistic perspective should be used in trying to understand the African American child. The work of Hale was further discussed, later in this chapter. In the United States, writers who have
understood the background of the African American child have often emphasized the need for teachers to be aware of this background and its impact on the child’s learning style.

Canada

A review of the statistics on immigration to Canada, with emphasis on Ontario revealed drastic changes after the 1960s (Stats Can., 1981). In 1974 more than 34,000 immigrants of school age settled in Ontario, the majority choosing Metropolitan Toronto. Samuda (1980) observed:

Many were parts of new and visible minorities, West Indian, Portuguese and East Indians of ethnic origin . . . The presence of these 'new newcomers' has presented the schools with a difficult situation in sharp contrast to the traditional pattern of a more or less homogeneous population. (p. 1)

It was important and difficult to understand the sudden changes that occurred in the policies of the Canadian government in relation to admittance of non-White immigrants. The purpose of this section of the review was to indicate the lack of preparation on the part of the government and universities for this multicultural society, a failure which had serious repercussions for the immigrant children.

Canadian policy in relation to immigration during the nineteenth century was aimed at keeping Canada’s people of similar racial composition as the founding fathers. When the need for laborers increased after World War I, people from Asia, Africa and West Indies were excluded. The same trend continued after World War II. An excerpt from a House of Commons debate on May 1, 1967, was as follows:

Immigration is subject to the control of the Parliament of Canada . . . the people of Canada do not wish, as a result of mass immigration, to make a fundamental alteration in the character of our population . . . The government, therefore, has no thought of making any changes in immigration regulations which would have consequences of that kind. (cited in Samuda, 1980, p. 7)

Immigration increased steadily after World War II. However, the admittance of
African people from the West Indies did not occur in significant numbers until the early 1960s. In 1962, unsponsored immigrants from all countries began to be admitted on the basis of educational and occupational standards.

Samuda (1980) had described the immigration from the West Indies during the two decades following World War II as a mere handful. In fact, between 1968 and 1977 the number of West Indians who came to Canada from the islands of Jamaica and Trinidad were almost 100,000.

D'Oyley (1976) stated that one can argue that those cities which had experienced a huge increase in visible minorities in the 1960s had ample time to adjust their educational systems by the early 1970s. However, Samuda (1980) had recounted that educators felt much frustration, a sense of uncertainty, of being overwhelmed by a situation too complex to handle. Samuda stated:

Educators in Ontario were not prepared for such a change in student population. Classroom teachers are still being trained in traditional ways with multiculturalism in many faculties of education remaining irrelevant or, at best, a vague ideal. Similarly, many school board officials - despite the recent attempts to meet the challenge - remain wedded to the concepts of Anglo-conformity, or integration, and, very often the educational practitioner must face these challenges with the traditional resources, using the same stereotypes and as McDiarmid and Pratt have shown, the same books and curriculum materials. (pp. 11-12)

McClinchey (1990), in a study entitled, The Development of Attitudes and Values Toward Learning as a Function of Social Class in Ontario Elementary and Secondary Students, made some discoveries that seem to apply to all members of the lower socioeconomic class regardless of race. The parents in the study were mainly Caucasian. Enniss (1991) noted similar attitudes expressed by Caribbean parents in Metropolitan Toronto. McClinchey's study was conducted in an urban South Western School district in Ontario. The sample included 187 students from lower and middle class schools. Investigators interviewed students, parents and teachers. The main independent variable was socioeconomic status. The research question was, Do
advantaged and disadvantaged students perceive the institution of learning differently?
The sample was of students from grades 4, 6, 8, and 10.

In the review of literature, McClinchey (1990) discussed cultural reproduction theory, which stated that “schooling, in many complex ways largely reproduced the existing social and economic order” (p. 8). It usually did not provide opportunities for individual growth or a route for upward social mobility. McClinchey commented that there was a lack in the literature of the Ministry of Education and Boards of Education, of studies on the possible impact of the SES of students, and that this factor possibly significantly differentiated the learning of children. He challenged the myth of the “neutral school system providing equal opportunity for all” (p. 38).

McClinchey (1990) chose the type of housing in the neighborhood as the determining factor of the social class for schools in different areas. This supported the present investigator's original intention of using location of Metropolitan Toronto Housing Buildings to locate teachers who worked at schools whose population comprised mainly disadvantaged students. McClinchey's stated, “imperfect as it may be, the type of school attended may be considered as an indirect measure of the SES of the student” (p. 47). The study looked at teachers' awareness of the part that SES played in the development of students' attitudes in the context of school and home.

A major finding of the study was that “middle and working class samples are clearly different in many aspects of attitude development and attitude acquisition” (p. 72). The study did not indicate why or how such trends may occur. Some of the major differences based on the class variable were the following: For the middle class sample both principals and teachers showed much concern as to the reaction of parents, and parents influenced their decision-making to a large extent. However, not much concern about parents of the working class group of students was demonstrated by principal and teachers. Some teachers stated that working class students worked best in
a structured environment. "They cannot work in groups" (p. 107).

Working class parents were seen as supportive, but not participating enough. Teachers stated that the parents generally believed learning was the school's responsibility and did not usually assist with the homework or school projects. At middle class schools, teachers appeared to judge the required responses to students' behavior in terms of how they might be perceived by the parents in the community. There was the image of the "parents watching as the teacher talked with the child" (p. 119).

In McClinchey's (1990) study, one teacher who had taught in inner city schools in Toronto stated that "an awareness of the power of social class on the lives of kids was not shared by most teachers in Canada" (p. 113). Another teacher felt strongly that social class determined the future occupation of students. He had taught at a middle class school for 16 years, he stated that he "would find it frustrating to work with poorer students" (p. 116). McClinchey (1990) concluded: "Ways in which teachers' action would be perceived by the parents seemed to be part of the consciousness of teachers in the middle class sample schools" (p. 118).

Interviews with parents revealed that working class parents were less involved in the school, and often responded by stating that they would go the school when their child was experiencing difficulty. Middle class families understood how the system was structured, the working class families did not generally understand the educational system. According to McClinchey (1990), the latter "appear to place much trust in the school, the school must know what is best" (p. 140). Working class parents did not seem to expect to be informed of positive progress, "Why would they want to talk to me when everything is going okay" (p. 141). Middle class parents were very supportive with more than 75% participation of parents. Most of these mothers were not working outside the home. McClinchey (1990) concluded:
There appears to be quite different perceptions of the relationship of the school to the home, especially of students in the middle class home and working class home. Perhaps it is this sense and reality of empowerment on the part of middle class families that is more central to the issue of social class and schooling than the differential formation and nature of students' attitudes. (pp. 141-142)

McClinchey expressed concern about the lack of attention to SES factors in curriculum documents issued by the Ministry of Education in Ontario, he stated:

The myth of equality of education opportunity that is central to the theories of 'cultural reproduction' and that may serve to perpetuate inequality fosters this consciousness that social class differences are not operative in Ontario's educational system. (p. 144)

McClinchey (1990) described the relationship of middle class parents and the school as more like a partnership, while the working class tend to think in terms of a foreman/worker relationship. He stated, "Working class parents tend to leave the work of the school to the school since it is believed that the school generally knows what is best. Schools interact differently with students of different socio-economic groups" (p. 149).

McClinchey (1990) suggested that more effort should be evident in helping to "make student teachers more aware of the possible impact of social class on the lives of students" (p. 152). It appears that more research needs to be done to investigate approaches to delivering educational programs equitably to those of all socioeconomic groups. Social class must be acknowledged as a significant factor in the educational experiences and opportunities of Ontario students. A concluding quote from McClinchey emphasized some of the major issues that this study sought to investigate:

The educational system must be organized to accommodate the learning needs of all not simply reorganized to better hide those who do not succeed. Educators involved in all aspects of schooling must address the complex issue of social class and education and must work to alleviate the systemic inequalities that limit the potential development of so many individuals. (pp. 161-162)

This significant study provided support for many of the propositions made by
the investigator of the present study. The realization of the impact of social class is vital if the education of disadvantaged students will be improved. McClinchey discussed some of the results of SES being used to negatively affect the education of poor children. The statements that were used by the school to justify the continuation of this practice which promoted inequality were not addressed by this study. Topics that could have been addressed in the study included: the type of specific information that was lacking in the education and training of teachers, and awareness that would force individuals to reexamine their previous views and make decisions as to whether or not attitudes will be changed. This study helped to make people aware of the way in which, Edmonds (1979) indicated that schools only do what they are forced to do and help those whose parents will create trouble if they don't. The working class parents are not seen as a threat, so why bother to fulfill one's duty to educate their children.

Great Britain

The purpose of this section was to provide information on the similarity between some of the problems that Canada experienced in the education of immigrant and first or second generation new Canadians and difficulties experienced by Britain. Canada gained its independence from Britain in 1867, but systems of education in both countries have been similar in many ways.

Immigration trends to Britain from the West Indies are somewhat different from trends in Canada in relation to time of arrival. Although there were a few visible minorities in Britain before 1945, after World War II the pace of immigration increased, and today more than 2.5 million British citizens belong to non-European ethnic groups (Swann, 1985).

The vast majority of the West Indians arrived in Britain from 1950 to 1970. Unlike the Canadian situation, by mid 1970s large scale admittance of immigrants to
Britain ceased. At present (1994) hardly any West Indians are admitted as new immigrants to Britain.

In Great Britain a child born abroad with at least one parent born abroad is considered a first generation immigrant. A child born in Great Britain with at least one parent born aboard is considered a second-generation immigrant (Taylor, 1981). In the 1970s the British government stopped taking educational information by country of origin so that presently it is difficult to provide accurate figures as to the number of West Indian students in the country. In 1972 West Indians numbered 101,898 or 36.4 percent of the immigrant population. Tomlinson (1979) had suggested that by 1979, there were between 125,000 and 150,000 West Indians in Britain.

Lord Swann (1985) described the historical attitudes in Britain towards ethnic minorities as consisting of two stages. At first the emphasis was on assimilation, the immigrants adopting the culture of their hosts. Recently the emphasis had changed to the multicultural approach.

In a study involving 508 West Indian teenagers in Britain, Gibson (1985) found that many of the young people were finding it difficult to cope with being Black in Britain and many were suffering from severe stress. The stress could lead to erratic, anti-social and eventually violent behavior, which in turn lead to incarceration either in a mental hospital or in jail. Gibson described, what he called West Indian Sociology as a unique culture, language, a psychology and a symbolism. In this culture, the family is seen as vital and the most pervasive influence in determining a child's cultural identity. The culture was a caring, sharing one. The extended family was an important reality and sensitivity to the individual was paramount. Three family structures were quite common in the West Indian society: single mother, common-law-unmarried, and formal family.

Gibson (1985) argued that the educational system perpetuated the status quo by
consistently failing to meet the needs of West Indian children. He stated:

Above all teachers have not been given the training they need to help them understand these children who while apparently speaking something resembling English, come from a vastly different cultural world with a language and conceptual system very much its own. (p. 26)

For people to communicate effectively, they must share a common conceptual system. The author contended that no common conceptual system and therefore no rapport, existed between West Indian children and their teachers in British schools. Unfortunately, neither teacher nor child was aware of this, both assumed that they had a common conceptual system. The mixture of Creole and standard dialect of English created a no man's land. Gibson stated that countries such as France and Holland, recognized the difficulty of this mixture; however, English-speaking countries like Britain, Canada, and the U.S.A. did not see the obvious link to poor performance of West Indian students in schools and the language differences. Provision was only made for those who spoke a language that was different in every way. In his discussion and recommendations, Gibson addressed the strong relationship between self confidence or self image and the failure of the educational system to recognize and make adequate provision for the language needs of Caribbean students. He argued that attitudes of teachers were learned through the process of socialization. Attitude was described as a psychological construct since it could not be observed directly by another person. These attitudes formed part of a person and involved concept formation. Hence the provision of equal opportunity without encouraging positive feeling of self worth was not very productive. This made it obvious that present emphasis on self esteem for the disadvantaged child was doomed to failure if the child's language was seen as a poor form of the standard dialect instead of a different dialect of English. Gibson contended that in the relationship between student and teacher, if the child developed a poor self image at school it was a poor reflection on the teachers and their
failure to eradicate unhealthy attitudes in themselves. The impact of society on the socialization of all individuals, including teachers, needed to be addressed by the educational system of a country. In trying to answer the question as to why West Indian students were underachieving at school and work, the author submitted, supported by empirical evidence, that the British educational system had failed to make provisions for Caribbean children and that those operating the systems were ill-informed and ill equipped to meet the special needs of these students.

Effective Schools

Research studies in relation to effectiveness usually were carried out at the school instead of the classroom level. This section reviewed the literature on characteristics of schools that have been successful in the education of disadvantaged students.

In Bates and Wilson, (1989) Edmonds is said to be the father of effective schools research. Edmonds' work started as a rebuttal to the Coleman (1966) studies. Edmonds believed that schools do make a difference in the education of children, even greater than the impact of the home environment. The Coleman Report (1966), had stated that school resources have little impact on student achievement independent of student background, the implication was that there was little the school could do to compensate for the effects of nonschool variables on student achievement. This suggestion was challenged by many educators. Block (1983) has stated that later research by Coleman (1975) himself, agreed with many of the findings of effective schools research, thus Coleman's later findings contradicted his earlier conclusions.

Coleman's (1990) present explanation for this contradiction was that there has been a vast change in the concept of equality of educational opportunity. Instead of emphasizing school resources (input), the focus shifted to effects of schooling (output).
Coleman (1990), now states that “the responsibility to create achievement lies with the educational institution, not the child” (p. 103). When this change occurred, the school’s responsibility shifted from increasing and distributing its resources to increasing the quality of its students’ achievement.

In their work on effective schools, Edmonds and Frederissen (1979) used city schools that were instructionally effective for poor children. They stated, “We recognize the existence of schools that successfully teach basic skills to all children . . . Our findings strongly recommend that all schools be held responsible for effectively teaching basic school skills to all children” (p. 47).

The book, Effective Schools (Block, 1983) published by Educational Research Service, reviewed more than 26 studies that related to characteristics of effective schools. In the majority of the studies, statements were made by the researchers that emphasized the importance of high expectations on the part of teachers as being very vital for an effective instructional program. Examples of some statements were as follows: There was lesser pessimism by teachers concerning their ability to influence pupils, they less consistently blamed the pupils or parents for the pupils’ poor performance. In another school seen as effective, teachers’ perceptions of student ability and their expectation concerning student performance were higher than such perceptions in less successful schools. Another study reported that there was a strongly held belief within the school that the students were capable of learning, that they were capable of mastering basic goals and objectives set by the school. In yet another school, the researchers found that the teachers were interested in their pupils and felt that all pupils can learn. Brookover’s (1979) study found that at effective schools, the staff evaluated their students more highly and believed that all of their students could master the basic objectives.
Block (1983), in summary stated:

The effective schools movement developed from the antipathetic reaction of many educators toward the assertions of school impotency contained in the Coleman Report. These studies showed schools did make a difference. . . . No single factor was found yet schools shared certain general features: high expectations for student performance, strong instructional leadership, and orderly climate, an emphasis on basic skills, careful and continuous monitoring of student progress. . . underlying the program, staff believed students could achieve and expected them to achieve. (p. 61-62)

In the review section of Danley's (1981) study, there is an extensive discussion of Coleman (1966), Equality of Educational Opportunity. The authors reviewed found the inference drawn from Coleman's study, that families rather than schools were responsible for failure, did not follow from the data. They argued that it was possible that factors in all the schools tended to prevent the academic achievement of poor and African children (p. 45). Banks (1979) has also cited the use of inadequate environment measures in relation to research linking families, schools and children's achievement.

In an article in Educational Leadership, Edmonds (1979) discussed his perspective in relation to effective teaching of disadvantaged students. He stated that inequity derived first and foremost from failure to educate the children of the poor. Education as used by Edmonds referred to early acquisition of those school skills that assured pupils, successful access to the next level of schooling. Edmonds contended that schools teach those they think they must and, when they think they needn't, they don't. Edmond's argument was that school personnel, influenced by research findings of Coleman (1966), Jensen (1969) and others, were pessimistic about their ability to have an impact. This created an environment in which children failed because they were not expected to succeed. Edmonds believed that all students are eminently educable and that the behavior of the school was critical in determining the quality of that education. Edmonds found the notion that the family was somehow the principal
determinant of whether or not a child succeeded in school was widely held and argued that such a belief had the effect of absolving educators of their professional responsibility to be instructionally effective. He recommended that all schools be held responsible for effectively teaching basic skills to all children.

The question asked by Edmonds was worth repeating:

How many effective schools would you have to see to be persuaded of the educability of poor children? If your answer is more than one, then I submit that you have reasons of your own for preferring to believe that basic pupil performance derives from family background instead of school response to family background. (p. 9)

Edmonds (1979), in this article, was critical of the educational research establishment. He stated that the poor was better served by political action than equity interest of the educational research establishment, because usually social services assist those they think they must, often that does not include the children of the poor. Edmonds has also emphasized the importance of more studies being completed with the classroom being the unit of analysis instead of the school. He stated that research on school effectiveness has been complemented and reinforced by research on teacher effectiveness. The correlates of effective schools and effective classrooms derived exclusively from the environment over which local schools have control (p. 20).

In the book, Effective Schools: Critical Issues in the Education of Black Children, Bates and Wilson (1989) and many experts on this topic presented their perspectives. D. Clark submitted that there appeared to be a theory that society needed a large number of people who were academically ineffective. In other words there was an expectation that there should be, in the population of the poor, a permanent underclass of students. He saw as a major problem the schools’ inability to use the highly developed audio, logical and visual skills that disadvantaged students brought to the school. D. Clark agreed with Edmonds (1979) that basic pupil performance derived from schools' response to family background.
Oakes (1990) did extensive studies on ability groupings and their effect on the students' performance. She listed several variables that influence ability to learn: schools were seen by some as meritocratic institutions where achievements determined opportunity. If one achieved more, then that one was more deserving of opportunity. Others saw opportunity, achievement and participation as a function of mental capacity. Some educators believed that the most important opportunity was confirmed at birth or before, with some children not having the mental capacity to be high achievers. Usually this hereditary basis seemed to have a racial or class link. Oakes (1990) argued that although this theory was totally discredited, it was still held. Support for this belief took subtle forms. Other educators blamed children's physiological history, for example, mother's nutrition and drug use for children's poor academic performance. Others identified cultural deprivation or a nation's history of racial, class or cultural bias. Inequality was also seen as regrettable but inevitable since there was a shortage of high quality educational resources and hence the need to promote the highest educational returns.

Oakes (1990) contended that unequal learning opportunities helped to maintain the status quo. Questionable educational practices helped to create and perpetuate differences in achievement and participation. Oakes stated:

Equal opportunity is seen as a democratic birth right, however, quality of the learning opportunities available to different categories of children relates strongly to social and economic circumstances of children’s families and communities. Assessment of academic ability, placement in different tracks or ability-grouped classes, and reduced educational opportunities that characterize low-track classes often parallel race and social class differences. One also notices significant effects of race, social class, and locale on opportunity at the elementary level. (pp. vi -vii)

Every student is from a racial group, a social class and a community. Each can be identified as having a particular ability status; low, average or high. These differences, as Oakes (1990) pointed out, should not be used in effect, to predestine
some students to academic failure.

Comer (1989), an educational researcher, experienced much success in improving the learning of disadvantaged students. He was acquainted with Edmonds (1979). These experts differed in relation to the factor that they placed as the most important for achieving effective schools. Comer emphasized school climate. In the following section the main points made by Comer during an interview were listed. Comer believed that for many of the educational outcomes, especially progress in cognitive areas, the school was much more important than background factors in accounting for variations among individuals (p. 60). Comer saw three factors as vital in effectively changing schools so that they were competent in educating all groups of students: school climate, academic program and staff development. The trust factor was very important. He contended that high expectations cannot be sustained in chaos. It was vital to create a desirable climate in order to attain academic achievement. Comer stressed the urgent need to help disadvantaged students achieve academic success. He stated:

Previously it was possible to close low income people out of the mainstream and still maintain stability in society. These people could take low level jobs not requiring an education, e.g., steel mills etc., now skills are needed. . . Schools need to modify the way they work to make it possible for low income students to be successful in school. If not the rest of us are going to be victimized by people who are frustrated, disappointed and angry. These people see others no brighter, but who had different experience. They simply are not going to tolerate it. . . It is vital to all to educate low income and minority students. (p. 77)

**Disadvantaged Students**

In the study by J. Edwards and McKinnon (1987), The Continuing Appeal of Disadvantaged as Deficit: A Canadian Study in a Rural Setting, the researchers obtained responses of 96 teachers from nine schools in Nova Scotia. These teachers worked at schools that served rural Black, White (English speaking background) and Acadian
population. The emphasis in this study was on teachers' perception of the characteristics of disadvantaged students. The investigators were surprised to find that teachers still viewed disadvantage as deficit even though this viewpoint had been rejected in the current literature. The researchers stated that "present evidence supports the view of speech styles of nonstandard English speakers as linguistically different and not deficient" (p. 330).

Did teachers consider this difference in language as a deficit? J. Edwards and McKinnon (1987) expressed concern that their studies revealed biases and inaccuracies by teachers which have important implications. It was noted that of the 96 teachers who responded to the questionnaire only about one-third (36.6%) had received information about disadvantaged students. The overwhelming majority (98.9%) felt that information on the subject should routinely be provided to student teachers.

Hargis (1989) in the book, Teaching Low Achieving and Disadvantaged Students, perceived the problem as deriving from the school. He stated:

There is enough time during the school day for instruction and reasonable achievement. Evidence that students labeled as learning disabled are first and foremost victims of defects in the schools not in themselves. Our schools should not shift the blame for this lack of achievement to the student, the home, or the social conditions. (p. 4).

Hargis thought that teachers should be held responsible for the basic achievement of all their students.

Multiculturalism

Since this study focused on disadvantaged students in a multicultural society, the terms multicultural and multiculturalism should be defined. The location of the schools from which the sample of teachers were randomly selected, were all multicultural in their student population. In recent times the term multiculturalism has been rejected by many experts who prefer the terms anti-racist or anti-bias. The present
author does not eliminate the term, multiculturalism but holds it must be properly defined and understood. This section also presented the opinions of experts as to what skills or attitudes were needed for working with children of different cultures.

In this article by Paige (1986) entitled: "Trainer Competencies: The Missing Conceptual Link in Orientation", much relevant information on the topic of multiculturalism was provided. The author explained the importance of having competent trainers or educators. Competence in knowledge, performance or behavior were required individual attributes. The main methods of communicating information on different cultures were discussed: lecture, discussion format to transmit information, or experiential, that is getting involved. The general and specific approach was also discussed, that is, focusing on specific characteristics of one cultural group or general information on different cultures.

Multiculturalism was defined by Paige (1986) as "the capacity to function effectively in two or more cultures" (p. 139). This required a paradigm shift. This was described as a cognitive, behavioral and affective shift from one's monocultural form of reference to one that was more multicultural in orientation (p. 139). Paige described the numerous competencies that a professor (who would most likely be the one providing training for teachers) required in the cognitive, behavioral areas. Personal attributes such as tolerance of ambiguity, differences, and cultural self awareness were described.

Paige (1986) stated, in summary, that to be an effective trainer in the area of multiculturalism required much academic training and experience. Often professors who teach the courses did not go through any training program themselves. Based on this article, it appears unlikely that a single course in multiculturalism would adequately prepare teachers to convey acceptance of all cultures verbally and nonverbally.

Coelho (1988) stated, concerning students of Caribbean background:
Few teachers in Ontario have more than a superficial familiarity with the cultural, linguistic and educational background from which the children have come and even fewer have received special training to equip them to work effectively with this comparatively new population. (p. iii)

Coelho (1988) commented that many Caribbean background students were not academically successful in Canadian schools. The main reasons for this failure were seen as being socio-cultural and related to the lower socioeconomic status of many of the students. Another major reason was “the conflict between the cultural values of the community and the dominant culture which was reflected in the schools” (p. 93). Coelho contended that all students have a basic right to an education that prepared them for life, one that would motivate them to achieve academic excellence. An urgent need was seen for teachers to be educated about language and language variety. According to Coelho stated, “our perceptions of a person are very closely related to the values we hold about language. Teachers need to be more knowledgeable about the language background of their students to assist them with out loss of their self esteem” (p. 146).

Coelho (1988) stated that “to be successful a student needs to have a teacher or teachers whose expectations for him or her are high” (p. 147).

The February/March 1992 issue of the Federation of Women Teachers Association of Ontario Newsletter, contained articles on the topic of anti-Racist education and practical suggestions as to implementation of programs to help promote acceptance of all ethnic groups, regardless of race, sex, socioeconomic status or other differing factors. Parak (1992) presented reasons why the term multiculturalism was being rejected in favor of anti-racist: She stated that cultural diversity was viewed in a positive manner; however, at the same time diversity was seen as a potential problem, because it threatened the status quo. The author discussed the differences in value given to various cultures. One reason for this, was that quite often culture was limited to one’s diet, dress or music. There was also the denial of equal opportunity and equal
access to jobs, training programs and appropriate schooling (p. 3). In contrast anti-racist education which focused on equal power distribution, teaches:

that diversity is not the problem, nor necessarily the preservation of one's culture and heritage. The problem, is the importance that is attached to differences and how these differences are used to justify unequal treatment. This unequal power, limits one's ability to earn a living, and meet basic needs. (p. 3)

The solution Parak (1992) presented aimed at correction and prevention. The choice of materials in school should focus on changing existing internalized behavior. New material should also be produced that projected positive images of all racial groups. Parak stated that anti-racist educators know that racism and unequal power exit in all Ontario Schools. Bias exists in all institutions of Canadian society with its history of racism. Anti-racist education should focus on opportunities for all students.

Parak (1992) stated that it was nearly impossible to have grown up in the Canadian society and not develop racist attitudes. These are transmitted consciously and unconsciously. She supported this claim by reference to research findings that, children by the age of four, five or six, were aware of racial messages and responded to them.

This article presented ideas on lesson aids to foster acceptance of all individuals as equal. However, like most other studies or papers it failed to address the root of the problem, or to discuss the subtle methods used by the dominant groups in any society to validate their unequal power distribution. In other words until evidence is presented that clearly shows the illogical basis of the excuses people use to treat others without dignity or respect, long lasting change is unlikely to occur. For example, in the schools, social class, language, and family background are the three main factors used as excuses to justify unequal outcomes. These factors and their role in outcomes, require in-depth and objective investigation.

Robinson (1985) did not agree with the view that learning about cultural
diversity will bring about acceptance of it. As a matter of fact, this knowledge could result in increased bias. Understanding and acceptance are not necessarily a cognitive process. From her experience and research Robinson (1985) appeared to support the view that “cultural experiences may affect perception and subsequent learning” (p. 25). One's experience within culture affects how one perceives other people. Cultural misunderstandings were seen as a function of perceptual mismatches or errors in cognitive processing. When people believe that the origin of control was within themselves, they were less anxious than when control was mediated externally. Social learning theory suggests that behavioral change led to attitude change.

This section on multiculturalism illustrated the need for appropriate information on different groups and recognition of the need for changes in the belief of all groups, including the dominant groups of society. The articles were used to develop parts of the questionnaire used in the study.

Home Related Variables

Parental Involvement

This section of the literature review looked at parental involvement, with emphasis on providing statements from investigators that would confirm the accuracy of information included in the questionnaire.

Most experts traced the beginning of the home versus school debate to the study by Coleman (1966). Of course, Coleman has since stated that the findings in that study were somewhat misinterpreted. Now, the emphasis in the evaluation of effectiveness is no longer being placed on educational inputs (Brandt, 1989). Instead of input being the major identifying characteristic of effectiveness, the outcomes of education are emphasized. Coleman's (1990) Equality and Achievement in Education
provided a very informative summary on the many changes that the family has experienced over recent times and their effect on the school system. An historical discussion on public education helped one to remember that public education on a national scale did not begin until the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Previously, learning took place in the context of the family or household and neighborhood. The author identified the different types of input provided by the home environment as attitudes, effort and conception of self. The school setting was seen as providing inputs such as opportunities, demands and rewards. Further, numerous changes have occurred in the role of the family in society. Three major changes were: movement from mainly agricultural (exploitation of child labor), to post agricultural (children seen as investment for the family) to the present or third phase, the advanced industrial society (family useful for consumption not production). Now the family's place has been taken over by large corporate bodies. Coleman (1990) stated "schools need to change as families change" (p. 331). The author argued that in this state of fluctuation the disadvantaged students suffer the most. He has stated, "effective schools are able to supply the intangible qualities to impel students to take full advantage of the opportunities provided by the tangible resources" (p. 313).

In a study of the relationship between environments and student achievements, Danley (1981) found a significant relationship in the interaction of home and classroom environments with mathematics concepts. The sample comprised of 1,660 Grade 5 students in 144 classrooms in Southern Ontario. Danley (1981) stated that the inference drawn from Coleman's (1966) study, that families rather than schools are responsible for failure "does not follow from the data" (p. 45). They stated, that it was possibly factors in all the schools that tended to prevent the academic achievement of poor and African children. Marjoribanks (1979) stated that inadequate environmental measures were used in research linking families, schools and children's achievements.
Comer (1989), in his research on school climate, emphasized the importance of working with parents. He stated that it was important to involve parents in areas in which they were comfortable. If teachers had tried to use the parents in an academic area, they would have felt inadequate, defensive and rebellious. Using parents in the social support area, parents felt they were doing something that was worthwhile and useful (p. 76). Like Coleman (1990), Comer recalled the time prior to 1940 when the school was a natural part of the community. Since World War II, there has been a high mobility of teachers who now live far from schools. Staff should generally respect the parents of their students and assist them to participate constructively by tapping their strengths.

Ziegler (1987) reviewed and summarized information available on the topic of the significance of home and school links. The main purpose was to emphasize the importance of a partnership. This objective could explain the lack of a balanced review of the literature on the topic of parent involvement. Studies appeared to be carefully chosen that supported the opinion that parental involvement is absolutely necessary for academic achievement. Although Ziegler mentioned Ogbu's 1974 study which found no difference in achievement levels between children whose parents were, versus those whose parents were not involved in the school, the review otherwise cites only studies which supported the positive benefits of parental involvement. The lack of balance in the survey raised the question as to what effect teachers really had. For example Ziegler (1987) stated: "There can be no more powerful argument in favor of parental involvement in their children's schooling than the fact that it is strongly and positively associated with children's achievement in school and attitude toward learning" (p. 6).

Ziegler disagreed with studies on effective schools that made no mention of parents being involved at the school level, implying that it was impossible to have an effective school without parental involvement. It is argued that the following statement
from Ziegler shows a biased view on who is an effective parent: "A second and even more important message of research is that school personnel can intervene positively, effectively and efficiently to teach most parents to be as effective as some parents already are" (p. 9). The sentiment appears condescending. The suggestion may, as well, be inappropriate. In some sections of Ziegler's review (as well as in other studies) teachers expressed the view that they did not feel adequately trained in the area of parental involvement. Therefore how would teachers decide what parenting is effective? The difficulties are evident in the following statement:

I became worried about the number of parents who appeared to show a lack of interest in their children's education . . . My subsequent experience of home visiting shamed me into rejecting the method I had so naively used as a means of assessing parental interest . . . Indeed, in all the homes I visited I was chastened to find interest in education in abundance. (Green cited in Ziegler, 1987. p. 33)

Why does parental involvement work? The point is made that a main reason may be that when learning is not reinforced, it is extinguished. In the education of young children, home reinforcement may be essential. Ziegler (1987) cited results from studies in Toronto which appeared to indicate that the majority of parents did visit the school for Meet the Teacher Night or report card conferences. However in the area of initiating contact with the schools middle-class like parents took the initiative. These findings appear to support the view that, teachers overwhelmingly believed schools cannot solve problems of illiteracy, without parents' help. However, many parents complained that they received very little communication from teachers on specific areas in which they could be of service in helping to solve the problems "While teachers profess to believe in the efficacy of parent involvement, many of them acknowledge their lack of training and expertise in bringing about parent collaboration" (p. 57).

This review carried out by Ziegler (1987) was intended to lead one to conclude that "parental involvement was desirable because it was inextricably tied to children's
achievement" (p. 60). Yet it failed to discuss or explain how, according to international data, many students succeed without parental involvement. Some countries discourage the involvement of parents, education being controlled by the state. Ziegler also left the impression that those children whose parents were unable or unwilling to participate could not achieve academic success.

In the book, *Disadvantaged and Education*, J. Mortimore and Blackstone (1982) reviewed several studies of the disadvantaged. Sections that focused on parental involvement or home background were reviewed. In relation to the cultural impact on education, J. Mortimore and Blackstone stated that no conclusive support had been obtained that lower scores on tests were caused by linguistic and intellectual deficits, as promoters of cultural deprivation theory claimed. Advocates of the cultural differences theory argued that most socially disadvantaged children did not have language or cognitive defects and that they came to school with the same ability to reason and the same language structure as middle class children. They argued that every human society provided experiences that were: “sufficient for normal cognitive and linguistic development and that lower working class and ethnic minority children come from cultures which are different, rather than deficient” (p. 47).

Mortimore and Blackstone (1982) disagreed with the opinion that the reasons for lack of parents' participation was lack of interest, as teachers appeared to believe. However, direct evidence from parents suggested that “most do not lack interest but are inhibited by lack of self-confidence or insufficient knowledge” (p. 53). J. Mortimore and Blackstone provided some reasons for the growth of the belief that children cannot be satisfactorily educated unless teachers enlist cooperation of parents: The widespread disillusionment with the effectiveness of schooling as a force for social change; rise of environmental theories of intelligence; the growth of consumer type pressure groups, and movements which resulted in increased demand for accountability. Child centered
learning was also seen as a reason for the new (1960s) emphasis on the importance of parental involvement.

On the topic of child centered learning in relation to the home environment of disadvantaged students, Shipman (cited in J. Mortimore and Blackstone 1982) saw sequence and continuity as vital from the kindergarten levels up.

A systematic approach to education is crucial for disadvantaged pupils who may find it harder to cope with ‘discovery methods’ that depend on the child ‘being able to find the necessary human and material resources . . . middle class parents support child-centered schooling because they teach the basic skills at home. (p. 138)

This view on child-centered learning in relation to the disadvantaged student was supported by Berstein (1977), and Tizard et al., (1981) among others.

Tizard et al., (1981) were cited by J. Mortimore and Blackstone (1982), as defining parental involvement in the following way:

if it means frequent, friendly home-school contact and making school more open to parents, it is not difficult to achieve. If it means giving parents a real understanding of the education offered by the school, helping parents to contribute to it and exchanging information and opinions, then there are obstacles. (p. 131)

Tizard et al., (1981) saw the lack of appropriate training of teachers and role definition for teachers as major obstacles. This lack resulted in difficulties in communicating with parents from different cultures and different educational backgrounds. Teachers appeared to see the role of parents as limited to fundraising and parents feared “offending teachers who hold a hostage to fortune in the form of their child” (p. 133). Some of the problems might be overcome if teacher education included specific training for working with parents. Tizard et al., concluded that “the key to successful and effective parent involvement remains the teachers” (cited in J. Mortimore & Blackstone, 1982, p. 133).

Weston (1989), writing on the topic of parental involvement and its effects on academic achievement stated that the result varied. Some children saw the family as...
very important, while for some other students, the school played the most important role. Weston spoke of the positive effects of parental involvement in the following light:

Some parents may not take an active role: they have faith that the professional teachers, counselors and principals know what they are doing and will look out for the welfare of each individual student. Parental participation may be helpful in that children of inactive parents may be more easily shuffled about for school purposes that are unrelated to their educational goals. Acceding to pressure schools may frequently end up handing the 'leftovers' to students with less active parents. (p. 85)

The College Board (1985) provided some informative statistics on the Black family structure in the United States of America: In 1982, 42% were headed by females. Forty-nine percent of African children lived with one parent, eight percent lived with neither parent. One out of every five Africans was unemployed. The College Board (1985) continued:

Black students are disproportionately enrolled in special education, also enrolled earlier and more extensively in vocational education programs, training for low status occupations. Typically these assignments are made by school personnel rather than election by students or their parents. (p. 2)

Excellence won't be a reality in the absence of enriched curricular opportunity and instruction from well qualified teachers. "Advocates demand that tangible features of education demanded by advantaged parents be available to less advantaged students as well" (p. 49).

Coelho (1988), in commenting on the family patterns in the Caribbean, stated that the purpose of schools in the Caribbean also served a social function beyond educating the child. If a child was having behavior problems the teacher viewed it as part of his duty to seek out the parents for face-to-face discussions. Teachers in these communities have the added role of involvement in the extended parenting of children. She continued: "Parents have a limited role to play in the school and may rarely visit. Within the school everything is the responsibility of the teachers and most parents
would not dream of interfering with that” (p. 44).

According to Coelho (1988), the relationships between school and community and between teachers and parents were very different from these relationships in Canada. Coelho stated that it was a misconception that the parents’ low involvement in the education of their children indicated a lack of interest. This was not correct. The author stated: “as we have seen the parental role in education in the West Indies is to send the children to school and to exhort them to do well. The rest is the teachers’ responsibility” (p. 72).

**Standard and Nonstandard English**

An important home factor in this study was standard and nonstandard dialects of English. An assumption of the study was that teachers were generally not provided with adequate information on the culture of the new students. An important objective of this review of literature was to provide a reference source, easily available to teachers. Some areas of this review may appear to be lengthy; however, most teachers may not have the first-hand sources easily available, their inclusion in this section of the review provides a needed resource. Support for the content of the questionnaire was also provided from this section of the literature review.

In this section the dialects of the African-American and the African-Canadian from a Caribbean background were examined. This section of the review looked at the English spoken by Blacks in America, Canada, and Britain and its effects on school achievement. Hilliard (1983), writing on the psychological factors associated with language in the education of the African-American child stated that historical understanding of the development of African-American language was vital if understanding of the present situation was to be achieved. This requirement also applied to understanding the present situation in the education of Caribbean students in
Canada and Britain. The dialect spoken by African-American was not broken English. It has structure, follows rules and was not inferior linguistically, to Standard American English. The author contended that the dominant culture lacked understanding and correct labels for African-American speech. Knowledge of African language by linguists resulted in much more favorable responses to differences in dialects.

An individual’s view of the world was structured by his language. The main contention of Hilliard (1983) was a need for teachers to be informed about linguistic principles. Such knowledge would result in changes in numerous aspects of the curriculum which was now biased against those who spoke a dialect other than standard English.

Hilliard (1983) stated that there was no universal language. Each dialect of a language has semantic and functional meanings that are context specific and not universal. When students were evaluated without consideration of legitimate cultural variations in sounds, words, meanings, and syntax misplacement resulted. When mastery in reading was placed on word-attack skills and so on instead of comprehension, children who spoke a nonstandard dialect were wrongly evaluated. Since it was difficult to find a set of words to which all Americans were equally exposed (no construct validity), it was unfair to use such a norm to test students in the area of reading. A difficult or easy word was also influenced by exposure to that word and bias occurred since exposures could be culturally influenced. English language skills were seen as an equivalent to thinking skills. Those whose mother tongue was Standard English will have an advantage over speakers of a nonstandard dialect.

**West Indian English**

In this section ideas expressed by Alleyne (1976), were presented, the emphasis being to illustrate the differences in some aspects of African-Caribbean speech. This
dialect of English, like any other dialect, has structure and was influenced by environmental factors. Within the last three decades (1960-1990), there has been much movement of Blacks from rural to urban centers of metropolitan countries, searching for the better life. One problem that developed was that their language and culture were not in harmony with their new environment.

Alleyne (1976) illustrated some difficulties in relation to time: In the rural setting, time was more approximate than precise. He stated:

This is correlatable with structural features of the language of Afro-Americans in which tense is not expressed as fixed categories of past time, present time, and future time, but rather the significant thing is whether an action is completed or not... In the rural sector therefore, there is not linguistic dysfunctionality, no disharmony between language structure and usage in the environment... Once transferred to an urban industrialized modernizing milieu, this language as structure and as usage, becomes dysfunctional. (p. 36)

Alleyne (1976) continued, that the child was now dependent on the school which became a major source for socialization and learning. However, the needs of these migrants were not understood by the school system. Having receptive but not productive competence only made things more difficult for the student. Teachers were not prepared to cope with these new demands.

The language or classroom atmosphere also required free expression, whereas, for many West Indian and African-American students, the cultural behavior in the presence of adults or strangers was silence or brief responses. Traditional culture allowed active participation by listeners whereas in the new environment, others are silent while the speaker speaks. Language for the African-American was also creative expression and emphasis was not on precision alone. In his article Alleyne (1976) traced the history of Caribbean speech, emphasizing that it was a mother language. The perception as to the origin and development of Black speech would affect the teaching methodology.

Using Surinam and Barbados as examples, Alleyne (1976) illustrated the
changes in language that occurred as a result of interaction. The Bush Negroes of Surinam, for whom contact with English ceased very early when the slaves fled to the interior, still have much of the morphology, syntax, and phonology of the West African languages, with English influence only significant in its lexicon.

Barbados on the other hand, because of the continuous unbroken English presence and the topography of the country favoring the spread of English, has eliminated many of the West African continuities. However, even in Barbados there are a number of words, as well as morphology and syntax of West African origin. The need was for an awareness on the part of teachers that the speech of West Indian students followed a system of rules like any other language and that it was different but not deficient. Alleyne (1976) stated:

Certain structures appear to be similar to English and the temptation will be strong to interpret them merely as corrupt deviances from English. Such an attitude can only lead to erroneous assessments of the intellectual ability of the child and his assignment to special classes for ‘backward’ children, a measure which is often self-fulfilling. (p. 57)

African American English

Numerous studies have been completed on Black English especially during the early 1980s. Chambers (1983) argued that there was much similarity between Black English and the standard dialect of English used in the business and marketplace. The differences between the two dialects were rule governed and not merely errors in the use of the standard dialect. Chambers discussed the ruling of the court in relation to Black English. He stated, “Schools should take note of the fact that Language used at home and in the local community is a barrier to the students' learning only when teachers do not understand it and do not incorporate it into their method of instruction” (p. xi).

The observation was made that the students who benefited most from the
educational setting in the schools were the ones whose language was similar to the language of instruction. Chambers (1983) stated that much of the failure of disadvantaged students was because these students' cultural competencies were not given recognition by the school system. This resulted in "inadequate learning theories, teaching methods and methods for accurately assessing aptitude and achievement" (p. xii). There appeared to be a common occurrence in relation to Blacks and English. Even Africans from Africa, had to contend with learning a standardized variety of a European language in order to succeed.

Unfortunately, according to Starks (cited in Chambers, 1983) the African American Child was still expected to change his or her identity, language being an important component, if the desire was to conform to the school's expectations. Starks contended that there was an urgent need for cultural anthropology which could help teachers to understand the background of their students and the language they spoke. The author stated that "societal attitudes are the key variables in relation to Black students and reading achievement" (p. 115).

Baugh (cited in Chambers, 1983), stated that when social, linguistic, cultural differences were recognized in the proper historical contexts, schools were better prepared to provide equitable education for all students. Labov (cited in Chambers, 1983), who was a recognized expert in sociolinguistics stated that the structural differences between Black English and standard English,

could not in themselves account for the massive reading failure ... Linguistics does not make a technical distinction between language and dialects: the difference is more political than linguistic. It is therefore factually correct to say that Black people have a language of their own. (p. 34)

Woods (cited in Chambers, 1983), viewed the impact of society, or the American culture on the thinking of teachers as tremendous. He contended that attitudes were not always rationally formed and that they were largely shaped "by our
understanding of history and by our perception of the prevailing social and economic order” (p. 60). He continued: “Teachers need to develop informed and constructive attitudes about race, class and ethnicity. Teachers must have a firm informational foundation” (p. 61).

Socioeconomic Status (SES)

In this section the influence of a student’s social class as defined by the economic status of the parents was examined. What are the necessary requirements for the mastery of functional literacy among disadvantaged students? If a factor was generally a necessity then there should be few deviations or exceptions to the requirement. In a study reported by Miller (1985), schools were examined that did not follow the expected pattern of low reading achievement, where the majority of students were from lower socio-economic backgrounds. Also there were twelve schools where achievement was significantly lower than would be expected on the basis of income level. Miller and Sellers (1985) provided numerous listings of studies that supported both sides of the issue, with Coleman (1966) having started much of the debate as to school versus home as major forces in school achievement results.

In conclusion, the investigator’s proposition that the necessities, with respect to effective teaching of disadvantaged students, were teacher expectations and teaching methodologies, were supported by Miller (1985), who stated:

Finally while the relationship between socio-economic status of children attending a given school and the achievement levels of those children are strong, there most definitely are schools which deviate from the trend. It is reassuring to note that some schools have students achieving at levels much higher than might be anticipated and somewhat discouraging to note that these schools have their minus difference counterparts. (p. 48)
Madden (1989), in the article “Can Every Child Learn?” described a school setting which appeared, after one year in effect, to support the slogan, Every Child Can Learn. If every child could learn, then the responsibility for failure must be placed on the school system, according to Madden. The program, mentioned above was completed at Baltimore’s Abbotston Elementary School, with a population of about 440 students of whom nearly 100% were Black. The Socioeconomic Status was very low with more that 76% of the students qualifying for free lunch. To implement the program during the 1987-1988 school year there was in-service training for teaching staff. Other provisions included a full time program facilitator, a Family Support Team consisting of two social workers and one parent liaison working full time in the program. An important part of the team were six tutors working with grades K-3 students. Tutors worked with students for 20 minutes every day away from the classroom during the 60 minutes social studies periods and also assisted in classroom each day during daily 90 minutes reading periods. “Another key policy of success for all program, is to avoid assigning children to special education except in the most extreme circumstances” (p. 362).

The program also placed more emphasis on the phonetic approach than the sight word emphasis of some texts. After one year the program had shown significant improvements in students’ achievement when compared to a similar control group. Standardized tests were used for the evaluation.

One was certainly pleased with the improved learning that the students attained and would have been amazed if they did not when such a great deal of additional help was provided. Madden (1989) rightly stated a concern as to what the results would be when all additional help was not so readily available. Information on the type of in
service training provided was not included in the article. The cost of the program made
its implementation on a wider scale barely possible. The study also gave the
impression that poor Black children can only learn when provided with much extra help
in addition to the regular classroom teacher. The impression may be problematic.

In the program the emphasis in relation to home-related variables was basic non
academic requirements for the success of any student. For example, adequate sleep and
meals, school attendance and encouraging expressions of support on the part of parents
and students.

School Related Variables

Methodology (Teacher Instructional Methods)

In this section of the review the methodology of the teacher and factors (such as
the hemisphere dominance of the brain, phonics, testing, self-esteem) that impacted on
the students were reviewed. Understanding as to the working of the brain and its role
in education continued to be developed as more knowledge about this organ and
research on its function were advancing. As education goes through its frequent
changes and new waves or methodology, some constants are being established in
relation to the needs of children as groups. The question was asked as to whether or
not some methods are necessary for some children if effective teaching was to occur.
Some topics in this section are also included as provision of reference material for
questions on the questionnaire for the study.

Brain Research: In her book Unicorns are Real, Vitale (1982) stated:

In short, the right brain and the left brain have specialized thinking
characteristics. They do not approach life in the same way, yet both
hemispheres use high level cognitive modes. Liner means part-to-whole. The
left brain person takes little pieces of information, lines them up, arranges them
in logical order and arrives at a convergent conclusion. The child with a
dominant right hemisphere starts with the answer, a total concept, or perceives
the whole pattern and discovers a divergent conclusion. (p. 7)

In a recent article Carnine (1990) summarized new research on the brain by stating: “Differing theories on the brain can be interpreted as supporting differing instructional approaches, and choices among these approaches should be based as much as possible on their effects on students” (p. 377). These points in relation to the brain and methodology were very important.

Many times in education with New Waves or ideas a get on the band wagon mentality develops. In this process, methods were sometimes discarded that were vital for the academic success of some children. What was best for the learning of the child should always be the main factor that is given major consideration.

Maybury (cited in Bates & Wilson, 1989) stated that the brain was developed, complicated and complex enough that even if some information was missed, if the right teachers, with the appropriate methods were involved, an individual could learn to function at an adequate level in society, "our society is filled with people whose development was ignored while they were in elementary school" (p. 157).

**Phonics and Methodology:** In the 1986 summary on literacy, The National Advisory Council on Adult Education (NACAE), listed as a cause for the illiteracy problem, the conflict in relation to phonics. They stated that this issue as to whether or not phonics should be emphasized in the reading program had been in existence for a long time among educators.

**Historical Awareness:** Danley (1981), writing in relation to teacher effectiveness, observed four main historical phases, effectiveness being seen as: a consequence of personality traits and characteristics of the teacher; a function of teaching methods; a function of behavior--what the teacher does; or a mastery of a set of competencies and appropriate use of these competencies by the students.
**Needed Components:** Hale (1982), saw three components as very important in the curriculum for the African American children: Political/cultural factors (ideology), pedagogical relevance (method) and academic content. She stated that methods used should demonstrate an understanding of the bidialectical needs, relational learning styles and socialization duality of African American children, as reflected in their history and present condition.

**Impact of Testing:** Sizemore (cited in Bates & Wilson, 1989) stated that the main object of instruction should be to present subject matter effectively with due regard to structure not coverage (p. 134).

Sizemore (1983) contended that another tool that hindered disadvantaged students in the educational system was testing. "Tests have become the new lynching tool for the aspirations of African American" (p. 145). Sizemore argued that the way to eliminate tests was to help minority populations to pass them. With appropriate use, tests could serve a useful diagnostic purpose, instead of being the mechanism for separating winners and losers. An effective curriculum will help all students, regardless of their neighborhood, regardless of their parents, regardless of their housing project to achieve equitable results from their schooling (p. 185).

**Inadequate Preparation:** According to McCutcheon (cited in Bates & Wilson, 1989) the need was to find out how to use the available information to gain the knowledge needed to obtain the results desired. Too many educators were seen as being pedagogically ill prepared for teaching disadvantaged students.

**Self-Esteem and Success:** According to Love (cited in Bates & Wilson, 1989), if the philosophy all children can learn can be put into practice, if one can inculcate those beliefs into the people who staff our schools, then a great contribution would be made to reforming education. Presently much discussion is held as to the importance of helping disadvantaged students develop positive self concept. Love contends that
the best way to do that was to help a child succeed in school for it was difficult to have
problems with one’s identity if academically successful (p. 171). She stated:

The world will not be perfect if they get an education, but it will be a lot better if
they can negotiate in that world. Schools should not be a place where parents
have to insist that we teach and insist that students learn. Schools ought to be
good whether or not parents are involved. Schools ought to be good for all
students, whether or not their parents are able to advocate for them. (p. 177)

Nothing helps success like success. Students must be made aware that
education is indeed the vehicle for social and economic mobility. Love (cited in Bates
& Wilson, 1989) argued, that if one simply believed something, it becomes a theory, a
philosophy, but when one can implement, then it becomes a program. The need was
for programs and curriculum that effectively teach disadvantaged students.

In regards to teaching methodology, the school climate according to the writers
quoted above should be one that promoted learning for all students. Teachers’ ideas
and methods should be those that assist and not hinder disadvantaged students.

**Teacher Thought Structures - Expectations**

In this section of the chapter, literature on the topic of teacher beliefs about
students’ ability to learn, teacher expectancy and attitudes were reviewed. The most
complete source of research on teaching and teachers’ thought processes was found in
Wittrock (1986). C. M. Clark and Peterson (cited in Wittrock, 1986) stated,
concerning the teachers’ thought, that “this research is so new that each study seems to
break new ground” (p. 292).

Researchers C. M. Clark and Peterson (cited in Wittrock, 1986) agreed that
thinking played an important part in teaching and that teachers had theories and beliefs
systems that influenced their perceptions, plans, and actions. Nisbett and Ross (1980)
viewed knowledge as represented by beliefs and theories which were important factors
in helping people understand social events. Psychologists submitted that the theories
with most far reaching consequences related to those that focus on the general causes of human behavior. Wittrock (1986) suggested: “that the teachers’ perceptions of the causes of students’ behavior or in other words, teachers attributions for the causes of students’ performance” (p. 281), could play an important part in explaining how teacher expectancies affected students’ achievement in the classrooms.

Unfortunately, as stated previously, research on teachers’ implicit theories constitutes the smallest and youngest part of the literature of research on teacher thinking. Factors that impact on teachers’ perception of possible student potential include past performances of students, as well as race and social class. Wittrock (1986) stated: “Even students who work hard to dispel a teacher’s misconception of their lack of ability might not receive full credit from the teacher for their actions” (p. 284).

According to C. M. Clark and Peterson (cited in Wittrock, 1986) there was no clear indication in research reports of the effects of race and social class on teachers’ attribution. More research was needed in this area. Other investigators showed that the effect of race on teacher’s attributions was mediated by students’ social class (H. M. Cooper, Baron, Lowe, 1975).

A concern of Wittrock (1986) was teachers’ perception in relation to the causes for success and failure of students. Did teachers place responsibility on themselves or the students? If teachers saw their role as insignificant or negligible, then would they work towards improving the performance of the students who were failing?

In a study by Crux (1989) on teachers’ beliefs, the researcher argued that “teachers beliefs were found to be a frame of reference within which many classroom decisions were made” (p. ix). The sample involved four teachers of a grade eight visual arts program. The author of this study concluded, “The findings of this study suggest that teacher beliefs should be considered as a factor influencing successful or
unsuccessful implementation and education change practices" (p. ix).

Crux (1989) stated that a review of the literature on teacher' belief showed that little empirical research had been done on the topic. The results that were available did support the assumption that the beliefs of teachers influenced their practice. Teachers' beliefs develop over time with factors such as cultural values influencing the beliefs (p. 1).

The work of Fullan (1981), in which he emphasized that teachers cannot separate themselves from their beliefs was frequently quoted by Crux. A very extensive review on the topic of beliefs was presented. From Nespor's study (1987), beliefs were seen as being based on personal, episodic and emotional experiences of the believer.

Crux (1989) discussed the relation between knowledge and belief with belief appearing to be more in the emotional and spiritual areas while knowledge could be objective as well as subjective. These two systems, knowledge and belief were linked through individual experiences. Crux described her opinion on the topic by seeing the two systems as a mirror. She stated:

The materials making up the mirror are knowledge (because the individual chooses the types of materials) and the reflected images are the beliefs. The type and clarity of the reflection depend on the choice of materials (i.e., the knowledge system). A mirror simply cannot be a mirror without both the materials and the reflection. (p. 45)

This point made by Crux, about knowledge affecting one's opinion was very important in relation to teacher effectiveness in teaching disadvantaged students. The quantity and accuracy of the information teachers possess would greatly affect their expectations and methodology.

Dobson and Dobson (1983) found an association between beliefs and human behavior and the type of non-verbal behavior teachers showed in the classroom. Janesick (1978) also found that what a teacher believed had an impact on what was
The review by Cruz (1989) had much relevance to the topic of teacher effectiveness in teaching disadvantaged students. The importance of beliefs, expectations or teacher thought structures cannot be ignored according to the literature. As stated by Wittrock (1986), much more research is needed on this topic. The assumption of Swann (1985) that society’s beliefs consciously or unconsciously influence teachers expectations for some students as well as teachers’ non-verbal classroom communication appears to be supported by the extensive review of the literature on the topic by Crux as well as the findings of her own study.

Fullan and Park (1981) writing on the topic of bringing about effective change in relation to curriculum (what happens at the school) implementation said:

Finally, curricula are based on certain assumptions, philosophies or beliefs about education. These beliefs are often critical to effective implementation (because they shape a teacher’s thinking and subsequent actions) . . . while people are much more difficult to deal with than things, they also are much more important for success. (p. 13)

Writing on the topic of teacher expectation J. Mortimore and Blackstone (1982) stated that the idea of self fulfilling prophecy was introduced by Merton (1948). He described the term as an expectation or prediction, originally false, which initiates a series of events that caused the original expectation or prediction to come true (p. 91).

Gasson (1989) found that teacher expectation also helped a student reach his potential at school. When teachers indicated to their students that good work was expected, even mediocre students extended themselves and may surpass all expectations, including their own (p. 45). The effect of expectations appeared to be greater on the younger students.

Banks (1985) writing on the situation of disadvantaged students in the United States has asserted, “the chief determinant of educational success for children and youths in formal school settings is the teacher” (p. 36). He stated that the type of
teacher needed was the one who believed in the educability of all children and youth and who possessed "academic and empirical knowledge and understanding of minority history and culture" (p. 37). Teachers should have high academic expectations of all of their students. Banks emphasized that African Americans should pursue education with more intense resolve and greater purpose since education remained the great equalizer in American society. When a society does not educate its minorities of color, "what we see is what we get, we send females to the maternity wards and the males to prison" (p. 66).

Chapter Summary

In addition to the usual reasons for a literature review, this review looked at the variables of this study with the aim of finding support for the inclusion of certain items in the questionnaire. One of the main reasons for this study being classed as exploratory was that previous studies were not found that examined the same variables with the focus on teachers' perceptions about them. Even though much information was available on the five variables in separate studies, including all the variables in one study and having them ranked in relation to importance by teachers, required much literature review on articles written by experts, instead of the usual review of previous studies. The assumption was stated that teachers were generally not aware of the vast amount of literature that emphasized the importance of the school variables with respect to effective teaching of disadvantaged students. This review of the literature has provided support for the argument that teachers need to be aware of the opinions of a wide range of experts if effective teaching of disadvantaged students is to succeed.

The literature demonstrated the need of an holistic perspective in relation to the present Canadian situation for disadvantaged students in Metropolitan Toronto. Tracing the history of this group of students in two other major Anglo-Saxon dominant
countries (Britain and the United States of America), demonstrated numerous similarities. Canada, as a nation, has historical ties with Britain and shares a border with the United States. As the younger of the three nations, a study of the trends in the two countries included should assist Canada in not making similar mistakes with respect to the education of disadvantaged students.

The apparent link between desegregation laws, the great increase in third world immigrants and the timing of studies that emphasized and tend to blame the home environment for lack of academic success of disadvantaged students, raised quite a few questions. This review has also presented views of another group of experts whose opinions are not as readily available as some others. As Heller (1992) emphasized during an interview with the researcher, in the social sciences field there are few definitive, agreed upon reasons for some of the major problems that plague education. Experts do not readily agree. Objectivity of research demands that observations be made to find out if teachers are aware of the different points of view in this debate as to variables that are vital for effective teaching of disadvantaged students. The quotes from experts in all areas of the study validated the inclusion of some questions that many may have felt originated only with the researcher. The review of literature clearly has provided evidence for the proposition that variables some experts have claimed are vital and necessary for effective teaching, were not supported as such, since many students who did not possess these characteristics were achieving functional literacy. Educators in a position to make changes would do well to consider the facts reviewed and questions raised.

Information on each of the five variables of the study: parental involvement, standard nonstandard dialects of English, socioeconomic status, teacher expectation, and teaching methodology, was presented in this chapter. That information also provided support for the content of the questions on these five variables that teachers
were asked to answer about the five home/school variables. The importance of teacher beliefs was emphasized by many writers in the review.

The following chapter presents the conceptual framework which shows the linkage between the theory or philosophical foundations of the study and the measuring instrument or questionnaire.
CHAPTER III

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

In this exploratory study the ranking choices of inner city teachers on the impact of five home/school variables on their ability to effectively teach disadvantaged students, were used to form two groups. Comparisons were made of the mean scores of these two groups on answers they provided to specific questions about the five variables.

The Research questions were:

Did teachers rank the three home related variables (parental involvement, standard/nonstandard dialects of English, and socioeconomic status of students) as having greater impact than the school related variables (teacher expectations and teaching methodology) on their ability to effectively teach disadvantaged students?

Was teachers' awareness concerning the range of opinion about the variables revealed in their answers to questions on the sources they accessed and the information they obtained?

Did the teachers with the higher mean scores on questions about the five home/school variables, also rank the school variables 1 and 2 and the home variables as 3, 4, and 5?

The purpose of this chapter was to provide the conceptual framework for the present study. It showed the link between the content of the literature review chapter and the questions on the instrument used for the survey. Chapter III also presented the rationale for the study. This chapter answered inquiries in respect to why the researcher chose the type of questions included on the questionnaire. As was the case
with the review of literature, the assumption was that most teachers were not aware of the information that was already available, supporting the view that schools can make a difference. This chapter also served the purpose of providing a reference for those teachers who had not obtained the relevant research information for successful teaching of disadvantaged students. The research questions focused on whether or not there was a link between the information teachers were aware of and their perception as to the impact of the five home/school variables on their ability to effectively teach disadvantaged students. Was there a consistency in teachers’ rankings of the variables and their scores on the questions? Review of the literature revealed that some experts (Edmonds 1979, Comer 1980 & Coelho, 1988), agreed with some aspects of the philosophy expressed by this researcher. Kerlinger (1986) emphasized the importance of the conceptual foundation for scientific studies. One wondered as to the possible link between opinions about the variables and perceptions about academic achievement of disadvantaged students.

**Philosophical Framework**

The major philosophy that has affected research by this investigator on students of average intelligence was expressed in the proposition that all students in regular classrooms regardless of racial, socioeconomic, linguistic, family background, or parental involvement are capable of achieving functional literacy at each grade level (Edmonds 1979, Slavin 1989). Teachers who hold the related system of beliefs about student abilities have high expectations for all students.

Home based variables such as level of parental involvement in the child’s education, socioeconomic status of the family, or whether or not the student spoke standard or nonstandard dialects of English arguably do not, by themselves have a negative effect on what the child was expected to accomplish by the end of the school
year. The information on home variables should simply be used to help plan a program that meets the educational needs of that student. Lack of involvement on the part of the parents was not interpreted as lack of interest in their child’s education (Coelho, 1988). Failure to appear at parent-teacher conferences or to visit the school on Meet the Teacher Night, and so forth, were not interpreted as indicative of no cooperation from the home. For one to effectively teach a student, minimum objectives that should be learned, there must be confidence in the student’s ability to master the objectives. Lack of involvement on the part of the parents can also be interpreted as an indication of their trust and confidence that the teachers made decisions that were in the best interest of their children.

Yes it is desirable to associate at least one face from the home with each student, and one should usually try to encourage parents to visit the school at a time that was convenient for them (Comer, 1980). However, if the parent was unable or unwilling to participate but sent the child to school regularly, with basic needs for food and rest taken care of then the child was not blamed or punished for the parents’ behavior. Expectations of the child should not be lowered. The child was possibly a victim of circumstances of birth, and these were beyond his or her control (Ryan, 1976).

Studies have shown (Mortimer & Blackstone, 1982) that basic objectives for each grade could be taught and mastered during the five hours each day, for more than 180 days each year that students were in attendance at school. Lack of parental involvement may negatively affect the achievement of above average or excellent level work (Bs and As), for some students. This would usually occur in the upper grades (beyond grade six), for home-work assignments at that time may play an important part in school performance.

For students who were below average academically or those that were borderline, and needed some additional help from home, or those whose behavior was
below acceptable standards, cooperation with the parents was vital for mastery of basic objectives or discipline. It should then be the teacher's duty to clearly communicate to the parents that a visit to the school was an absolute necessity. Parents who appeared as lacking interest in the education of their child usually responded when the teacher communicated, or took the initiative. The present researcher operated on the basis that parents cared about their children's education. Parental involvement as defined in North America and Britain was not a world wide expectation. Demands at work, home, or even feelings of inadequacies on the part of the parents may prevent them from expressing their concern in the way that North American society expects. (Coelho, 1988). The initiative should come from the school or teacher if they view visitation to the school by the parents as very important. This philosophy placed responsibility for academic learning at the school level.

Appropriate Teaching Methodology

In addition to high expectations for all students the methods used in teaching or instructing different students was another vital factor in relation to whether or not mastery of basic grade objectives occurred (Butler, 1987). The area of brain research that supported the theory of hemisphere dominance provided vital information for anyone concerned about effectively teaching all students (Vitale, 1985).

The researcher was unable to find the linkage proposed in this study between the main mode of communication, example talker or writer, and method needed to learn basic literacy in reading/mathematics. None of the research studies or opinions of the experts (Vitale, 1985; Danley, 1981 & Sizemore, 1989) that were reviewed indicated awareness of the possible linkage between brain dominance and methodology needed for effective teaching. Nonetheless it has been reported to work in classrooms (Enniss, 1991). This rationale could also help to explain why about 10 percent of
middle and upper class students are not attaining functional literacy levels: The methods used did not coordinate with their learning style (Slavin, 1989).

How the Method is Applied

Very early in the school year the teacher tries to identify the main mode of communication that the student used. Basically one checked to see if the child was more a talker than a writer. If given a choice would the student prefer to read/write about something or talk/draw about it? Usually by grade one (age six), a difference in choice is observable. This practitioner has found that the talkers and viewers were usually more right brain and required more structural learning methods (for example, phonetic), whereas the writers and readers appear to be more visual: seem to learn using the sight method for reading (left brainers). This characteristic was common to all children regardless of race, language, home environment, or socioeconomic status.

The following observations on reading and teaching methods are based on Enniss’ (1991) study. Historical information on different cultures would help teachers to understand that many Africans and other visible minorities like the Natives have an oral tradition of passing on information from generation to generation. The invention of printing and the identification of literacy as being able to read and write have been much harder on these ethnic groups than the Anglo-Saxon or Caucasian people (Vitale, 1985). These students are expected to learn to read by a method that is more left than right brain (sight instead of sound). This helps to make learning more difficult for them. This has very serious implications for large segments of our student population. For example, using the Sight Method for teaching reading may not work with some students beyond the first grade. Some students need the structure that phonics provide (Hale, 1982). While the left brain child may be able to quickly recognize the pattern and recall the sound from a list of sight words used in beginning reading, other
students need to be taught the phonology (sounds) of the language, recognize and memorize some word families and see how words are put together (their structure). Once the initial stage is mastered which should occur by the end of Grade 1, reading presents no difficulty for these students (Pecci, 1983).

Apparently because of hemisphere dominance (Blakeslee, 1980) and the need to see the structure of the language, independent reading cannot be achieved without mastery of the phonology of the language (Goodman, Chall, Durkin & Strickland, 1990). Knowing the sounds of any language, was also needed for sight readers; however, they appeared to be able to recognize and memorize the structure of English without being specifically so instructed. Unfortunately phonics was seen as taboo by some educators (National Advisory Council on Adult Education (1986). Yet many experts say that no one can acquire a language without learning the phonology of the language (Goodman, Chall, Durkin & Strickland, 1990). Of course this was simply the first stage: being able to pronounce the word. Without this mastery, the morphology (word meaning) and syntax (correct usage in sentences) may be present but difficult to assess (Goodman, Chall, Durkin & Strickland, 1990).

For many African students, recognition and hence pronunciation or reading of the word when seen in print was the problem. These students usually already knew the meaning of the word and many of them used these words in speaking; however because they were not taught using a method of word attack skills that was appropriate for their learning style, they could not recognize or pronounce the word when they saw it in print (Hilliard, 1983).

In mathematics this practitioner (Enniss, 1991) has found that most children needed a solid foundation in understanding our decimal system (place value) if metric measurement and other major mathematical concepts were to be mastered. An overview for example, from millimetres to kilometres seems to be helpful at the
beginning. Starting with the larger size example metre, and breaking it down into smaller parts instead of building up to metre from centimetre, appeared to be more effective for retention and mastery. If the left brain method was the only one used, part to whole, some students would not achieve basic mastery of objectives (Vitale, 1985). For the disadvantaged child or the ones who mainly communicated by talking, repetition deepens impression and hence increased retention. This method is very important for the child who may not get the reinforcement from the home that could be very helpful for retention (Bennet, 1976). When concepts were introduced late in the school year, enough time was not provided for reinforcement before the summer vacation, so at the start of the new grade the student may have forgotten most of what was learnt. Early introduction of topics in the school year provided enough time for frequent review and better retention (Enniss, 1991).

Provision of Wide Range of Information

Another position in relation to effective teaching of functional literacy to disadvantaged students was that teachers generally lacked the necessary information as to the variables that affected teaching and learning (Chambers, 1983).

Researchers and professionals in an attempt to explain a difficult area often have over the last two decades (started in the 1960s), attributed failure of disadvantaged students to home based variables like poverty, dialects, and lack of parental involvement. The review of the literature clearly showed that these variables cannot be indispensable for basic learning to occur since some poor dialect speaking students had learned. Also on an international scale students who, whether because of laws of the state or country or because of attendance at boarding schools away from the home, did not have parental involvement in their education still achieved average and even above average mastery of the objectives taught (Taylor, 1983).
Historical Interpretation

This researcher argues that the timing of research findings in relation to the necessity of parental involvement was not a coincidence. The late 1960s when according to Coleman (1990) these studies on the home and its impact on academic achievement started to appear in large number, were also the time when vast changes began to occur in the composition of schools in relation to the student body in North America. Britain was also experiencing the impact of similar changes. Desegregation laws were coming into effect in the United States. The British education system was experiencing the impact of the children of third world immigrants. The new immigration laws in Canada during the 1960s allowed entrance of much more Asians and Africans (Samuda, 1980). Why did the belief or realization of the impact of the home occur at this time? Why did it happen around the same time when the schools in North America and Britain were experiencing or, in the case of Canada, were about to experience a shift from a predominantly middle class, monocultural, Caucasian student body to one that was multicultural, and also having greater mixture of socioeconomic classes all in the same public schools? This researcher argued that those in the educational system — governments at the national and local levels, school boards, and universities — had failed to prepare teachers for this new type of student body. Whether consciously or unconsciously, they knew the teachers and their organizations would not (and rightly so) allow themselves to be blamed for a situation that they did not create. So the educational researchers had to blame the parents and the home background of the students! These disadvantaged students and their parents could not defend themselves, as the teachers could have, so they become the scapegoats. The reality is that one is influenced by the stereotypes of the society in which one grows up (Rodriguez, 1983). As one reviewed the literature on schools, written in the 1960s and
1970s, the argument could be made that the attention to home variables (language, poverty, and parental involvement), was just an excuse for unequal treatment of students. It does seem as a very strange coincident, that around the same time that desegregation laws were being passed in the United States of America, and Britain was experiencing the effects on their school system of immigrant children, that research on the vital necessity of the home for academic success of students were being published. This researcher preferred to support the rationale that during the 1960s and up to the present, frequently the situation of the blind leading the blind occurred: there has been a lack of awareness or knowledge of needed skills for effectively teaching different cultural groups. Some may claim that children from poorer backgrounds or lower socioeconomic class have deprived homes which hinder their academic success. The majority of the African students in the U.S.A. as well as the other racial groups from the third world countries are poor.

All three of these formerly predominantly Anglo-Saxon countries also had a great percentage of poor Whites. Teachers who were not racists read and accepted these research findings on the effects of economic class on academic success, and applied the findings to all children. Expectations were thus lowered for all poor children, not just the non-Whites. A result of this error arguably, was that these three countries (Canada, Britain, and U.S.A.) have the highest percentage of illiterates among their non-immigrant citizens, when compared to other developed countries (Clamp, 1990).

The submission has been made that success will not be achieved in the fight against under achievement of any group of students be they poor Whites or visible minorities, until the excuses for their failure are attacked and boldly exposed. That poor students, nonstandard dialect speakers of English, and those students whose parents are unable or unwilling to be actively involved in the education of their children,
can learn and achieve functional literacy, has been supported by research studies (Comer, 1980). There is an urgent need to educate all individuals so that false reasoning to justify unequal outcomes among students could be brought into question. This research study attempted to provide such facts.

Visible Signs of Social Stratification

The variables labeled as home variables are arguably signs of social stratification. An examination of social stratification in Canada clearly demonstrated that economic factors determined the dialect of a language the members of a group spoke as well as the type of parental involvement that the parents practice. Lower class students usually speak a nonstandard dialect of English, more often than middle or upper class students. Poor students' parents as a group only participated on a limited basis at the school level whereas, parents in the middle and upper class are usually extensively involved at the school. On careful analysis and awareness of the geographical and social factors that impact on one's ability to participate, it should be seen that money is the main variable behind the type of parental involvement.

Chapter Summary

This chapter provided the link between the philosophy or rationale behind the study; the link between the content of the questionnaire and what writers have said, as quoted in the literature review. Figure 1 presented a visual or chart summary of the main foundational concepts of the study.

The rise in emphasis on parental involvement was linked to nationwide changes in desegregation in the United States of America, and vast changes in the composition of the student body in Canada and Britain. The school systems were not prepared for these cultural changes that occurred with the presence of these new students. Teachers
Figure 1. Conceptual Framework and Summary of Variables.
did not observe similar results when methodology previously used were applied to these new students. Teachers were also accustomed to a different type of parental involvement from middle class or Anglo Saxon background parents. Teachers were also not familiar with the nonstandard dialects of English that the majority of these new students spoke. The parents, their language, or deprived home environment of these students were blamed for their poor performance.

The link between one’s socioeconomic status and the type of parental involvement, as well as the dialect of English that one spoke was emphasized in this chapter. Differences in class membership were usually demonstrated by variations in students’ speech and their parents’ participation in their education.

The questionnaire of the study which focused on the information available from writers who supported the view that schools can make a difference, regardless of the home environment, was produced because of the underlying hypothesis that an effective method of bringing about positive change was to present individuals with information that was different from views they presently hold. This new information created ambivalence or conflicts in the mind which would not be resolved until a decision was made to reject or accept the new information. One may argue that in matters of unequal educational outcomes the individual’s attitudes and feelings also need to be addressed.

If the proposition that teachers were generally not aware of the information that supported the school variables as having the greatest impact on effective education of disadvantaged students was supported by data from the study, then the provision of this information should help to improve the education of these students. The purpose of the study was to use the ranking choices of teachers with respect to the impact of five home/school variables on their ability to effectively teach disadvantaged students to form two groups. The means of scores on questions (which measured awareness), on
the five home/school variables were then compared. The proposition being that those
who were informed as indicated by their higher scores on the questions, would also as
a group, rank the school variables as having a greater impact on their ability to
effectively teach disadvantaged students, than the home variables.

The following chapter presents the methodology used in the study.
CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY

This exploratory study compared Metropolitan Toronto Public Elementary inner city teachers' rankings of the impact of five home/school factors on their perception of their ability to effectively teach disadvantaged students, and their scores on answers they provided to specific questions about these five factors.

The Research questions were:

Did teachers rank the three home related factors (parental involvement, standard/nonstandard dialects of English, and socioeconomic status of students), as having greater impact than the school related factors (teacher expectations and teacher methodology), on their ability to effectively teach disadvantaged students?

Did teachers' answers to questions on the sources they accessed and the information they obtained indicate that teachers were aware of the wide range, of often differing opinions, about the impact of the five home/school factors on effective teaching of disadvantaged students?

Did the teachers with the higher means on the questions asked about the five home/school factors, also rank the school factors 1 or 2 and the home factors as 3, 4, or 5, with respect to effective teaching of disadvantaged students?

This chapter was divided into four parts: (1) Sampling Design, (2) Development of Instrument, (3) Measures, and (4) Procedure for analyzing data. The research method was the survey approach and observation was in the form of a questionnaire. The descriptive survey was most appropriate for this type of research since the emphasis was on describing the present situation. The mailed questionnaire
procedure was chosen because the gathering of information did not require interaction with the respondents. The number of teachers that were required for a representative sample made the mailed survey the most appropriate method in relation to cost and feasibility. The need for anonymity, and the type of information requested were also important reasons for this choice. The quantitative methodology was used in answering the research questions.

Sample

The population of teachers from which the sample was drawn comprised of those who taught at the elementary level in public inner city schools of Metropolitan Toronto.

Identification of Inner City Schools

The identification process that was used for Inner City schools provided a reliable basis although the identifying characteristics were quite varied. Each year the Metropolitan Toronto Board of Education provides extra funding to the school boards that comprised Metropolitan Toronto. The six boards included in this study did not include the French school board. The funding was based on what was called the Inner City formula.

Each board submitted requests for extra funding, using guidelines they followed for their specific board. Metropolitan Toronto School Board allocated extra funding based on specific guidelines that they followed. Since this requirement was consistent across all board, using the numbers and proportion that was allocated by Metropolitan Toronto School Board, provided the most accurate estimate of special needs or Inner Cityness.

The extra funding to the six boards for the 1992-1993 school year, which was
identified as extra instructional staff ranged from 10.2 to 62.1. Each board made their own decision as to how this extra funding was allocated. Most of the six boards have an up to date listing of the schools in their city or borough. Their was no agreement as to what these school were called. Some preferred the term special needs, or neediest schools, special programs, inner city and so forth. Most boards also divided the schools into different categories from most to least inner cityness. The identifying characteristics also varied depending on the board. For this study, the researcher obtained from each board their most recent list of schools. For four boards, the list of schools was provided and from this list it was obvious which ones were ranked most needy to those that were least (groups in categories from most to least needy). One board simply provided a list all their schools that received funding the previous year, and by discussion with informed personnel, a ranking based on needs was arrived at. In the other case the person in charge provided this researcher with the names of the required number of schools, ranked in order of neediness.

This method of selection even though it may not be viewed as the ideal, was the best currently available since there was no direct form of measuring. This was described as proxy (Harvey, 1992) and had been used by others in studying Inner City Schools. Other identifying characteristics of areas that may have Inner City schools, (such as those with a large number of single parents, recent immigrants, much congestion and so forth) could not be used since the information was not available. Harvey (1992) in completing research on Inner City Schools in Metropolitan Toronto used indirect means: Harvey used the census data from Statistics Canada in trying to locate catchment areas that most likely displayed Inner City characteristics.

The researcher obtained the number of elementary schools in each board. The total number of Elementary teachers in the board was also obtained. Knowing the number of schools that qualified for inner city funding, provided a method for arriving
at the proportion of the sample of teachers that should be randomly selected from each board. For example, if board X had a total of 100 elementary schools in their board and 25 of these schools received extra funding based on the Inner city formula then one could conclude that a similar ratio of teachers may be included in the sample. However, this method was not accurate or consistent, since the basis for deciding which schools received the funding and the amount of funding varied vastly from board to board. Some boards appear to aim at sharing the funds equally among all the schools regardless of their inner-cityness, while for a few others it was difficult to determine how some schools qualified.

In order to be consistent, the decision was made to use the percentage of extra staff received from the Metropolitan Toronto Board by each board, comparing this with the total number of additional staff provided for all six boards. That proportion or percentage was then used to obtain the number of teachers that were needed from that board for the sample. For example, 204.2 additional staffing was provided by Metro for the six boards. If Board X received 25 additional staffing then 25 divided by 204 times the sample size was the number of teachers randomly selected from board X. From the total number of schools a proportional representation of schools were randomly selected. The basis for the decision as to which schools received additional staffing from the allocation provided by the Metro Board, appeared to become less obvious beyond a certain level of grouping. Therefore, the researcher decided to use a similar decision making process as for the number of teachers, in arriving at the number of schools that were included in the sample. There appeared to be general agreement among most of those who were involved in the process, as well as those who were aware of the characteristics of the schools, in relation to the schools listed in the first category or level. After this point, the level of agreement fluctuated with some expressing surprise that certain schools were listed for extra funding when they thought...
they should not be, or that other schools were not included that they thought qualified.
Realizing that a few boards also have elementary schools that include grades seven and
eight, as well as the realization that one list that was provided included a school that
was at the Junior high level resulted in some boards having one or two schools more
than or less than the exact proportional division would have provided. This process
resulted in the number of schools from each board varying between two to 15.

The original plan of identification of inner city schools using schools that were
close to housing facilities (apartment buildings) provided by Metropolitan Toronto
Housing Authority and the City of Toronto was not successful. The main reason for
this failure was difficulty in obtaining a complete list of housing provided by the
different governments.

Procedure Used in Obtaining Sample of Teachers

The sample size required for generalization and the application of certain
statistical methods was 342 (Borg, 1989). In the original stages of planning this
survey research study it was the intention of the researcher to obtain the required
random sample through the six school boards. The process of trying to meet all the
different requirements for each board, the varying interpretations as to the terms used,
for example, should a school be called inner city, special needs, resulted in the
realization that the time frame needed to complete the study would not be possible using
the boards. The decision was made to request the assistance of the Federation of
Women Teachers of Ontario (referred to as FWTAO) in obtaining a random sample of
the teachers needed from the inner city schools. The membership of this federation
comprised of only female elementary school teachers. The sample requested from this
federation was 392 teachers. After this decision was made an application was
approved by the Ontario Public School Teachers Federation (OPSTF), whose
statutory membership comprise of male elementary school teachers. These members are about 30% of the elementary teachers, therefore a sample of 132 teachers, were randomly drawn from the male federation. The total sample size was 524.

Type of Sample Obtained

A stratified random sample, based on sex was drawn. In Ontario approximately 30 percent of the teachers at the elementary level are male. In addition to sex, the method used by the Metropolitan Toronto School Board in identifying the proportion of additional funds that each board received for their inner city schools, was also used as a stratifying characteristic. This procedure was explained in the previous section. Specific boards that comprise Metropolitan Toronto Public Schools Boards were included. A computer generated random sample of teachers were drawn by the FWTAO. In entering the names of teachers, the federation entered all the teachers from the schools selected for each board each time. The computer generated total random sample of teachers for that board was then drawn. In this way the proportion of teachers required from each board was obtained. However, this resulted in a total of six schools from four of the six boards not having any female teachers included in the random sample. The random sampling procedure used by OPSTF was manually done. The method used resulted in at least one teacher being randomly drawn from each school. One condition of the agreement with each federation was that they were responsible for mailing the original questionnaire packages and also the follow up correspondence. In this way confidentiality and anonymity of the members who participated in the study was maintained. The return address on the stamped envelopes was that of the researcher. Co-ordination of the coding systems used for following up resulted in the federations having accurate records of the exact school and specific questionnaires that went to each board, although the exact person who received the
questionnaire was not known to the researcher. Unfortunately, the questionnaires were sent out during the last week of school in June 1992. The timing of the mailing had a negative effect on the response rate. The first mailing of questionnaires for the male federation were all sent to school addresses. The first mailing for the female teachers were sent to their home addresses if available. Six percent of the female teachers did not have a home address listing with the federation. These questionnaires were sent to the school addresses and were therefore not received, since by the date of delivery the teachers were on their summer vacation. Approximately four percent of the follow up packages were not sent to the male teachers because the federation did not have their home addresses.

Timeline of the Study

As stated in a previous section, both federations (FWTAO & OPSTF) agreed to assist the researcher in obtaining a stratified random sample of teachers from specific schools in each of the six boards.

During the last week of school for the 1991-1992 school year a complete package was mailed out by each federation to the teachers selected. Each package contained the questionnaire, a cover letter from the researcher, another cover letter from either the president, in the case of the OPSTF, or, a cover letter from the executive secretary for the FWTAO, as well as a stamped return envelope addressed to the home of the researcher. On Friday, 19th June 1992, 132 questionnaires were sent to the school addresses of OPSTF members. On Monday, 22nd June 1992, 369 complete packages were sent to the home addresses of FWTAO members. Home addresses were not available for 23 members and hence these were sent to their respective schools.

The first follow-up letter was delivered to the key or contact teacher of both
federations at each school's address by the researcher on the 25th June 1992. They were asked to place a copy in each teacher's mail box since the names of each teacher in the sample was not known to the researcher or the contact teacher. Unfortunately, this was the last day of school for students at some boards and those teachers who were transferring to another school could have already left. Second follow-up letters were sent out by the OPSTF (male teachers' federation) on the 9th July, 1992. The female federation mailed the second follow up letters on the 21st July, 1992. By the 15th August nearly 50 percent of the questionnaires were returned.

A final follow-up letter was sent to key teachers at each school by the researcher on the 29th September 1992. A few additional questionnaires were returned as a result of this third follow up letter. October 15th 1992 was used as the cut off date. Six completed questionnaires were received after this closing date, but they were not entered in the data file.

Development of Instrument

A questionnaire developed by the writer was used since an instrument that measured the variables of this study was not found.

Field Testing of Questionnaire

Two pilot studies were conducted on this questionnaire, involving a total of more than twenty individuals in both studies. The purpose for the field test, which was made of a sample of 12 teachers was mainly to be certain that the questions were clearly understood and that researcher and respondents understood the meaning of each question as it was intended. Corrections were made in relation to clarity. During the period from September 1991 to April 1992, members of the class, 3234 Y Research Seminar in Multicultural Studies, spent a great deal of time critiquing the questionnaire.
With Dr. Peter Gamlin, the professor, they also completed the questionnaire. Many of their suggestions were also implemented.

**Expert Input**

Five experts were then asked individually to critique the questionnaire and provide suggestions for improvement. Interviews ranged from 15 minutes, to as long as one hour. Their suggestions were also included in the revision of the questionnaire. Those interviewed, because of their expertise in one area or another included the following doctors: James Cummins—Curriculum, OISE (Ontario Institute for Studies in Education); Michael Fullan—Teacher Education, U of T (University of Toronto); Edward Harvey -- Completed statistical aspect of Inner City Schools study, professor at OISE; Monica Heller -- Sociology of Education, OISE; and Ross Traub -- Measurement and Evaluation, OISE.

The experts whose opinions and studies were used in developing the questionnaire, were not as well known as some writers and researchers. Opinions differed in many areas as was to be expected. This questionnaire has been tested and revised extensively. A copy of the questionnaire is included in the appendix.

**Reliability and Validity of the Instrument**

**Reliability**

**General Guidelines**

It was very important that the questionnaire which was developed by the researcher, resulted in people in comparable situations answering questions in similar ways, and that the answers provided be true measures and have the meaning that was intended (Fowler, 1988). There were usually three different main ways of checking
the reliability of an instrument: Coefficient of Stability (test-retest), Coefficient of Equivalence (alternative-form) method, and Coefficient of Internal Consistency (Carmines & Zellers, 1979). The most commonly used methods of computing internal consistency were: the split-half test, the Kuder-Richardson methods, and Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha. The Cronbach's method was appropriate for this questionnaire because most of the questions were not dichotomous but multiple-choice, with several possible answers, each of which was given a different weight (Borg & Gall, 1989).

Reliability was described as the ratio of the true to observed variance. Since reliability was a strictly statistical concept, it could not be determined by subjective investigation of the test items, the questionnaire had to be administered to a group of subjects and the reliability coefficient computed from the score. However, Fowler (1988) provided some practical suggestions for helping to increase reliability of an instrument, and these had been implemented before the questionnaire was mailed out. The three main suggestions made by Fowler were: (1) The use of a questionnaire helps to ensure that each respondent in the sample is asked the same set of questions. (2) Designing questions that mean the same thing to all respondents, (3) "Respondents should have the same perception of what constitutes an adequate answer for the question" (p. 83). The author suggested that closed instead of open type questions helped to fulfill the third aid in improving reliability.

Assessment

The reliability of this questionnaire varied according to the different sections. The range being from 0.42 to 0.69. For each subscale, the reliabilities were as follows: parental involvement 0.59, socioeconomic status 0.46, teacher methodology 0.30 and teacher expectations 0.44. This was somewhat lower than one would prefer; however, the exploratory nature of the study, and not finding an appropriate
instrument, when weighed against the possible contribution of the finding to the education of students, appears, as Borg (1989) had stated, to far outweigh not conducting the study. As one reads the views of experts on the question of reliability, it becomes obvious that the question as to what is a minimum acceptable coefficient has no one answer. It depends a great deal on previous similar studies that have been done before, and as stated previously none could be found, hence a comparison was not possible. The type of questionnaire also did not lend itself to the use of reliability as the main method of evaluating the consistency of the questions: one of the sections, dialects of English, contained only dichotomous variables. The scale type variables in the other four sections comprised from two to six items.

Validity

General Guidelines

Validity refers to an instrument doing exactly what it was intended to do, that was measuring what it is supposed to measure.

Realizing that the presence of error was inevitable, be it random or non random (validity), the purpose was to reduce them. Much effort was extended in attempting to make the instrument produce consistent results and reflect its intended theoretical concept. Reliability has been described as an empirical issue, (Carmines & Zellers, 1979), focusing on performance of empirical measures (observable response), while validity is more of a theoretically oriented issue (unobservable concept).

Fowler (1988) provided some practical suggestions for increasing the validity of factual and subjective response. Four main reasons why respondents' information was not accurate were, lack of: knowledge, recall, understanding of question, or social desirability. Suggestions for correcting the above problems have been included.
in the questionnaire. Validity of subjective questions can be increased by: making the 
questions as reliable as possible, the validity of a measure will be increased if real 
differences among respondents are measured, it is also better to have more than fewer 
categories and multiple questions, varying the form of the questions, help to improve 
the validity of the measurement process. As Judd and Kidder (1986) stated, 
operational definitions were necessary even though inadequate in assessing validity and 
reliability, since no operational definition completely defines the construct. The aim 
was to be as accurate as possible under the given limitations. This the researcher 
attempted to do in developing the instrument.

The researcher spent a great deal of time on trying to be certain that all the 
major factors that could make an instrument invalid were considered. There were 
numerous types of validity, some relating mainly to experimental research: Internal 
validity is very important when one is focusing on causal link, while external validity, 
which provides a basis for generalization, requires that sampling procedures be 
carefully followed.

Face validity. This validity usually involves judges or sometimes experts who 
read or looked at a measuring instrument and decided whether in their opinion it 
measured what it was supposed to measure (Judd & Kidder, 1986).

According to Carmines and Zellers (1979), each type of validity had a 
somewhat different approach in assessing the extent to which a measure does its job.

Criterion-related validity. This validity was required when an instrument was 
used to estimate some important form of behavior that was external to the measuring 
instrument itself, the latter being referred to as the criterion (p.17). Judd and Kidder 
(1986) contended that this type of validity was very useful in some areas but not 
much in social sciences that involves concepts that were often abstract. For criterion
related validity the standard or criterion against which the measure was assessed also should be valid. The instrument developed for this study had to be produced by the researcher, with many of the items not used before in the literature. Attempts to finding an instrument containing the type of information that this study investigated was not successful. The absence of an appropriate criterion makes this type of validity invalid for this study. There were no criteria against which this measure can be reasonably evaluated (Carmines & Zellers, 1979).

According to Carmines and Zellers (1979), each type of validity had a somewhat different approach in assessing the extent to which a measure measured what it was intended to measure. Content validity depended on the extent to which an empirical measurement reflected a specific domain or content. It was very difficult to specify the domain of abstract concepts. Another difficulty with theoretical concepts was obtaining a representative sample of the items that comprised the content. Usually experts do not agree on what comprise the content. For most variables in social sciences there was no agreed upon criterion for determining the extent to which a measure had content validity. For this study it was near impossible to find agreement on what constituted the body of knowledge on the five home and school factors that were used as variables. As provided for in the review of literature section, articles were included that provided quotes from experts in the area to validate the inclusion of as many items as possible. In this manner the researcher had attempted to provide content validity for the instrument. This set of items cannot claim to be a representative sample of the entire content of the construct knowledge since the limitations of that body of information was not even known. Therefore, using content validity in and of itself would certainly not have provided evidence that the instrument was valid. An extensive review of the literature on the different types of validity resulted in the decision to focus mainly, on construct validity for this questionnaire.
**Construct Validity.** According to Carmines and Zeller (1979) “Construct Validity is woven into the theoretical fabric of the social sciences and is thus central to the measurement of abstract concepts” (p.23). This type of validity tried to answer the question: “To what extent do certain explanatory concepts or qualities account for performance on the test?” (Isaac & Michael, 1981, p. 82). Carmines and Zeller (1979) identifies three steps that were important in applying construct validity. First the theoretical relationship between the concepts needed to be specified. Then the empirical relationship between the measures of the concepts must be examined. Finally, the evidence must be interpreted in terms of how it clarified the construct validity of the measure. One may object to this being the main type of validity used in this study, knowing that it was somewhat exploratory in nature, and construct validity was theory laden so to speak. Carmines and Zellers (1979) stated, “this should not lead to the erroneous conclusion that only formal, fully developed theories were relevant to construct validation” (p.23).

**Assessment**

The researcher met with five experts (Drs. Cummins, Fullan, Harvey, Heller and Traub). Different aspects of the questionnaire were discussed with some of these experts. Suggestions made for improvement were implemented. This procedure helped to increase not only the face but also the content validity of the instrument.

The construct validity of this questionnaire was assessed by observation of consistency in answering and ranking of the five home school factors. In this study the answers to specific questions on each factor, and the ranking of the factors were compared. Scores on these two measures were correlated. This provided a numerical estimate of the relationship between the variables. A substantial relationship supported construct validity. If it was evident that high scorers on the test also tended
to rank school factors as more important than home factors, the underlying concept or construct of the study was supported. Factor analysis by its reduction of many variables into a few constructs or factors also was evidence of construct validity of the questionnaire.

**Rationale for Choice of Variables**

This section of the chapter showed the connection between the factors chosen for the study, and how these factors were addressed on the questionnaire. Reasons for choosing the five factors of the study were also provided.

A review of the literature revealed a great number of factors that had been previously listed as affecting the teaching of disadvantaged students. However, the three home related factors, parental involvement, dialect of English, and socioeconomic status were constantly listed in more than one study. The school related factors of teacher methodology and teacher expectations, were also given much emphasis in the current literature. Studies on teacher thought structure being a good example (Wittrock, 1986).

A major difficulty in previous work had been the tendency to address only one of the numerous factors on an in-depth basis. What was needed was a summary or bringing together of teacher information and attitudes on all the major factors that had been identified with effective teaching and disadvantaged students.

This was an exploratory study because other research studies that examined awareness of teachers on the same variables, in a holistic approach had not been located. The development of the questionnaire and the investigation about teachers' perception and ranking of all these variables was also new ground. Under these circumstances, research hypotheses were not advisable (Long, 1985).

Studies had been conducted demonstrating academic success of students from
lower socioeconomic class, students who spoke a nonstandard dialect of English and students whose parents were not actively involved in their education. These three students' factors cannot be always negative if some students were academically successful even though they had these characteristics (Mortimore 1988).

In this study the underlying rationale was that all students, in a regular elementary classroom, who are of average intelligence can achieve basic functional literacy (defined as mastery of minimum grade level objectives). This achievement was not dependent on the language spoken, the socioeconomic status or level of parental involvement. At the elementary level, the important factors were that teachers possessed and demonstrated, high expectations for all students, and teaching methodology based on students' learning styles. In the presence of such a supportive, trusting relationship between teacher and students, functional literacy should occur for all students (Parson, 1985).

In this section, an overview of the questionnaire was presented. This section showed the connection between the conceptual framework and the items in the questionnaire used to measure the major variables (see Figure 1).

Table 1 showed the division of the questionnaire into sections based on the five factors examined in the study. In each cell of the table, the numbers are the exact ones used in labeling the questions on the questionnaire.

Table 1 showed that the format for questions on: sources accessed, usefulness of sources, adequacy of teacher training, impact (helpfulness) of factor, and perceived importance of each of the five factors, was repeated for each factor.

Additional information on the questionnaire was presented in Table 2.

The measurement scale was composed of three of the four types. The ratio scale was not used. Fourteen of the 30 questions used as measurement of the
Table 1
Division of Questionnaire: Each Cell Contains the Number Used to Label the Item on the Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groupings of questions</th>
<th>Parents Involved</th>
<th>Dialects of English</th>
<th>SES</th>
<th>Teacher Methods</th>
<th>Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception: Rating</td>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>Q18</td>
<td>Q32</td>
<td>Q42</td>
<td>Q51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources Accessed</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>Q21</td>
<td>Q34</td>
<td>Q45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thirty Specific Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Factual type</td>
<td>Q's 3 - 6</td>
<td>Q14, 15</td>
<td>Q23, 24</td>
<td>Q's 36- 38</td>
<td>Q47, 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Own Experience</td>
<td>Q 7-9</td>
<td>Q16, 17</td>
<td>Q25-31</td>
<td>Q39-41</td>
<td>Q49, 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Usefulness of Sources</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>Q22</td>
<td>Q35</td>
<td>Q46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Adequacy of Training</td>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>Q20</td>
<td>Q33</td>
<td>Q44</td>
<td>Q53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of FACTOR on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Success</td>
<td>Q19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q43</td>
<td>Q52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Q = The label numbers for items on the questionnaire.
Table 2  
Scale Type Used in Questionnaire  
Each column contains total number of questions on each factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Parina Q1</th>
<th>Langb Q12</th>
<th>SESc Q21</th>
<th>Methsd Q34</th>
<th>Expse Q45</th>
<th>Answer Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sources:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessed: Nominal</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>Q21</td>
<td>Q34</td>
<td>Q45</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness: Interval</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>Q22</td>
<td>Q35</td>
<td>Q46</td>
<td>Useful/Not Useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy: Interval</td>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>Q20</td>
<td>Q33</td>
<td>Q44</td>
<td>Q53</td>
<td>Adequate/Inadq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance: Interval</td>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>Q18</td>
<td>Q32</td>
<td>Q42</td>
<td>Q51</td>
<td>Imp/Unimportant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q19</td>
<td>Q43</td>
<td>Q52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Helpful/Unhelpful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Division of thirty specific Questions

| Nominal             | Q3,9      | 14-17     | 23-25    | 36-38      | Q47,48    | Yes/No       |
| Interval            | Q4-8      | 0         | 0        | 39-41      | Q49,50    | Agree/Disagree |
| Interval            |           | 26-31     |          |            |           | Helpful/Unhelpful |
| Ranking the five factors | Question # 54 | 1 to 5tim | | | |

Plus 18 demographics Factors

Note. Q = The label numbers for items on the questionnaire.  
aParental involvement.  bDialects of English.  cSocioeconomic status.  
dTeaching methodology.  eTeacher expectations.

independent variable was dichotomous (yes/no). Of the other 16 questions, ten were  
the agree/disagree type while the remaining six were helpful/unhelpful scale. The  
dependent variable was measured using the ranking choices (1 to 5) and  
important/unimportant rating scale.

There was much debate in the literature on whether some data classified as
interval scale type data for measurement purposes really met the requirements (Andrews, 1981). In this study, attitude type scales were used as interval type data for statistical analysis. Along with the thirty questions that comprised the independent variable, other questions included and analyzed used adequate/not adequate and useful/not useful scales.

**Specific Measures and Variables**

**Perception of Home/School Factors:** Teachers were asked to rate the importance of five home/school factors on a 5-point scale (Q.10,18,32,42,51). They were also asked to rank the relative impact of the five factors (Q. 54).

**Awareness/opinions of Home/School Factors:** Teachers were asked to answer 30 questions designed to test their factual (13 questions) and experiential understanding (17 questions) of the five home/school factors (see Tables 1 and 2). These 30 questions were either scored 1 for expected answer or 0.

**Access to Information:** Questions were based on the sources accessed (Q.1,12,21,34,45), the usefulness of information from those sources (Q. 2,13,22,35,46) and the adequacy of the information gained during teacher training (Q. 11, 20, 33, 44, 53).

**Demographic Variables:** Teachers were asked to provide information regarding their background that included: age, gender, type and location of early residence, education, teacher training, languages, and composition of student population.

In scoring the 30 questions that made up the independent variables, each answer was either scored 1 or 0. A total score was calculated for each factor. For the dependent variables, the 1 or 0 identified group membership. Answering the question as either important or somewhat important placed a teacher in one group. Those who answered neutral or unimportant belonged to the other group. In the case of the
ranking questions, giving a factor a 1 or 2 meant membership in one group, while a rank of 3, 4, or 5 placed the teacher in the other group. For the dependent variable (ranking and rating), whether or not the answer provided assigned the teacher to Group 1 or 0 depended on whether the factor in question was a school or home factor. Teachers who chose very important or somewhat important for teacher methodology and teacher expectations were placed in Group 1, for those analyses that involved this variable. Those who ranked teacher methodology and teacher expectations 1 or 2 were placed in Group 1 for those analyses that involved the ranking variable.

Procedure for Data Analysis

Best and Kahn (1989) emphasized the importance of carefully organizing the data so that analysis and interpretation could continue in an efficient manner. Mutually exclusive categories were identified for tabulation. The organization of the data mainly used the subproblems as a guide. Tabulation involves transferring the data from the data gathering instrument, the questionnaire, so that they can be systematically examined. Judd and Kidder (1986) described coding as placing the information generated by the research into a form that makes analysis possible. The program CENTRY (Wolfe, 1986) was used for data entry and coding. The records storage process allowed for easy access and processing. A code book that clearly identifies the unit of analysis (teachers, one row for each respondent), was created. One column was designated for each piece of information, and the cells contained the value of each variable (coded data). The importance of being consistent in the assignment of values was frequently emphasized by authors. While categorical data can be coded arbitrarily, the scheme for ordinal and interval need to preserve the values and differences in the meaning of the numbers given. Keeping in mind that the purpose of the data coding was not an end in itself but to help in the analysis so that the research questions raised
could be answered, emphasis was placed on using tables that helped best in achieving this goal. According to Best and Kahn (1989) tables help to show the similarities and relationship of data. Only percentages were presented in the cells for most tables; however, the actual numbers, in brackets were sometimes included.

Subproblems

1. The first subproblem dealt with descriptive statistics on teachers' rankings and ratings, of these five home/school variables: Parental involvement, standard and nonstandard dialects of English, and socioeconomic status of students (the three home variables), and teaching methodology and teacher expectation, (the two school variables).

   Teachers who ranked or rated a home variable as 3, 4 or, 5 and a school variable as 1 or 2 were placed in Group 1. Those teachers who ranked a school variables as 3, 4 or, 5 or a home variable as 1 or 2 were placed in Group 0.

2. The second subproblem dealt with the assessment of teachers' answers and scores to specific questions about these five home/school variables: (1) parental involvement, (2) standard and nonstandard dialects of English, (3) socioeconomic status of students, (4) teaching methodology and, (5) teacher expectation of students' learning. Each of the 30 answers was scored 1 or 0.

3. The third subproblem compared means obtained from answers to the 30 questions provided by the two groups of teachers. Teachers' placement in either of two groups was based on the choices they made when ranking the impact of the five variables of the study, on their ability to effectively teach disadvantaged students.
Statistical Analysis of Data

In answering subproblem three the answers to subproblem one and two were compared: teachers' ranking/rating and their answers to the 30 questions. Teachers' answers to the questions on sources accessed for each factor was also compared with their answers to questions on that specific factor.

In answering research questions one and two, tables were created providing descriptive statistics on the variables. Summaries including percentages and number of respondents were also tabulated.

Statistical analyses of differences between rating, ranking, sources accessed, and answers to specific questions were completed using the t test produced by SPSS program.

Teachers' choices in ranking the five home/school factors were grouped and the new variable created was used in some of the analysis (see Tables 15 and 29). The rankings of the five factors were grouped using the two top rankings (choices 1 or 2). For some statistical analyses the following procedure was used. Those teachers who ranked both school factors (teacher expectations and teacher methodology) as 1 or 2 were placed in one group. The teachers who placed one school factor plus parental involvement as their two top rankings comprised another group. The final group was made up of teachers choosing either school factor and either of the remaining home factors (language or SES). SPSS program Manova was used to analyze the relationship among the three groups based on ranking choices and teachers rating of the importance of each of the five home/school factors (see Table 16). This provided a consistency check between the two questions that addressed research question 1.

Running procedure Factor Analysis and using ten of the 16 scale type questions resulted in three factors. These three factors were compared with the variable based on
teachers' ranking choices (see Table 29). This analysis demonstrated the correlation among the three new factors from factor analysis and the variable (teachers ranking choices). This provided answers to research question 3.

Application of Factor Analysis procedure by SPSS resulted in the reduction of 10 variables to a total of three. This reduction of the number of variables demonstrated their correlation, thus support the construct validity of the questionnaire.

Additional Information on Research Design

Assumptions Concerning t-Test and Anova

Three assumptions that should be met before using parametric statistics such as t-test are: (1) scores form an interval or ratio scale of measurement, (2) scores of the population under study are normally distributed, and (3) score variances for the population under study are equal. According to Borg (1989):

Statisticians have conducted research to determine what happens when the assumptions underlying the t-test and other parametric statistics are violated. They have found that these tests provide accurate estimates of statistical significance even under conditions of substantial violation of the assumptions. (p. 548)

None of these assumptions were violated. The sample size was large and met the normal distribution requirement. According to Andrews (1981), for analytic purposes two-point scale (for example, yes/no) can be treated as interval scale (p. 65). For the equal variance assumption, SPSS statistical procedure OneWay was used. OneWay procedure test for homogeneity-of-variance. The probability ranged from .291 to .916. According to Norusis (1988) "If the significance levels are not small there is no reason to worry" (p.199).

Concerning the population that the two groups were taken from, the assumptions for the use of parametric tests were not violated. Borg (1989) mentioned...
studies in which two groups from the same random sample were formed using answers on one variable. Mean scores on another variable achieved by the two groups were compared using t-test. The two groups in this study were from the same population, differing in their ranking choices. Support for this statement of similarity of the groups, was provided by running SPSS program Crosstabs, with the two ranking groups compared on demographic variables, for example, sex and training. Chi-square test did not reveal any significant differences among the groups based on these demographic variables.

Comparative Nature of Study

Some authors (Balian, 1988; Best, 1989 & Borg, 1989), stated that when the focus of the study is on differences between groups instead of relationships within one group then the statistical method used involves comparison.

One may view all analysis as relationships and interrelationships with varying levels (Balian, 1988). Statistics help to describe the intensity and magnitude of these relationships. The focus of this study was the comparison of group means. Teachers’ ranking choices was used to create the two groups of teachers. Were the two groups formed similar, with the main difference being their ranking of the impact of the five factors? According to Borg (1989), the comparative method “involves comparing samples that are different on a critical variable but otherwise similar” (p. 535). As was done in this study, such groups may be drawn from the same population.

Statistical test (chi-square) was used to compare the two groups of teachers on different demographic variables: age, sex, location of training, educational levels, and so forth. The groups were similar the main exception being their ranking choices.

Thirty questions (16 scale type and 14 dichotomous) were answered by teachers on the five factors. Answers were coded 1 or 0. Initially the analyses of all the
answers were only based on the factor that the questions focused on (see Table 1). That is, the means of the answers for each factor by itself were compared. As stated previously, the two groups were based on the ranking choices (see Tables 23 and 24). This method was appropriate since all the answers were coded 1 or 0 and the form of the questions (yes/no or scale type), did not influence the total score (Andrews, 1981).

However, additional statistical analyses were completed, with the answers being separated based on whether or not the type of questions were dichotomous or continuous. The results of the statistical analyses were similar (see Tables 30 to 34).

For this exploratory study, the t test and Analysis of Variance: to test if there were significant differences between group means were used. Borg (1989) emphasized that the t test and Anova do not provide information on the magnitude of the relationship between the variables. The suggestion was made that when observed differences are statistically significant, correlational statistics, which indicate the magnitude of the relationship between two variables should be computed (p. 567).

For this study, the group comparisons that were statistically significant, were further analyzed for magnitude of relationships. Parametric tests, (for the scale type variables) and non-parametric for the nominal and ordinal variables were used.

In summary, this chapter discussed the following topics: sampling design, the identification of inner city schools, the procedure used in obtaining the sample, the timeline used for deliver and receipt of questionnaires from teachers. The next section discussed the development of the instrument: the field tests conducted, evaluation by experts, as well as the methods used for ascertaining its reliability and validity were presented. The timeline in collection of the data was discussed. The division of the questionnaire based on the research questions was summarized in table form. In the final section of the chapter data management and statistical analysis procedures were discussed. Additionally, information in the final paragraphs supported the focus on
differences between group means and the comparative nature of the study.

The following chapter discussed the findings of the study.
CHAPTER V

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

Overview

In this exploratory study, the ranking choices of inner city teachers on the impact of five home/school variables on their ability to effectively teach disadvantaged students, were used to form two groups. Comparisons were made of the mean scores of these two groups on answers they provided to specific questions about the five variable.

The Research questions were:

Did teachers rank the three home related variables (parental involvement, standard/nonstandard dialects of English, and socioeconomic status of students) as having greater impact than the school related variables (teacher expectations and teaching methodology) on their ability to effectively teach disadvantaged students?

Was teachers' awareness concerning the range of opinion about the variables revealed in their answers to questions on the sources they accessed and the information they obtained?

Did the teachers with the higher mean scores on questions about the five home/school variables, also rank the school variables 1 and 2 and the home variables as 3, 4, and 5?

This chapter presented the results of the study. The first section discussed information on the characteristics of the sample of teachers (see Tables 3 to 9, and Figures 2 to 8). The tables were organized according to the research questions. For each table when necessary, the main research questions that the analyses attempted to
answer were restated. The findings were then reported. Brief statements on the meanings of the results were provided.

In later analyses, some values that were less than 20 were combined so that minimum cell frequencies of about 30 cases each, were maintained. Teachers' answers to the first research question: the rating and ranking of the five home/school variables were used throughout most of the analysis involving group comparison.

The Statistical Packages for Social Sciences SPSS (Norusis, 1988), Release 4.0, was the computer program used in the analysis of all the data.

**Characteristics of the Sample**

In this section information on the sample is presented. Emphasis was placed on providing data to support the statement that the teachers came from the same population and were similar in many characteristics. Many additional statistical tests were completed involving age, educational levels, training, and sex. No significant differences were found when these demographic items were compared with teachers' ranking choices. This made it possible to complete the groupings of the teachers based on ranking choices since they were no significant differences that could be used in arguing that the sample was from different populations.

Pie graphs (see Figures 2 to 8) were also drawn on the demographic information provided in the tables. As noted in Table 3, and Figure 2, the majority of the teachers (40%) were in the 40 to 49 age group. In further analysis the age groups were collapsed into three levels: below 40 (1), 40 to 49 (2) and 50, and over (3).

Table 4 and Figure 3, show that more than half of the teachers grew up in urban areas. Areas where teachers grew up formed two groups, urban and non-urban.

Teachers (62%) had completed a Bachelor's degree (see Table 5 and Figure 4). Education groups were, Unto Bachelors, and Beyond Bachelors.
Table 3

Characteristics of the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response: Age</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age: 20-29</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 plus</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no response</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Percentage Distribution of Age.
Table 4
Type of Community Where Teachers Grew up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response: Areas Teachers Grew up in</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural &amp; other</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>245</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Responses included communities in and out of Canada.

Figure 3. Percentage Distribution of Areas Where Teachers Grew up.
Table 5
Educational Levels of Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response: Level of education</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Courses for B.A.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses for M.A.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond Masters</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4. Percentage Distribution of Level of Education.
Places where teachers grew up were also grouped as: Central Canada, which included Ontario and Quebec (1), and Other (which includes rest of Canada or another country (2). 76% of the teachers in the sample grew up in Central Canada (Ontario or Quebec). Table 6 and Figure 5 show that 18% of the teachers did not spend their early years in Canada.

A similar proportion of female to male teachers, (three to one), as was found in the regular school staff was maintained in the sample (see Table 7 and Figure 6).

The ratio of female teachers to male in the elementary schools in metropolitan Toronto is approximately 3 to 1. Stratified random sampling based on sex, was used to help maintain this balance.

Four groups for Teacher Training were often used in analysis. In some instances not in Ontario and teachers' college were grouped as Other Training (3). A small group of teachers, who appeared to have received training at the only source then available for training: Teacher Training Colleges' provided comments that presented a view of the content of previous teachers' training programs. From the comments made by this group of teachers, they appeared to provide some interesting information and basis for further analysis; however, because they were a small part of the sample (total being less than 30) more detailed study of this group could not be completed.

Nearly one third of the teachers (30%) were trained at the University of Toronto (see Table 8 and Figure 7).

Teachers provided additional information on the different demographic variables that were not statistically analyzed because of the qualitative nature of the information. Teachers who were not trained in Canada and grew up outside Canada mainly listed their countries of origin and training as Great Britain or the United States of America.
Table 6
Geographical Location of Early Residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response: Places where you grew up</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ontario and Quebec</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other section of Canada</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other country</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total *more than one response</td>
<td>263*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Total sample = 245 teachers.

Figure 5. Percentage Distribution of Places Where Teachers Grew up.
Table 7
Sex and Federation Membership of Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response: Federation Membership</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F.W.T.A.O.\textsuperscript{a} - Female</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.P.S.T.F.\textsuperscript{b} - Male</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}FWTAO = Federation of Women Teachers Associations of Ontario.
\textsuperscript{b}OPSTF = Ontario Public School Teachers' Federation.

Figure 6. Percentage Distribution of Gender.
Table 9 and Figure 8 show that 65% of the teachers speak only English. Language groups were collapsed into two values; Only English (1), and English plus (2).

Age, education and training were the main demographic variables used in additional analyses. Unfortunately in the process of preparing the questionnaire for printing the variable that specifically requested information on years of teaching experience was unintentionally omitted. The age variable was therefore used as a proxy for experience.

The data provided on the student population (see questionnaire in appendix) indicated that Caribbean or West Indian students were the one group of students most frequently chosen by teachers when ranking the first three students' groups with the highest population at their school.

Crosstabulations of Age with other demographic variables were completed. Additional demographic information that was not included in Table 1 to 9, involved the amount of time teachers in the sample were employed to teach. 85% of the teachers (209) taught on a full time basis. Only six percent (14), were employed on a half-time basis. Below five percent of teachers worked less than half time. Ten teachers did not answer the question.

In the analysis of the data the specific impact of the University of Toronto was compared with the other variables. Within the context of Metropolitan Toronto area, the importance of the University of Toronto to teacher training was frequently reviewed. Five percent (12) of the sample of teachers did not provide information on their training.

Many statistical tests were completed on the demographic variables. The result confirmed that the two groups which were based on teachers' ranking choices, and used extensively in numerous analyses were not significantly different, and could
have been from the same population.

Table 8
Location of Teacher Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response: Location of Training</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Toronto</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other University in Ontario</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not trained in Ontario</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained at Teachers' college</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Teachers trained at these locations were in the older age group.*
### Table 9
Different Languages Spoken by Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response: Languages Spoken</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only English</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and French</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and other</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English, French &amp; other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** The two official languages of Canada are English and French.

![Figure 8. Percentage Distribution of Languages Teachers Speak.](image)
Research Question 1

Did teachers rank the three home related variables (parental involvement, standard/nonstandard dialects of English, and socioeconomic status of students), as having greater impact than the school related variables (teacher expectations and teaching methodology), on their ability to effectively teach disadvantaged students?

Rating of the Home/School Variables

Table 10 summarized some of the information on this research question. In answering the first research question, 81.5% rated parental involvement as very important compared to 77% that rated the school variable, teacher expectation as very important or 74% for teaching methodology. Table 10 shows the highest frequency was for a home variable, parental involvement. In organizing the tables, the format followed the one used in the questionnaire design, whenever appropriate. This meant that the five variables: parental involvement, dialects of English, socioeconomic status, teaching methodology, and teacher expectation were labeled in similar order, in the tables as on the questionnaire. Further analyses of these ratings were recorded in other sections of this chapter, (see Tables 16 and 24).

Table 10 shows how each variable was rated. Only socioeconomic status had 14% of teachers rating it below neutral. For all the other variables the percentage was less than two percent. With respect to Research Question 1 which focused on the ranking choices of teachers, information on the rating of importance of the variables by themselves served as a consistency test. The intention was to observe if any teachers, for example, rated a variable unimportant but then ranked it higher than another variable that was rated as important.
Table 10
Teachers' Opinion on Importance of the Impact of Each Home/School Variables on Their Ability to Effectively Teach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response: Rating Topics: (^a)</th>
<th>1 Parinvl</th>
<th>2 Lang</th>
<th>3 SES</th>
<th>4 Meths</th>
<th>5 Exp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(200)</td>
<td>(138)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(182)</td>
<td>(188)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Important</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(35)</td>
<td>(88)</td>
<td>(118)</td>
<td>(47)</td>
<td>(43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Unimportant</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unimportant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(245)</td>
<td>(245)</td>
<td>(245)</td>
<td>(245)</td>
<td>(245)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Column label Headings: 1 = parental involvement: (Parinvl)  2 = dialects of English: (lang)  3 = socioeconomic status: (SES)  4 = teacher methodology: (Meths)  5 = teacher expectation : (Exp)

\(^a\)Ratings values ranged from 1 for very important to 5 for unimportant
With the numbers used for both rating and ranking being of the range from 1 to 5, with 1 having the greatest value and 5, the least it was possible to calculate means and frequencies.

Table 11 presents descriptive statistics for the rating of the importance of the five variables. This summary shows that the home variable, parental involvement had the lowest number for its mean. With the scale being 1 for most important, this meant that teachers rated this variable as the most important in its impact on their ability to effectively teach disadvantaged students. The school variables were rated next in terms of the means being closer to very important. For this variable on importance only 35 teachers rated four of the variables below somewhat important. There was a tendency observed in Tables 10 and 11: the home variable, parental involvement, as observed in frequency and mean, was rated as having the most importance among the five variables of the study in regard to effective teaching of disadvantaged students. The variable that was not rated very important to the extent the other four were, was socioeconomic status.

However, teachers emphasized their view that poverty, when called by that name was not seen as important as the other four variables, since a total of 35% of teachers rated importance of poverty as neutral (21%) or unimportant (14%).

It should be noted that socioeconomic status had the highest frequency for neutral when compared to the other four variables. In scoring the six scale type questions on this variable, the answer that was scored 1 was neutral.

The relevance of questions on the importance of the five variables by themselves becomes evident in the section on research question 3.
Table 11
Descriptive Statistics for the Rating of Importance for Each Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of each Variable: abbreviations in later tables in brackets ( )^b</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD^a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parental Involvement (Parinvl)</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Expectation (Exp)</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Methodology (Meths)</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialects of English (Lang)</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-Economic Status (SES)</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Rating scale values: 1 most important to 5 least important
^aSD means standard deviation
^bThe abbreviations for the names of the variables are used in Tables.

The questions on the rating of the importance of the variables by themselves helped to demonstrate the differences of opinions that one home variable appeared to generate. In answer to the research questions, teachers appeared to be consistent in their view that two home variables: dialects of English and socio-economic status should be rated and ranked below both school variables with respect to the impact of the variables on their ability to effectively teach disadvantaged students.
There is less agreement on the home variable, parental involvement.

Ranking of the Home/School Variables

The research question inquired as to whether teachers would perceive the home related variables as more important than the school related variables for effective teaching of disadvantaged students. Question 54 requested that teachers rank the five home/school variables from the most impact (1) to the least impact (5).

Teacher expectation was ranked as having the greatest impact, by 46.5% of the teachers, while 23% ranked the second school variable, teaching methodology as the variable having the greatest impact. However, the home variable, parental involvement, was ranked between these two school variables with respect to impact: 27% of the teachers ranked parental involvement as having the greatest impact on their effective teaching of disadvantaged students, (see Table 12).

In relation to the research question, the ranking of these variables demonstrated that while teachers considered the school variables as very important, one home variable, parental involvement, appeared to be the first or second choice of nearly 30% of teachers. The first two ranking choices for these teachers were a school and the home variable (parental involvement), instead of the two school variables.

Research studies (McClinchey, 1990) suggested that the level of parental involvement usually depends on socio-economic factors. Working class parents are less involved at schools than middle and upper class parents. Ranking parental involvement as having greater impact than either or both of the school variables, could mean that the home was viewed as having greater impact on their effective teaching than the school.
Table 12
Ranking Values for the Five Home/School Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response: Ranking Choices a</th>
<th>1 Parinvl %</th>
<th>2 Lang %</th>
<th>3 SES %</th>
<th>4 Meths %</th>
<th>5 Exp %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GREATEST IMPACT</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(66)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(56)</td>
<td>(114)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2ND Greatest Impact</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(46)</td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(101)</td>
<td>(68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RD Greatest Impact</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4TH Greatest Impact</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5Th in Impact</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (N = 245)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aRanking values ranged from 1 for greatest impact to 5 for least impact.

In the tables that follow, abbreviations are frequently used to represent the names of the five different sections of the questionnaire. As stated previously, the
ranking of the five variables form a major part of the analysis.

In answering Research Question 1 concerning how teachers ranked the impact of each variable on their ability to effectively teach disadvantaged students' descriptive statistics was provided in Table 13.

Table 13
Descriptive Statistics for Ranked Home/School Variables:
1 Most Impact to 5 Least Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables ranked:</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>SD&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parental Involvement</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialects of English</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-Economic Status</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching methodology</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Expectations</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>The smallest number indicated highest ranked
<sup>b</sup>SD means standard deviation

Parental involvement was the only home variable with a mean that was below 3.00. A mean of 2.52 indicated that some teachers ranked this variable as 1 or 2. As shown in Table 12, 27% of teachers ranked parental involvement 1 while 19% ranked it 2. The tendency seen in the rating of five variables, was repeated in the ranking of
these variables: nearly 50% of teachers (45.7%) stated that parental involvement had a greater impact on their ability to effectively teach disadvantaged students than both or one of the school variables. Only teacher expectations had a mean that was below 2.

With respect to the two school variables there appeared to be greater agreement among teachers as to the impact of teacher expectations. The mean of 2.21 for teaching methodology meant that a percentage of teachers ranked it as a 3, 4, or 5. The exact percentage was 34%, (see Table 12).

There was a total of 61 different combinations of ranking for the five home/school variables. Frequencies for different combinations ranged from one, to as many as 32, (see Table 14). A complete listing of the different rankings are provided in Appendix B.

Table 14 contains the frequencies for combinations that were more than ten. The statistical analysis, in most cases required at least five cases in each cell, hence further analysis involving all the different ranking combinations was not possible. In the questionnaire the five variables were listed in the following order (see question 54): Socioeconomic status, expectations, parental involvement, methods and language. In Table 14, the number 1 in the first column indicated that this respondent ranked SES as the most important variable or the one with the greatest impact on their ability to effectively teach disadvantaged students, whereas number 1 in the fourth column indicates that Methods was ranked as the variable with the greatest impact.

Table 14 served the purpose of helping a reader gain a quick overview of how the majority of the random sample of teachers ranked the variables. Parental involvement had a high frequency of teachers ranking it 1 or 2.
Table 14
Examples of the Sixty-one Different Combinations Teachers Used in Ranking of the Five Variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sa</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Frequency n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( n = 245 \) for all different combinations.
aVariables listed in this order on questionnaire.

Formation of Groups Based on Ranking Choices

In answering Research Question 1, it was assumed that if teachers ranked both school variables as number 1 and number 2, then they placed those variables as having the most impact on their ability to effectively teach disadvantaged students. In
attempting to answer this question, the ranking choices were grouped (see Table 15) according to the following. Teachers that ranked either teaching methodology or teacher expectation as a 1 or 2 for impact and then the home variable, parental involvement as the other first or second variable in impact, were placed in one group. Those teachers that ranked both school variables as their numbers 1 and 2, were placed in a second group. Teachers who ranked the home variable, dialects of English, as one of their first two in ranking with the other being either teacher expectation or teaching methodology were placed in a third group, and teachers were placed in a fourth group who had socioeconomic status as one of their first two in ranking and either school variables as the other. Seventeen respondents were coded 0, these individuals had neither teacher expectation or teaching methodology as 1 or 2 in ranking. On examination the answers of these seventeen individuals were incomplete, either because of no response, or incomplete ranking. These individuals were not used in further analysis that involved grouping the teachers on the basis of their ranking choices (see Table 15).

In some of the analyses, the teachers were placed in two groups: those who ranked the two school variables as 1 and 2 were placed in Group 1. All other ranking combinations, that is placing any of the home variables as 1 or 2 or any of the school variables as 3, 4, or 5, resulted in placement in Group 0.

This grouping method, was frequently used in most of the analyses in answering Research Question 3.

However, with the exception of Tables 15 and 29, the new variable was not used in tables involving groups based on ranked choices that are presented in this chapter. Description of the other method of grouping that was used occurs later in this chapter.
Table 15
Grouping of Ranked Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES RANKED</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Both School Variables First&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents &amp; 1 School Variable 1&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English &amp; 1 School Variable First&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES &amp; 1 School Variable First&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Responses for Question #54 (questionnaire in appendix A), was used for the groupings in this table. 
<sup>a</sup> Were members of Group 1 in other tables. 
<sup>b</sup> <sup>c</sup> <sup>d</sup> Were placed in Group 0 in later analyses.

Relationship Between Rating and Ranking

Research Question 1 focused on teachers' perception of the importance of each variable by itself and when ranked with the other variables. One wondered if there was any consistency between teachers rating the importance and their ranking of the impact of the five variables on their perceived...
ability to effectively teach disadvantaged students. In most of the statistical analyses that were completed the emphasis was on teachers' ranking choices. Answers on the importance of each variable helped to provide some additional information in trying to assess teachers' opinion. The answers were consistent in that no teacher rated a variable as unimportant but then ranked it higher than those they rated as important.

In Table 16, the groupings presented in Table 15, which grouped the teachers according to their ranking choices, was crosstabulated with the rating of the importance of each variable by itself. Group 3 in Table 16, resulted from the collapse of Groups 3 and 4. Group 3 therefore included those teachers who ranked either language or socioeconomic status as a 1 or 2, in addition to a school variable.

A total of 32 teachers comprised Group 3. It should be noted that the group with the lowest mean is the one that placed parental involvement as a 1 or 2 with respect to its impact on their ability to effectively teach disadvantaged students. As shown earlier, even though a greater number of teachers ranked one of the school variables as having the most impact, parental involvement was rated higher in importance.

If one observed the means for the entire table, parental involvement had the lowest mean (1.071), indicating that it was viewed as the most important variable. On the scale for importance, 1 was most important and 5 unimportant. Parental involvement was rated more important than either of the school variables.

In most of the tables that follow, teachers are placed in one of two groups.

Those teachers that ranked a school variable (teacher expectation or teaching methodology) 1 or 2, as well as those who ranked a home variable (parental involvement, dialects of English or socio-economic status), 3, 4, or 5 were placed in
Table 16
Comparison Between Groups: Their top 2 Ranking Choices and Rating of Importance of Each Variable: A Consistency Check

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating Importance: 1 most imp. to 5 unimp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groups: Top 2 Rank Choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parlnv &amp; 1 schl Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both school Variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 schl &amp; Lang or SES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aParental Involvemnet. bDialects of English. cSocio-economic Status. dTeaching Methodology. eTeacher Expectations.

Group 1. Those teachers who ranked a school variable 3, 4, or 5 and those who
ranked a home variable 1 or 2 were placed in Group 0.

Research Question 2

Was teachers' awareness concerning the range of opinion about the variables revealed in their answers to questions on the sources they accessed and the information they obtained?

In answering this research question answers to more than 100 questions were summarized in Tables, and the explanation that follows.

Teachers' perception of the adequacy of the information they received during their teacher training was presented first (see Table 17). Table 18 shows the different sources that teachers accessed in obtaining their information on these five home/school variables. Teachers' answers to 30 questions were presented in Tables 19 to 22.

Adequacy of Information

Teachers were asked to rate the adequacy of the information that they had been provided on each of the five variables during their teacher training, for its contribution to their effective teaching of disadvantaged students. Table 17 provided the summary of their rating.

For the five variables, more than 50% of the teachers stated that their preparation was inadequate (see Table 17), 24% felt that their preparation was adequate for parental involvement, 16% for dialects of English and 22% for socioeconomic status. This meant that less than one in four teachers felt that they had been adequately prepared on the home variables. The percentages that felt adequately prepared on the school variables were 38% for teaching methodology and 39% for teacher expectation.
The full text of the questions used in Table 16 are provided in Appendix A which contains the questionnaire.

Table 17
Adequacy of Information From Teacher Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Variable</th>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; A (%)</th>
<th>2&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; S A (%)</th>
<th>3&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt; S I (%)</th>
<th>4&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt; I (%)</th>
<th>5&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt; NR (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parental Involvement (11)&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialects of English (20)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Status (33)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Methodology (42)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Expectation (53)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Row total = 100%. Total sample: N = 245.

<sup>a</sup>Adequate.  <sup>b</sup>Somewhat Adequate.  <sup>c</sup>Somewhat Inadequate.  <sup>d</sup>Inadequate.  <sup>e</sup>No Response.  <sup>f</sup>( ) Label number for item on questionnaire.

Sources Accessed for Information

Table 18 shows the sources teachers accessed in obtaining their information on the five home/school variables.

Table 18 illustrates that the majority of teachers accessed the source experience most frequently for gaining information on effective teaching of at risk or...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources Accessed</th>
<th>Parents Involved</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Social Status</th>
<th>Teacher Methods</th>
<th>Teacher Expectation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Univ. Course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inservice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Journals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a} n in each cell are those who answered Yes for sources accessed. Sample = 245

\textsuperscript{b} % of the total sample (245) who accessed the source.
disadvantaged students. The source used with the least frequency was other. When experience and other as sources were excluded, university, was the least accessed, among the remaining four sources. An average of the percentages showed that university courses were used by 43% of the sample, while 57% accessed workshops. Inservice and Professional Journals, on an overall average was accessed by 50% of the teachers. When compared with Table 17, in which more than 50% of teachers stated that the information provided during their university training was inadequate, one wonders as to whether the results mean that inadequacy was due to lack of availability of the courses, since the university was the least accessed source. The questionnaire contained 30 questions that requested teachers rating of the usefulness of the sources they had accessed. The scale was rated 1 very useful to 5 not useful. Intended analyses were not completed because more than 90% of the teachers who accessed a source found it either useful or somewhat useful. There was insufficient variation in number of teachers and rating choices.

Responses to Questions

The 30 additional questions were asked to obtain teachers' opinions in respect to the five home school variables. In the summary (see Tables 19 and 22) the questions are grouped together on the basis of whether or not they used the same scale, instead of on the basis of which variable the questions addressed.

Each sections of the questionnaire focused on one of the five variables. The range of questions was four on dialects of English to nine questions on the variable, SES (see Table 1). There was also a mixture of nominal and interval scale type questions for four of the five section (see Table 2). The one exception was dialects of English which contained four yes/no type questions.

Table 19 shows the answers to the statements on the five home/school
### Table 19

Teachers Opinion on Certain Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions - # in brackets for full questions</th>
<th>1 (SA)</th>
<th>2 (AS)</th>
<th>3 (DS)</th>
<th>4 (SD)</th>
<th>5 (NR)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents not permitted to be involved in the ed. (4)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education seen as the school’s responsibility (5)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal learning without parental involvement (6)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Literacy is schl’s responsibility (7)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some children need Phonics when learning to read (39)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of different learning styles and needed</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning styles influenced by cultures (41)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children live up to tr’s academic expectations (49)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each influenced by beliefs and of society (50)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students can learn without involvement of home (8)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* 1(SA) = Strongly Agree 2(AS) = Agree Somewhat 3(DS) = Disagree Somewhat 4(SD) = Strongly Disagree. 5(NR) = Neutral. \( n = 245 \)
variables that used the strongly agree to disagree scale. In this study the answers, strongly agree or agree somewhat were scored 1. Answers strongly disagree and disagree somewhat were scored 0.

The full text of the questions used in Tables 19 to 21 are listed Appendix A, containing the questionnaire.

There were ten statements using the agree/disagree scale (see Table 19). For nine of those statements the higher percentage was on the agree side. On the question of education being seen as the school’s responsibility in some cultures, 85% of respondents agreed. Teachers (96%) agreed that awareness of different learning styles are needed. Teachers (92%) who responded agreed with the statement that each individual is influenced by the beliefs and stereotypes of their society. The one statement that had a higher percentage on the disagree side was: Students learn just as well in countries where parents are not allowed to be involved in school activities as in those where they are encouraged to participate? The percentage that disagreed was 53. Another statement that had a high percentage of disagreement (38%) was the one that stated: Students can attain minimum grade objectives without communication between home and school. It should be noted that both these questions were from the parental involvement section of the questionnaire.

The final question on Table 19 as well as the first four questions on Table 20 specifically requested information on the possible impact of each of the five variables on the ability of teachers to effectively teach disadvantaged students.

Table 20 shows the frequencies for the questions asked on the five home school variables, using the scale; extremely helpful to extremely unhelpful.

Six of the nine questions (see Table 20) that used the helpful/not helpful scale, were included with the 30 questions that were compared with teachers’ rating and ranking. These six questions are listed at the end of Table 20.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions -# in brackets for full questions</th>
<th>1 (EH) %</th>
<th>2 (SH) %</th>
<th>3 (N) %</th>
<th>4 (SU) %</th>
<th>5 (EU) %</th>
<th>6 (NR) %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effect of nonstandard dialect of English (19)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect of learning style (43)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect of low teacher expectation (52)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect of poverty (31)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulating home env. (26)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well dressed student (27)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower class student (28)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Parent home (29)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle class home (30)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** 1(EH) = Extremely helpful 2(SH) = Slightly helpful 3(N) = Neutral 4(SU) = Slightly unhelpful 5(EU) = Extremely unhelpful 6(NR) = No response

a Numbers in brackets ( ) are the labels for the full text of each question found in the questionnaire in the appendix A.
The answer that some writers identified as needed for effective teaching of disadvantaged students was neutral. This was given a score of 1 for this study. Being from a single parent home was not helpful according to 43% of teachers. While 64% saw poverty as not helpful, 55% saw being middle class as helpful.

**Two-Point Scale Items**

The categorical items (yes/no answers), were grouped together (see Table 21) based on the similarity of the questions. The three major groupings were: The first three questions asked teachers if they personally know students that fit the characteristics stated. The next five requested information on whether or not they did courses on specific topics, the two questions that followed asked if they were aware of studies on two of the variables.

Fourteen yes/no type questions were included in the 30 questions that were compared with teachers rating and ranking. In this study the answer, yes was scored 1, answer no was scored 0. Teachers (62%) said that they knew students who were successful without academic involvement in their studies, by their parents. The same percentage of teachers had the opinion that one can be effective in either dialect.

These questions focused on specific topics in many instances. For example, teachers were asked whether they had accessed information on parental involvement in other countries. Sixty percent said no, also 61% of teachers had not obtained any information on the impact of social class on the development of the dialect of a language that was accepted as standard. More than one-third (35%) of the sample of teachers stated that they did not know any students who were successful academically without parents being involved in their education. All teachers taught at schools that were considered inner city or special needs schools!
Table 21
Answers to Fourteen Dichotomous Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONS</th>
<th>YES #</th>
<th>YES %</th>
<th>NO #</th>
<th>NO %</th>
<th>NR %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Success without parent (9)a</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success -both Dialects(16)</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success &amp; Lower Class(25)</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parinv. - other countries (3)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociolinguistics Course(14)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology of Ed. (24)</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course on the Brain (36)</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Vrbl Comm. Info-(48)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies on Lower Class-23</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-fulfilling Prop. (47)</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society &amp; Language (15)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of Printing (38)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider Comm. Style (37)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled in both Lang. (17)</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Row Total: N = 245, % = 100. a( ) Numbers used on questionnaire.
In Table 22, descriptive statistics were provided for the 30 questions which were grouped together according to the variable they addressed.

Table 22
Means for Questions on Home/School Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>n&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Proportions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent Involvement -7Qs&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialects of English -4Qs</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>socioeconomic Status-9Qs</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Methodology - 6Qs</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Expectations - 4Qs</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Entire sample = 245.

<sup>a</sup>The number represents those who answers the question.
<sup>b</sup>Qs = The total number of questions for that variable.

Questions were grouped together based on which of the five sections they addressed. Questions for each section ranged from four to nine. The breakdown of the questions according to sections were as follows: parental involvement (7), dialects of English (4), socioeconomic status (9), teaching methodology (6), teacher expectations (4). Because of the variation in number of questions per section, the
mean was used in all analysis. The scoring for all the questions were the same: 1 or 0. Therefore the type of scale used did not make a difference. Scores are continuous, therefore measurements using interval type scale could have been used.

Using the mean and the maximum number of questions for each section the proportion of questions that respondents scored points on were shown.

For parental involvement and dialects of English, 52% received points. 46% of the teachers who answered the questions on SES received points. Teachers' scoring on the school variables were: 68% for teaching methodology and 76% for teacher expectations.

In answering Research Question 2, the information provided by teachers confirmed that only 26% of teachers took either a sociolinguistics or sociology of education course. An average of less than 35% of teachers obtained information on society's impact on dialects, the influence of printing on definition of literacy and studies confirming academic success of lower class students.

Research Question 3

Did the teachers with the higher mean scores on questions about the five home/school variables, also rank the school variables 1 and 2 and the home variables as 3, 4 and 5?

This research question focused on whether or not there was a difference in the way teachers answered certain questions and their ranking and rating of the importance of the variables that these questions were based on. Did teachers who scored higher on the questions also rank the school variables as more important than the home variables in impacting their ability to effectively teach disadvantaged students?

The 30 questions previously mentioned were used as the independent
variables. As discussed in chapter II on the review of literature, opinions vary as to which answers are helpful or not helpful, usually based on whether one supported the view that schools can make a difference in learning outcomes regardless of the involvement of the parents. For this study the opinions of those writers who supported the view that education is the responsibility of the schools whether or not parents are able and/or willing to be involved, were used in the scoring of the 30 questions. A detailed scoring scheme was created by the researcher, with scores for each question ranging from 5 the highest, to 1 the lowest point possible. This scoring scheme provided a range of scores so that for the scale type questions all information was retained. For example, for the agree/disagree scale, the answer strongly agree resulted in a score of five, agree somewhat a score of 4 and so on. In the helpful/unhelpful scale neutral was the expected answer hence that resulted in a score of 5. To maintain objectivity, this scheme was not used. Unfortunately, this resulted in some information being lost.

**Group Comparison: Criteria for Grouping**

In answering Research Question 3, two groups were created for most of the analyses. In order to maintain consistency in grouping, the following procedure was followed: Membership in Group 1 depended on the choices teachers made in rating or ranking the variables, and whether or not the variable was a home or school variable. In understanding the organization of each table the questions asked were: Was this a school variable? Did the teacher rate or rank the variable as 1 or 2? When both answers were yes the teacher was placed in Group 1. The questions could also be: Was the variable named in column one a home variable? Was the variable rated or ranked as a 3, 4, or 5? If the answers to both questions were yes membership was in Group 1. Membership in either Group 1 or 0 was therefore mutually exclusive.
since a variable was either a home or a school variable, but not both. In summary, Group 0 members were those teachers who rated or ranked a school variable as 3, 4, or 5, as well as those teachers who rated or ranked a home variable as 1 or 2. SPSS t-test procedure was used to analyze if there was a difference in the mean scores of the two groups of teachers. The scores for each variable were analyzed separately, for most of the analyses. Tables 23 to 34 show teachers' responses that provided answers for research question 3.

Relationship Between Perceprtion and Responses to Questions

Table 23 shows the results of t-test of differences between means. Group 1 respondents under parental involvement in Table 23 would have been those teachers who ranked parental involvement as a 3, 4, or 5. Whereas for the variable methods, Group 1 members would have been the teachers who ranked teaching methodology as a 1 or 2.

Criteria for Computing Group Membership and Means

For each of the variables there were five different responses possible for rating or ranking. Rating choices ranged from 1 which meant most important to 5 for unimportant. Ranking choices ranged from 1 for variable with the most impact, to 5 for the variable with the least impact on teacher's ability to effectively teach disadvantaged students. Membership in Group 1 was achieved if the teacher ranked or rated a school variable 1 or 2 and a home variable 3, 4, or 5. Group 0 members comprised of those teachers who ranked a school variable 3, 4, or 5 and a home variable 1 or 2. After teachers were grouped based on their ranking choices, the mean scores were computed by groups. This mean score was based on the score obtained when answering the questions asked on the different variables. Differences in the
number of respondents for the variable resulted in a slight variation in the mean, usually at the second or third decimal place.

Research Question 3 focused on a major rationale of the study. Understanding the methods used in Tables 23 to 34, formed an important foundation for understanding how the different analyses, helped to answer the research questions. In the tables provided (see Table 23) it should be noted that even though some comparisons may produce significant results, since the number of cases needed for group comparison may have departed greatly from the suggested three to one ratio, the significant probability should be ignored and instead of inferential application, the results, for these specific instances, were presented for descriptive purposes. The comparisons that are significant and have appropriate number of cases in each group are indicated by an (*). Research question 3 assumed that if information had any impact on ranking and rating, then those teachers who scored the higher means when answering most of the questions, should also, as a group, rank the school variables as having more impact on their ability to effectively teach. This reasoning was logical since as stated in previous chapters the study focused on the opinions of those writers who emphasized that schools can make a difference with or without parental involvement in the education of their children. One would assume that if answers to questions were in any manner related to ranking of the five topics then this would be obvious because of consistency over sections and different variables.

As stated previously, a major purpose of presenting the statistics was to provide information as to whether the group with the higher scores, which may be seen as an indication of awareness of the views of some writers on what was needed for effective teaching of disadvantaged students, also were members of Group 1. These teachers ranked the school variables as having more impact than the home variables with respect to their effective teaching of disadvantaged students.
Table 23 shows the comparison of the means for the two groups.

Table 23
Test for Difference: Means Based on Answers to Questions on Each Variable. Groups Formed on Ranking Choices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables Ranking of:</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD(^b)</th>
<th>Std Err(^c)</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents Involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aGroup 1</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>3.9829</td>
<td>1.532</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>-3.39</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 0</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3.3048</td>
<td>1.444</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>2.0769</td>
<td>1.097</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>.742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>1.041</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>4.1581</td>
<td>1.749</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>-2.05</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.1538</td>
<td>.987</td>
<td>.274</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>4.1389</td>
<td>1.186</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 0</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4.0263</td>
<td>1.119</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>3.0872</td>
<td>.936</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>.903</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Only n’s for Parent Involvement groups had significantly different means.
\(^a\)Group 1 = Those who ranked a home variable 3, 4, or 5, or a school variable 1 or 2.
\(^b\)SD means standard deviation. \(^c\)Standard Error of measurement
\(*\)p < 0.001.
The means for the variable, parental involvement was significantly different at the .001 probability level. This suggested that teachers who obtained higher scores, tended to rank parental involvement lower (giving it 3, 4, or 5), with respect to its impact on their ability to effectively teach disadvantaged students. Table 23 shows that the groups for parental involvement were the only ones with nearly the same number of teachers in each group. These two groups had a difference of only 12 in numbers, while the difference in numbers for the other four variables ranged from 68 to 202 cases. This may have suggested less agreement among teachers as to whether school or home variables were more important for effective teaching, or that a wider range of conflicting information was received by teachers on this variable. A consistent tendency was observed in the result of this analysis: The means for the group of teachers who were members of Group 1, were all higher than the other group.

Table 24 shows the result of SPSS t-test procedure. This table is similar to Table 23, except that the item for Table 24 was based on rating and not ranking.

In Table 24 group membership was based on teachers' rating of importance of each variable by itself. The groups were unequal with the ratio being greater than three to one, in all cases except SES. Therefore only SES groups were significantly different at the 0.001 probability level. This meant that teachers who scored higher on the questions about the SES variable tended to rate the importance of this variable, as 3, 4 or 5. There was a great difference in the percentage of teachers who were members of Group 1 for SES based on rating (Table 24) and ranking (Table 23). While 94% of teachers ranked the impact this variable as 3, 4 or 5, (see Table 23),
Table 24
Test of Difference Between Means Based on Answers to Questions.
Groups Based on Rating of Importance of Each Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups Based on Rating</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Std Err.</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.5714</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>-3.48</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group 0</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>3.5973</td>
<td>1.494</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.8750</td>
<td>1.126</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group 0</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>2.0802</td>
<td>1.092</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>4.9880</td>
<td>1.604</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>-6.33</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group 0</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>3.5915</td>
<td>1.594</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>4.1095</td>
<td>1.138</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group 0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.6667</td>
<td>1.862</td>
<td>.760</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>3.1041</td>
<td>.891</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group 0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>1.414</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Only significance for SES is valid: n's too varied in other groups.

\(^a\)Group 1 = Those who ranked a home Variable 3, 4, 5 or a school Variable 1 or 2.

only 36% rated the importance of SES as 3, 4 or 5 (see Table 24). This difference in rating and ranking percentages was consistent for all five variables. The reason may have been because the rating of each variable was by itself, unlike the ranking process.
that involved all the variables.

Teachers tended to agree that each variable was important, but when asked to make a choice by ranking, the level of importance attached to each variable became more obvious. This helped to emphasize the importance of the means for scores on the 30 questions, as a differentiating measure: the consistency of higher means occurring with Group 1 members, regardless of the number of cases in each group could have helped to answer the third research question.

Comparison of Sources Accessed With Ranking of Variables

Each of the five sections of the questionnaire contained six questions that related to specific sources that teachers may have accessed in obtaining information on the five variables of the study. These six sources were: university course, inservice training, reading professional journals, workshops/seminars, experience, or other. Teachers' access to these sources ranged from zero, (none of the sources accessed) to six, (all sources accessed).

In Table 25 the sum of the different sources accessed was crosstabulated with the ranking groups for each of the five different variables or constructs. In the rows respondents are either in Group 1 which include those who ranked the variable as 1 or 2, if the variable was a school variable, or 3, 4, or 5, if the variable was a home variable. Each cell contained the percentages for each group, and the total number of respondents (n) who accessed that number of different sources. The numbers that are listed at the top of each column represents the number of different sources that teachers accessed. For example, if a case was listed under heading 4 it implied that the individual obtained information from four (4) different sources. The research question that this table addressed referred to the sources accessed. It was assumed that the range of information available on each variable of the study, varied. Teachers
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who accessed the same source of information, and obtained opposing views on the same variable could reflect this difference by variation in ranking choices.

It was also expected that a consistent occurrence would be observed with respect to the variables that the literature review identified as promoting much debate among the experts. That is, less agreement may be reflected in greater variation in ranking choices. It was also assumed that those who had accessed more sources of information would also display a certain consistency in ranking. It was assumed, that as a group, those who are more informed, would be members of Group 1. Because some cells had fewer than five cases in them the use of inferential statistics was not

Table 25

Ranking of Home/School Variables Compared With the Total Number of Different Sources Accessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Different Sources Accessed</th>
<th>1 Source % (n)</th>
<th>2 Sources % (n)</th>
<th>3 Sources % (n)</th>
<th>4 Sources % (n)</th>
<th>5 Sources % (n)</th>
<th>6 Sources % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Group</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Group</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total n</td>
<td>(43)</td>
<td>(47)</td>
<td>(47)</td>
<td>(62)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking Parental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Group</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Group</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total n</td>
<td>(68)</td>
<td>(53)</td>
<td>(46)</td>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 25—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>1 Sources % (n)</th>
<th>2 Sources % (n)</th>
<th>3 Sources % (n)</th>
<th>4 Sources % (n)</th>
<th>5 Sources % (n)</th>
<th>6 Sources % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking SES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total n</td>
<td>(54)</td>
<td>(41)</td>
<td>(56)</td>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>(34)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking Meths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total n</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(40)</td>
<td>(59)</td>
<td>(85)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rnk-Expectation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total n</td>
<td>(39)</td>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>(51)</td>
<td>(54)</td>
<td>(49)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Six different choices of sources for information could have been accessed. 

aGroup 1 = Those who ranked a home variable 3, 4 or 5, or a school variable 1 or 2.

appropriate. The information was provided for descriptive purposes only.

The recorded frequencies (see Table 25) displayed the answer to Research Question 3, in that the greatest number of cases were consistently in Group 1, that is the group of teachers who ranked a home variable 3, 4, or 5 and a school variable 1 or 2. This tendency could have provided support for the assumption that the manner of ranking was consistent throughout the table, except for column four under ranking parental involvement. In this column, 48% or 30 teachers were in Group 1, and 52%
or 32 teachers in Group 0. The other variables had the highest percentage of teachers in Group 1 all the time. This variable, parental involvement, was the only variable ranked 1 or 2 by a higher percentage of teachers.

Table 25 attempted to answer Research Question 3, that is, to observe if information impacted on ranking.

The speculation being that the highest frequency of cases should be with those who ranked the school variable as 1 or 2 and the home variable as 3, 4, or 5. That is, if both Groups (0, and 1) had the same number of sources and Group 1 consistently had higher frequencies, then maybe, the nature, content and quantity of information does impact on ranking. This would be logical since the questions focused on the views of those writers who emphasized awareness of specific information. In answering Research Question 3 the consistency of the results supported the view that information impacts on perception. In Table 25, as in two previous tables, the exceptions appeared to occur in respect to the home variable, parental involvement. Table 25 shows that Group 1, for parental involvement, consistently had the lowest percentages for Group 1 members when compared to the other variables. This occurrence was consistent across different number of sources accessed, the only exception was for teachers who accessed six different sources, and the number of cases in that cell was not enough for valid comparison.

What relationship was there, if any, between the presence or absence of a source of information and the ranking of the variable? In an attempt to answer Research Question 3, the rankings of all those teachers who had accessed the sources listed previously, were compared. Table 26 shows this comparison. Each cell contained the number of teachers who had accessed the source for the specific variable (column heading). The second number in each cell shows the percentage of all the teachers who accessed the source (n) and ranked the variable as Group 1.
members did.

Table 26 shows a tendency with respect to parental involvement that was present in other tables. All the other variables: Teacher methods and expectations, dialects of English and SES have percentages that are definitely higher for the groups that accessed the source of information than for the group that did not. However, this is not the case for the sources accessed on parental involvement. Nearly all of the percentages for parental involvement sources are below 50% (column two). University course has exactly 50%. Again, this occurrence is not observed in any of the other four variables. One may assume that the information provided to teachers on this variable was probably different from the information that some writers suggested was needed for effective teaching of disadvantaged students.

The percentage of Group 1 teachers (those who accessed a source and ranked the school variables as 1 and 2), for parental involvement ranged from a low of 43% to a high of 51%. The range for three of the other variables was a low of 72% and a high of 95%. Teaching methodology, which was closest to parental involvement, ranged from 64% to 73% still higher than parental involvement.

In answering Research Question 3, the specific sources that teachers accessed for information and their related answers to questions on each variable were compared using $t$ test (see Table 27). It was assumed that those teachers who did obtain information on the specific source (members of Group 1) should have a higher mean score than those who did not obtain information. Because the source of information called other did not have many teachers that accessed it this source was not included in the following table. Some variables even though significant, did not have at least a three to one ratio of members in the two groups, therefore their probability, were not specifically indicated by the (*) sign.
Table 26
Number of Teachers Who Accessed a Source for Information and Percentage That Were Group 1 Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCES Accessed</th>
<th>Parents Involved</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Social Status</th>
<th>Teacher Methods</th>
<th>Teacher Expectation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Univ.Course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: n</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>50%(^a)</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inservice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: n</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: n</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: n</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: n</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Group 1 members = Those teachers who ranked a home variable 3, 4 or 5 and a school variable 1 or 2.
\(^a\)\% listed = percentage of the n in each cell who ranked variables as Group 1 members.

Table 27 provides a summary of the t test that resulted in statistically
significant differences. It should be noted that for each variable, the mean score for group one members, that is those who did access the source was higher than the group that did not.

This continued for all five different sources with only one exception: those who did not take a university course for the variable, parental involvement (157 teachers) had a higher mean score (3.6943), than those (72 teachers) who did access a university course on parental involvement. The mean score for this group was 3.5833. Excluding experience and other, a total of 20 comparisons were possible based on mean scores on questions and sources accessed. Table 27 shows 14 sources with significant differences between groups. Out of the 20 groupings only parental involvement had the group obtaining information from university with lower mean.

This difference in means is not statistically significant, but it appeared to continue the previous occurrence, in which parental involvement appeared to be the only variable with a different result from the other four variables.

Only parental involvement (see Table 27) did not have Infogroup 1 as the group with the higher mean. The difference is not significant between the two groups. However, all the other sources of information that were not significant had the higher mean scores for those who accessed the information. A possible reason for this difference could be that the information provided by universities on parental involvement was different from that suggested by the writers on whose writings most of the questions for this study were based.

Comparison between ranking choices and sources accessed were made in Tables 25 and 26. Table 27 compared mean scores. In all three tables, parental involvement was the only variable that consistently had different results.
Table 27

Test of Differences Between Means of Scores on Answers Provided by Teachers who Accessed Sources (Group 1) and Those who did not

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources for groupings</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Std Er.</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InfoGroup 1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.5833</td>
<td>1.599</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>-.51</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>.607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InfoGroup 0</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>3.6943</td>
<td>1.475</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Journals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InfoGroup 1</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>3.868</td>
<td>1.481</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>.017*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InfoGroup 0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.390</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars /Workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InfoGroup 1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2.257</td>
<td>1.036</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>.011*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InfoGroup 0</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1.866</td>
<td>1.105</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic SES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. Course:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InfoGroup 1</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>4.500</td>
<td>1.833</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>.004**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InfoGroup 0</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>3.830</td>
<td>1.596</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journals on SES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InfoGroup 1</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>4.465</td>
<td>1.681</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>.003**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InfoGroup 0</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>3.774</td>
<td>1.725</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 27—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources for groupings</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Std Er.</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methodology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InfoGroup 1</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>4.222</td>
<td>1.202</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InfoGroup 0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.588</td>
<td>.942</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Journals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InfoGroup 1</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>4.217</td>
<td>1.198</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>.006**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InfoGroup 0</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3.742</td>
<td>1.057</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InfoGroup 1</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>4.167</td>
<td>1.197</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InfoGroup 0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.6977</td>
<td>1.013</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InfoGroup 1</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>4.147</td>
<td>1.164</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InfoGroup 0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.315</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InfoGroup 1</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>3.339</td>
<td>.823</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InfoGroup 0</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2.808</td>
<td>.954</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inservice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InfoGroup 1</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>3.2199</td>
<td>.785</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>.002**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InfoGroup 0</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2.8235</td>
<td>1.093</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 27—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources for groupings</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Std Er.</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Journals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InfoGroup 1</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>3.3017</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InfoGroup 0</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2.8273</td>
<td>1.021</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars/Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InfoGroup 1</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>3.1712</td>
<td>.791</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>.028*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InfoGroup 0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.8875</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InfoGroup 1</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>3.123</td>
<td>.886</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>.013*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InfoGroup 0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.625</td>
<td>1.173</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. InfoGroup 1 answered yes, while InfoGroup 0 answered no to the question on whether or not they had accessed the source of information listed in column 1. *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

Factor Analysis Findings

The third research question attempted to provide answers to the inquiry as to whether or not there was a difference in the mean scores on the 30 questions of the two groups of teachers. Their rankings of the impact of the five variables on their effective teaching was used in deciding group membership. Of the 16 scale type questions, ten were used in a factor analysis (See Table 28). These 10 variables were reduced to three constructs or factors which were used in further analysis. Table 28 shows the factor loadings (the correlation between each factor and the items that defined it). The 10
Table 28

Factor Loadings for ten Questions: Support for Construct Validity of Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Poverty I</th>
<th>Home/School Impact II</th>
<th>Social Expectations III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student from a Lower Class Student Q28</td>
<td>.74604</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student is from Single Parent Family Q29</td>
<td>.62752</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of Poverty on Pupil's Academic success Q31</td>
<td>.58527</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Literacy is School's Responsibility Q7</td>
<td>.68569</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives learnt without home involvement Q8</td>
<td>.58300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Cultures education is school's responsibility- 5</td>
<td>.27724</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student is from Middle Class background Q30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.50921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each influenced by beliefs of their society Q50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.47486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning style influenced by one's Culture Q41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.46179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student is always well dressed Q 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.41003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = 181

were part of the 30 questions on the five variables that were used to compare teachers’ ranking/rating and answers to questions or their awareness. The responses of a total of 181 teachers were used in the factor analysis.

The main reasons for using factor analysis in this study were to reduce the number of variables as well as to support the construct validity of the questionnaire.

The three factors created by factor analysis were called: poverty, home/school...
expectations, and social expectations. In the analysis these three factors were correlated with the rankings that teachers gave to each of the five variables. Item #54 on the questionnaire asked teachers to rank the five variables, with 1 indicating the variable with the greatest impact and 5 the variable with least impact on their ability to effectively teach disadvantaged students. The 10 items that were chosen did not include any from dialects of English since all those questions were dichotomous. Only one variable from the methodology section was included for the factor analysis, that was the question on the impact of one's culture on belief system.

This lack of representation was reflected in the absence of significant correlation (see Table 29) between the rankings of language or teaching methodology with the three factors.

The factor loading of five of the 15 questions included in factor analysis were not included in Table 28. These items were excluded because of low factor loading or because the results of teachers answered were skewed, that is, there was little variations in teachers’ answers to these questions.

Table 29 shows the correlation between the three constructs created by factor analysis and the ranking of the five home/school variables of the study. The difference in direction among the answers to questions and ranking resulted in the negative correlation. Factor #1, or Poverty was a new variable resulting from factor analysis. In ranking the five variables, 5 was chosen most often for SES; however, in answering question 28, most respondents chose 1 or 2, resulting in negative number for the correlation. Hence while SES was given a low ranking (mainly 5), in answering the questions on this variable, mainly 1 or 2 where chosen on the five-point scales.

Table 29 shows the correlations between the three factors and teachers’ ranking choices. In addition to providing support for the construct validity of the instrument,
Table 29

Correlation Between the Variables Resulting From Factor Analysis and Teachers' Ranking of the Topics of Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranked Variables Q.54</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construct resulting from Factor Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( r )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( p )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home/Schl Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( r )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( p )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( r )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( p )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( n = 181 \)

\(*p < .05. \quad **p < .01.\)

This analysis answered the research question, in that it identified a statistically significant relationship between how teachers ranked the five home/school variables...
and how they answered the questions.

The scale used in the questionnaire for the variables included in the factor analysis was interval type. Additional correlation tests were also completed involving both categorical and continuous type items that were grouped together according to the home/school variable that they focused on.

Additional Information

Separation of Variables According to Original Scales

In response to comments with respect to the original scales used in the questionnaire and the method of scoring answers to questions on the five home/school variables, the following Tables (30 to 34) were produced. The main focus of these tables was to separate the variables: those that took the form of interval scale and the dichotomous type. As stated in chapter 4, for analytical purposes, variables with at least a two point scale, can be treated as nominal, ordinal or interval for statistical analysis (Andrews, 1981). The scoring for all questions was either 1 or 0, therefore the type of scale for the questions did not impact on the scores or means obtained.

Another advantage of separating the variables according to original scales was the benefit of analyzing with respect to the type of questions asked. The majority of the dichotomous variables were of a factual nature (see Table 1). One can observe the consistency of answers teachers provided with respect to the type of information. Table 30 is similar to Table 23 with the exception being that for Table 30 the variables are analyzed separately: interval scale type and dichotomous. In Table 30, like the previous ones, teachers with the higher mean scores were in groups that ranked the home variables 3, 4, or 5. In Table 30, all the home variables with the same type of scale were grouped and the groups were significantly different.
Table 30
Test for Difference Between Groups (Based on Rankings) and Mean Scores on Questions (Dichotomous & Interval)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Std Err.</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parents Involved</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aInterval scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2.9694</td>
<td>1.116</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>.004**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 0</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>2.5217</td>
<td>1.191</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>1.191</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bYes/No Qs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1.1158</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>.003**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 0</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>0.8417</td>
<td>.673</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 HomeVariable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cInterval Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5.3263</td>
<td>2.013</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>.020*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 0</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>4.7293</td>
<td>1.822</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dYes/No Qs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5.1605</td>
<td>1.706</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 0</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>4.6273</td>
<td>1.812</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 HomeVariable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interval &amp; Y/N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>10.3636</td>
<td>2.575</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>.006**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 0</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>9.2453</td>
<td>2.739</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The home variables were Parental Involvement, Dialects of English and SES.
Note: The scales used were Agree/Disagree and Helpful/Unhelpful
aMaximum score = 5. bMaximum score = 2. cMaximum score = 11. dMaxscore = 9
*p < .05, **p < .01.
Table 31, shows the nonparametric equivalent to the t-test. The results are

### Table 31

Non-Parametric Test of Means (Mann-Whitney U for Teachers’ Rankings (Formed Groups) and Scores on Answers to Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>2-Tailed ( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parental Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interval Scale Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>132.99</td>
<td>.0042**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 0</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>108.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal Scale Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>131.68</td>
<td>.0039**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 0</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>107.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Home Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interval Scale Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>125.02</td>
<td>.0391*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 0</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>106.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal Scale Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>104.95</td>
<td>.0503*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 0</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>89.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Home Variables Together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>104.10</td>
<td>.0081**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 0</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>88.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home/School Variables Together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>94.23</td>
<td>.0156*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 0</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>76.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Group 1 ranked a school Variable 1 or 2, and a home Variable 3, 4 or 5.
*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.
similar. The teachers who ranked the home variable as 3, 4, or 5 and those who ranked parental involvement as 1 or 2, obtained scores that were significantly different. The mean score for Group 1 members are higher than the other group.

Tables 32 and Table 33 show the non-parametric analysis of the variables.

Table 32
Crosstabulation of Ranking Choices (Groups) and Scores for Interval Type Questions on Parental Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Score = 0, 1 or 2</th>
<th>Score = 3</th>
<th>Score = 4 or 5</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total n</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total n</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Chi-Square and Contingency Coefficient, Significance = .02261*
*Group 1 members ranked Parental Involvement 3, 4 or 5. Group 0 members ranked Parental Involvement 1 or 2.
*Maximum score for Interval type questions was 5.
*p<.05

They are separated on the basis of original scale. Parental involvement showed a significant difference in scores on questions with respect to ranking choices (see Table 23). Similar results were obtained using crosstabulations. The groups were collapsed.
for these tables. Those teachers who ranked parental involvement 3, 4, or 5 were in Group 1. Ranking 1 or 2 resulted in Group 0 membership.

The two items, scored yes/no asked teachers if they were aware of parental involvement in other countries, and if they knew any students who were successful academically without parental involvement in their education. As in previous tables, parental involvement showed a consistent occurrence: the groups were more evenly divided with respect to rankings when compared to the other four variables.

Table 33

Crosstabulation of Ranking Choices (Groups) and Scores for Dichotomous Type Items on Parental Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Score = 0 or 1</th>
<th>Score = 2</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n 64</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 35%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n 117</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 65%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>n 181</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>n 77.4%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Chi-Square and Contingency Coefficient, Significance = .00256
Group 1 members ranked Parental Involvement 3, 4 or 5. Group 0 members ranked Parental Involvement 1 or 2.

aMaximum score Dichotomous type questions was 2.
With respect to the third research question, there appears to be less agreement among teachers, and it is difficult to demonstrate the relationship between awareness and ranking (see Table 33). A reason could be that only two items were used.

The significant but low magnitude of the relationships among the variables in this exploratory study, (see Table 34), was expected because of the variety of variables and the small number of items possible for each.

The relationship between a home and a school variable: teacher expectation and socioeconomic status was positive and statistically significant ($\tau(231) = .36, p < .001$). The two school variables: teacher expectation and teaching methodology, shared a significant, positive relationship ($\tau(224) = .33, p < .001$). The relationship between two home variables: dialects of English and SES was also positive and significant ($\tau(195) = .23, p < .01$ (see Table 34).

Table 34

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>ParIn1</th>
<th>ParIn2</th>
<th>Lang3</th>
<th>SES4</th>
<th>SES5</th>
<th>Meth6</th>
<th>Meth7</th>
<th>Exp8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents Inv 2</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>229</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td>193</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 34—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>ParIn1</th>
<th>ParIn2</th>
<th>Lang3</th>
<th>SES4</th>
<th>SES5</th>
<th>Meth6</th>
<th>Meth7</th>
<th>Exp8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Methods 6</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>229</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods 7</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xpectation 8</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xpectation 9</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Questions on each of the variables were grouped according to scale: Items # 1, 4, 6 and 8 were Interval; Items # 2, 3, 5, 7 and 9 were Nominal. Interval type SES variables showed no significant correlation with the other variables.

*aSpearman’s rho and Pearson’s r produced similar results using SPSS package.

*p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001.

Chapter Summary

Chapter V presented the findings of the study. The analyses focused on any consistencies of responses. Teachers were placed in two groups based on their ranking choices. Groups were also based on whether or not sources of information on the five home/school variables were accessed. Teachers who scored higher means on questions about the variables, tended to rank the school variables as more important than the home variables in their impact on teachers’ ability to effectively teach disadvantaged students. The exception was the home variable, parental involvement: The higher mean scores were consistently obtained by the group who had accessed a source of
information when compared to the group that did not access the source for information. The only exception was for accessing a university course on parental involvement. Teachers who had not obtain information on parental involvement from a university course had higher mean scores than those who had taken a university course. The items on the questionnaire focused on awareness of the writings and studies of those who emphasized that schools can make a difference in the education of disadvantaged students. In all three areas of comparisons: rankings and quantity of sources accessed (see Table 25); rankings and awareness of sources (see Table 26); or rankings and mean scores on questions (see Table 27), there were differences between parental involvement and the other Variables. For the comparison between sources and ranking, parental involvement, consistently had the lowest percentage of teachers who accessed sources on this variable and the lowest percentage of teachers who ranked parental involvement as a 3, 4, or 5. Comparing mean scores, parental involvement was the only variable for which the group of teachers with the higher mean scores was the group that did not access a university course to obtain their information.

More than 50% of the teachers stated that the information they obtained during their teacher training was inadequate in helping them effectively teach disadvantaged students. Consistently the group who accessed a source for information scored higher than the group that did not. The exception: those who did not take a university course for information on parental involvement, had a higher mean score than the group accessing the source. University course, as a source of information or awareness was the least source accessed for each variable, excluding the two sources, experience and other.

The result tended to suggest that the information received by some teachers on parental involvement varied from or excluded the information some writers suggested was necessary to facilitate effective teaching of disadvantaged students. Those teachers
who appeared to be aware of the information provided by these writers: as indicated by scoring higher in answering the questions, as a group, also ranked the school variables as having greater impact on their effective teaching.

The following chapter, provides for interpretation of the findings and recommendations.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter consists of three sections. The first presents a summary of
background information, the goals of the study, and study design. The next section
summarizes the results. Lastly, recommendations for future studies and changes in the
educational system are made.

Summary: Background and Goals

Over the past three decades the debate and discussions concerning the
relationship between the home and the school impact on effective teaching, especially
of, disadvantaged students, have been a very current topic. The 1960s marked the
beginnings of this debate with the Coleman study that appeared to emphasize the vital
necessity of parents being involved in the education of their children. The general
opinion promoted since that time appeared to be that schools cannot be successful in
the education of students by themselves. They need the active participation of the
parents of the students. This thinking was dominant for more than a decade, until the
1970s and the work of Edmonds (1979) and others who strongly disagreed with the
assumption that it was impossible for schools to effectively teach disadvantaged
students if their parents did not participate. These educators promoted the idea that
schools can make a difference, and can successfully educate students even without
parental involvement. Presently in the 1990s the emphasis appears to be on a
partnership or collaboration: home and school working together for the academic
achievement of disadvantaged students. What happens to the educational achievement
of those students whose parents are unable or/and unwilling to actively participate in their education for whatever reasons?

Throughout these years of discussions, studies, and debate, the opinions of a vital group of players have been noticeably absent from the research studies. Teachers have been involved frequently as subjects or consumers of the findings, but rarely providing their opinions on the issues. Also, while there are numerous studies on different subjects that have been promoted as having major impact on the education of disadvantaged students, no studies were found that presented all the major variables at the same time in one study. The question begged an answer as to what teachers' opinions were on the topic of effective teaching of disadvantaged students. The goal of this study was to provide teachers' opinions on the topic of the education of disadvantaged students.

A review of the literature revealed five major topics that researchers, educators, and the general public seemed to emphasize as affecting educational outcomes of these students. Socioeconomic status, standard/nonstandard dialects of English, and parental involvement, were the home variables in this study. Teacher expectations and teaching methodology were called the school variables.

As stated previously, this study focused on obtaining teachers' opinion on the variables. Teachers' rankings of the impact of these five variables on their ability to effectively teach disadvantaged students was used to form two groups. Teachers who ranked the school variables as 1 and 2 and the home variables as 3, 4, and 5 were in one group. Teachers with other ranking combinations were in the next group. Mean scores on questions about the five variables, provided by these two groups of teachers were compared. Comparison based on the sources these two groups accessed to obtain information on the variables were also made.

An underlying proposition or belief of the researcher was that the type of
information that teachers were aware of and were provided would have an impact on
how they ranked these five variables. In other words the study attempted to find out
whether there was a significant difference in the way in which teachers ranked these
variables and how they answered specific questions about these variables. Is the belief;
that information impacts on behavior, and that awareness, or lack of awareness makes a
difference in one's perception, supported by research? Another rationale that affected
this study was the view that a key ingredient in producing change in attitude or change
in behavior is to present individuals with new or different information than what they
presently have. The provision of contradicting information will result in the creation of
dissonance or confusion in the mind of the recipient that would only be resolved when
the individual makes a decision, either to accept the new information, or reject it and
continue with the old belief system. A review of the literature revealed a wide range of
opinions on what is needed for effective teaching of disadvantaged students. Which
type of information are teachers aware, and supportive of?

In attempting to answer this question on teachers' opinions and their ranking of
the five variables, and also to determine whether or not their ranking and answers were
related, a questionnaire was designed by the researchers.

The reliability of this questionnaire varied according to the different sections,
the range being from 0.42 to 0.69. This was lower than one would prefer. The
possible contribution of the findings to the education of students, appeared as Borg
(1989) had stated, to far outweigh not conducting the study because of the low
reliability. As one read the views of experts on the question of reliability, it became
obvious that the question as to what was a minimum acceptable coefficient had no one
answer. Reliability depends a great deal on comparison with previous similar studies.
After extensive computer and manual searches, no similar studies were located. The
type of questionnaire also did not lend itself to the use of reliability as the main method
of evaluating the consistency of the questions.

The sample of teachers was obtained with the assistance of the two elementary teachers' federations in metropolitan Toronto. In Ontario membership in either federation is related to one's sex. Only female teachers can be members of the FWTAO, which is the Federation of Women Teachers' of Ontario. Male elementary teachers are members of OPSTF., which is Ontario Public School Teachers' Federation. Females are about 70% of the elementary teachers. This ratio was maintained in the stratified random sample that was obtained from both federations. The process of arriving at the required sample size that was needed was elaborated in chapter III. A total of 342 teachers was needed for a representative sample. There were 251 questionnaires returned. Of this amount, six arrived after the deadline and therefore the sample of teachers used in the study was 245.

Summary of the Findings

The purpose of the study was to obtain teachers' opinions on the five variables: parental involvement, dialects of English, socioeconomic status (home variables), and teaching methodology and teacher expectations (school variables). The range of possible questions was numerous, and the focus varied depending on which of the two major theories one supported: Teachers cannot effectively teach disadvantaged students without parental involvement. The other school of thought promotes the view that schools can make a difference in the education of disadvantaged students, that functional literacy is the responsibility of the school, and that the school variables and not the home variables are the most important in the achievement of effective teaching. This study focused on the latter view and the questions used were designed to find out which view teachers supported. The underlying rationale was that the types of information teachers were aware of and supported would influence how they ranked
these five variables in respect to their impact on effective teaching.

In attempting to answer the research problem, three research questions were investigated:

The first research question was: Did teachers rank the three home related variables (parental involvement, standard/nonstandard dialects of English, and socioeconomic status of students), as having greater impact than the school related variables (teacher expectations and teaching methodology), on their ability to effectively teach disadvantaged students?

Tables 10 to 16 in chapter V summarized the findings on this research question. Teachers were asked to rate each variable on a five-point scale with 1 being the most important to 5 being unimportant. The same numbers 1 to 5 were also used by teachers when ranking the five variables. Ranking the variable as 1 indicated that in the teacher's opinion this variable had the greatest impact on their ability to effectively teach disadvantaged students. The highest percentage (82%) when rating its importance was given to parental involvement, a home variable. The highest rating for a school variable was 77% for teacher expectation. In contrast, when the variables were all placed together and teachers were asked to rank them, 46% of the teachers ranked teacher expectations as the variable with the greatest impact on their ability to effectively teach disadvantaged students. If the school variables have the greatest impact then the variable with the second greatest impact should be teaching methodology; however, this was not so. Teachers rated parental involvement as the variable with the second greatest impact (56% of teachers). This appears to indicate that teachers do not think that they can successfully teach without parental involvement. In answer to the research question, teachers rated one of the home variables (parental involvement) as more important than one of the school variables (teaching methodology). Table 15 showed that the ranking of the variables followed a certain pattern. Teachers (42%)
ranked both school variables as 1 and 2. However, closely behind this group were the teachers who placed parental involvement as a 1 or 2. These teachers made up 38% of the sample (n equal 94). More than one-third of the inner city teaching force believed that they cannot effectively teach without the parents being involved in the academic aspect of education.

Tables 12 and 13 display the percentages and means for the ranking of each variable. In this summary teacher expectation has the highest frequency (46%), apparently indicating that it has the most impact on teachers' effective teaching. However, 27% (n = 66) ranked parental involvement as the factor with the greatest impact. The second school variable, teaching methodology was third with 23% of teachers (n = 56). The second variable was not teaching methodology but parental involvement. The ranking means for the three variables (see Table 13) were: teacher expectation 1.89, teaching methodology 2.21 and parental involvement 2.52.

The answers provided for the research questions showed the ambivalent situation that some teachers find themselves in. They seem to express confusion as to exactly what role one of the home variables (parental involvement) plays in their effective teaching. Only a slight majority of the teachers thought that they had the greatest impact on the effective teaching of disadvantaged students. The following situations could be contributing to teachers' confusion. More than 50% of the teachers stated that their teacher training did not adequately prepare them for effectively teaching disadvantaged students. The majority of teachers also listed their main source for information as experience. Answers to some of the questions on the five home/school variables also indicated lack of awareness about the information available on effective teaching of disadvantaged students, without parental involvement. It is argued that when more than one third of the teaching staff believes that they cannot do anything for the academic growth of their students if the parents do not get involved, and when
studies (McClinchey, 1990) have shown that working class parents as a group are not actively involved at the school level, the outcome could be more negative than positive for students.

The second research question stated: Was teachers' awareness concerning the range of opinion about the variables revealed in their answers to questions on the sources they accessed and the information they obtained?

The analysis of the data showed that of the six major sources of information that teachers could access for information—university course, inservice, professional journals, workshops/seminars, experience or other—experience was the main (and in some instances the only), source accessed. The range of the sample of respondents for those who accessed experience was 213 to 227. Excluding the source called other, university courses were the source least accessed by teachers. The range for this source of information was 73 to 154. Following experience, workshops/seminars were most often used. This source also had the highest response rate in respect to usefulness. More teachers who attended workshops found them useful as compared to any of the other sources accessed.

The questionnaire was divided into five sections, each focusing on one of the five home/school variables of the study. A total of 30 questions on these variables was included. The range of questions was four to nine. There was also a mixture of nominal and interval scale type questions for four of the five sections. The one exception was dialects of English which contained four yes/no type questions.

There were 10 questions using the agree/disagree scale (see Table 19). For nine of agree/disagree questions the higher percentage was on the agree side. The one item that had a higher percentage on the disagree side was: Students learn just as well in countries where parents are not allowed to be involved in school activities as in those where they are encouraged to participate. The percentage that disagreed was 53%.
Special attention is drawn to the fact that on the question of education being seen as the school’s responsibility in some cultures, 85% of respondents agreed. Teachers (96%) agreed that awareness of different learning styles is needed. It is interesting that 92% of teachers who responded agreed with the statement that each individual is influenced by the beliefs and stereotypes of their society. Another item that had a high percentage of disagreement (38%) was the one that stated: Students can attain minimum grade objectives without communication between home and school.

Six of the 30 questions (see Table 20) used the helpful/not helpful scale. The answer that some writers identified as needed for effective teaching of disadvantaged students was neutral. Teachers (43%) thought that being from a single parent home was not helpful, 64% saw poverty as not helpful. Being middle class was helpful (55%).

Fourteen yes/no type questions were included in the specific questions (see Table 21). It should be noted that the higher percentage of teachers (62%) said that they knew students who were successful without academic involvement, by their parents. The same percentage of teachers had the opinion that one can be effective in both standard and nonstandard English. These questions focused on specific topics in many instances. For example, teachers were asked whether they had accessed information on parental involvement in other countries. A total of 60% said no, also 61% of teachers had not obtained any information on the impact of social class on the development of the dialect of a language that is accepted as standard. It is a matter of some concern that 35% (or more than one-third) of this sample of inner city teachers stated that they did not know any students who were successful academically without parents being involved in their education.

If the speculation is accurate that beliefs or perceptions are influenced by the degree of awareness one has on the topic in question, then one has to be very
concerned at the large percentage of teachers (more than 30% in each instance) who are not aware of some very important information, or view a variable as not helpful when there is empirical evidence that the variable should be seen as neutral. It may seem laudable that the majority of teachers ranked socioeconomic status as having the least impact on their ability to effectively teach disadvantaged students; that is, that teachers do not think that because a student is economically poor they cannot learn. However, on closer analysis, one realizes that teachers are still seeing low income as negative. In a school setting, the visible signs of poverty are: (a) decreased parental involvement in the education of their children, at least in the manner expected by school authorities; (b) knowledge of the impact of society on language makes one aware that money does have a major impact on the dialect of a language that becomes acceptable as standard. Without being taught, most poor children do not speak or write standard English, at the level expected by the schools. Thus teachers, (at least more than 30% of them) confirmed by their answers that poor students who are really victims of circumstances beyond their control are being blamed for the situation and their chances of obtaining a basic education are seriously harmed.

Table 22 provided descriptive statistics on teachers' opinions. The 30 items focused on answering the second research question. It is noteworthy that the mean scores for the home variables are all lower than those for the school variables. The proportions for the three home variables were 52, 51, and 46, lowest mean being SES. Is it possible that the descriptive statistics of Table 22 support the speculation that one's awareness level about a subject will influence one's answers to questions on that subject.

Table 17 summarized teachers' opinions as to the adequacy of the information they had received on each of the variables during their teacher training. No variable received a percentage above 40 on the adequate section of the scale. The rating as
adequate ranged from a low of 16% to 39%. Even the two school variables that had higher percentages (see Table 22), were rated high on the inadequate side of the scale (51% and 56%). For the home variables, an average of 67% of the teachers chose inadequate (see Table 17). Teachers by their answers to specific questions revealed that they were not as informed as one may expect them to be on these important variables. In their rating of the adequacy of information obtained during teacher training the majority stated that in their opinion, the information they were provided during that time (teacher training) was inadequate.

The third research question was: Did the teachers with the higher mean scores on question about the five home/school variables, also rank the school variables 1 and 2 and the home variables as 3, 4, and 5?

If the answer to the third research question is yes, then it may suggest that exposure to certain type of information could have an impact on changes in one's way of thinking. In other words, if the teachers who ranked the two school variables as 1 and 2 also scored higher (had higher means) than those who ranked otherwise, then the conclusion could be drawn that providing the teachers who ranked parental involvement variable as a 1 and 2 with the information that the other group had could result in a change in their perception, which affect their ability to effectively teach disadvantaged students.

In attempting to answer Research Question 3, a comparison of the mean scores the two groups of teachers obtained on the questions about the five variables was made. Teachers’ rankings and ratings of the five variables were used to form the two groups. This summary was presented in Tables 23 and 24. The number of cases in most of the cells, had a ratio greater than three to one, this therefore, did not allow statistical inferences. The main purpose of these tests was the comparison of the mean scores between the two groups. In the tables, the group with the higher mean was
expected to be members of Group 1. These teachers ranked the school variables 1 and 2 and the home variables 3, 4, and 5. This could imply that one’s awareness influenced one’s ranking. In all the ranking and rating information provided (see Tables 23 and 24), this view was supported. The one exception was the language groups. As previously explained the language section of the paper contained only four questions on that variable, and all the questions were two-point (yes/no) scale. For example, those teachers with the higher (4.9880) mean should also be members of Group 1. This was the case in nine of the t-test. SES groups for rating of importance showed significant differences, while the parental groups were significantly different for the ranking comparison. The findings support the view that information impact on perception of importance.

Concerning sources accessed for information on these five home/school variables and the answers to the questions (see Table 25), the same results were obtained; t-test was used to compare the groups. Mean scores for Group 1 were consistently higher than Group 0.

The statistical analyses showed consistent findings: Those 72 teachers (see Table 27) who accessed a university course for information on parental involvement ranked this variable differently. These teachers who had accessed a university course had lower mean score on the seven questions about parental involvement (3.58). The group that did not access this source had a mean of 3.69. This appeared to support the view that some universities may not be providing teachers with views on parental involvement that are helpful to the effective teaching of disadvantaged students.

This presence of a difference on parental involvement was also noticed in Table 26. For the other four variables a higher percentage of all teachers who accessed a specific source, ranked the school variables 1 and 2 and the home variables 3, 4, and 5. The range for these other four variables was 64% to 95%. For parental involvement
the result was the opposite. The highest percentage for any group under parental involvement was in the other group (51%, not included in Table 26). The other five sources, including university courses, averaged only 46% with a range of 43% to 50%. One would assume that universities would have provided teachers with a wide range of the opinions and information available on a topic, this might not have occurred.

Limitations

1. There was an unintentional exclusion of the question on teaching experience, and hence a need to use age as a proxy for experience.

2. Only yes/no questions were used in the language section of the questionnaire, which prevented certain statistical analysis of the data from that section.

3. The reliability of some sections was not as high as preferred.

4. The inclusion of some qualitative type methods, for example, interviews would have added some useful additional information to the results.

5. Although Toronto was a major metropolitan area for immigrant settlement in North America, the present findings need to be replicated in other metropolitan areas.

Recommendations

1. A study should be carried out involving teachers from a non-inner city school for comparison purposes, either by themselves, or as a part of the sample for replication.

2. A qualitative study of a similar nature be completed with emphasis on the teachers in the 50 plus age group. These teachers, even though they did not obtain information from university sources, ranked the variables in a manner that was much more beneficial for the disadvantaged students. Emphasis in this future study should be on trying to discover what makes these teachers different from the others, as a
3. Focused attempts should be made by universities (for teachers in training) and by school boards through inservice, to provide inner city teachers with the information that they stated was lacking. One possible result could be a change in teachers' opinions about their ability to teach disadvantaged students effectively.

4. The Metropolitan Toronto School Board should seriously re-examine their present method of allocating extra resources for inner-city schools to make sure that the students and schools who need the most help will be so provided by their school boards. While the author was visiting each board and gathering information for this study, it became quite obvious that through lack of accountability and supervision, the neediest schools were not always the ones that received adequate additional resources.

5. It is further recommended that an ombudsperson or committee of individuals be appointed by the Metropolitan Toronto School Board to focus on the specific needs of inner city students. This researcher visited the different school boards and discussed, read and observed the politics. In many cases the trustees who are the most vocal or persuasive appear to get more than is needed for their area. Further, the composition of the Boards of Trustees did not reflect the cosmopolitan nature of the Metropolitan Toronto area. Decision makers should realize that the best decisions are made when those directly affected have significant participation in the decision making, and are represented by those they perceive as concerned about their children's best interest. More than one third of the teachers viewed a student's lower class background as not helpful (38%), and 43% of the teachers in the sample thought that being from a single parent home is not helpful. One might raise the question whether trustees also had negative views about disadvantaged students. Since the vast majority of trustees are members of the dominant culture, one is led to ask whether proper school-board representation of all cultural and racial groups might not lead to better decision making.
for inner city schools.

6. Teachers need to be more actively involved in the decision making process. This study had demonstrated that there was a significant number of teachers at the inner city schools who firmly believed that they can make a positive impact on the academic achievement of disadvantaged students! The boards' monopoly on decision making, even while they fail to provide necessary staff training, should be challenged by those elected to represent the interest of teachers: Federations should direct efforts towards making certain that teachers are more actively involved in decision-making regarding teaching and the curriculum.

7. (a) All teachers at inner city schools should be provided with the information that they clearly stated they have not been aware of regarding the role of parental involvement, especially its impact and practice in other countries. The realization that the North American or Anglo-Saxon perspective (Britain, U.S.A. and Canada), was certainly not a world wide view is important. Academic achievement is seen as the schools' responsibility in many countries. A historical perspective on the sudden focus on parental involvement in the 1960s is useful. One must consider its possible connection to the increase in the immigration of visible minorities to Britain and the impact of these immigrant children on the school systems in the late 1960s and early seventies. Since Canada has not reached the state in the education of disadvantaged students that Britain and the United States have attained, this country has the opportunity to become a leader and clearly demonstrate the erroneous nature of some of the previous research findings on parental involvement. It is recommended that the governments at the provincial level, especially those with a large percentage of inner city schools (like Ontario), take the initiative in changing the practice of blaming the victims, poor parents and their children.

(b) Teachers should be provided information that would help them realize the
contradiction in their ranking and rating of the five home school variables examined in this study. The vast majority of teachers (88%) ranked SES (socioeconomic status), as least in impact (given the number 5), and the rating of SES was significantly different from any of the other four variables. Thus teachers overwhelmingly stated that they do not think being poor would prevent them from effectively teaching these students. Yet the signs or effects of being poor or poverty among students are: (1) Parents of poor children, as a group, are not as involved in their education, as those parents of middle or upper class students, (2) Poorer or lower socioeconomic status students are more prone to be speakers of a nonstandard dialect of English. Since many teachers believe these variables hinder teaching, they are unintentionally harming the prospects of disadvantaged, particularly African, students. Their mistaken beliefs about home variables are hurting the educational interest of the students whom they are supposed to be serving. It is urgently submitted that teachers should be provided not only with one viewpoint or type of information but with the wide range of material that is available on parental involvement.

(c) It is recommended that teachers in training as well as those who presently teach at inner city schools be provided with appropriate information on the topic of language and society, as clearly supported by many experts in that field. When one is aware that dialects of a language are simply different from each other, that money or class determines which dialect of a language is accepted as standard, that the manner in which an individual speaks is greatly influenced by natural and man-made barriers, then it is obvious that speech is no indication of mental capacity. The majority of teachers (62%) responded negatively concerning whether they were aware of the impact of social class on the dialect that is accepted as standard. It is the duty of boards to provide appropriate information so that the education of these students will not continue to be negatively affected. More than 55% of the sample of teachers stated that they are
not aware of studies that clearly report that there are lower class students achieving as well as or better than middle and upper class students in reading; so the boards in Metropolitan Toronto and the Ministry of education in Ontario should provide proper information on success variables in the education of disadvantaged students.

8. It is strongly recommended that those in decision making positions realize the importance of teachers being actively involved, in a meaningful sense in decision making. Teachers and their federations should focus on helping, especially elementary teachers be recognized as professionals not just semi-professionals. The lack of assistance and actual negative reactions to this research by several different school boards was unsatisfactory. The politics of most boards is a hindrance to teachers who desire to be more than consumers of research findings. Teachers need to recognize the importance of being accountable as well as receiving professional status. It is obvious that the vast majority of teachers care for and believe they should be doing a better job of educating disadvantaged students; however, until we, like doctors and lawyers, have major involvement in decisions that affect us at the front line, precious minds will remain undeveloped.

9. It is recommended that teachers at inner city schools in Metropolitan Toronto form an association, to share ideas, as well as to request strongly that they be provided with the necessary tools and information to effectively teach disadvantaged or special needs students. While collaboration with parents is the ideal and should be promoted, students whose parents are not willing to participate should not have their right to basic education denied.

10. Lower or working class parents in Metropolitan Toronto, regardless of their race, or language, should act politically, as a group, refusing to be made scapegoats and, insist that their children be properly educated. These peaceful, well-organized actions should be directed, not at the building levels (or schools) but to those
in the decision making positions: trustees, boards, and the Department of Education for Ontario. An ideal place to start organizing would be the numerous government (provincial and City of Toronto) housing units that are scattered throughout Metropolitan Toronto.
APPENDICES
Appendix A

Copy of Questionnaire Developed by Researcher
QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this questionnaire is to obtain teachers' perceptions as to the importance of five factors in respect to effective teaching of 'educationally disadvantaged' or 'special needs' students. These students have at least average intelligence, but are 'underachievers'. The possible relationship between perception and knowledge will also be explored. Knowledge refers to any information, facts, beliefs, opinions that were acquired through education or experience. Please feel free to add any comments as you complete the questionnaire. Effective or successful teaching occurs when at least functional literacy is achieved.

In this section, the role of parents in the education of their children is examined. As used in this study parental involvement is demonstrated by visits to the school, e.g. for 'Meet the Teacher Night', Parent/Teacher Conferences, keeping in touch with the teacher, supervision of homework or similar participation, etc.

1. What specific sources did you access to obtain your knowledge on parental involvement. (Please circle your answer)

1. University course ........................... 1. YES 2. NO
2. In service training ....................... 1. YES 2. NO
3. Reading Professional Journals ...... 1. YES 2. NO
4. Workshops, seminars...................... 1. YES 2. NO
5. Experience..................................... 1. YES 2. NO
6. Other ......................................... 1. YES 2. NO

(please specify)

2. How useful do you consider the information from the sources listed above in respect to effective or successful teaching of disadvantaged students? (Please circle your answer)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Useful</th>
<th>Somewhat Useful</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Little Use</th>
<th>Not Useful</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. University Course</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In Service Training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Reading Prof. Journal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Workshops, Seminar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Did your information include looking at or assessing parental involvement in other countries?
   1. YES       2. NO

Based on your knowledge on the topic of parental involvement, how would you rate the following statements on using the scale to the right.

(Please circle your answer)

1. STRONGLY AGREE (SA)
2. AGREE SOMEWHAT (A)
3. DISAGREE SOMEWHAT (D)
4. STRONGLY DISAGREE (SD)
9. DON'T KNOW (DK)

SA  A  D  SD  DK

4. In some countries parents are not permitted to be involved in the education of their children
5. In some cultures education is seen as the responsibility of the schools and teachers
6. Students learn just as well in countries where parents are not allowed to be involved in school activities as in those where they are encouraged to participate
7. Functional literacy is the responsibility of the school system whether or not parents are willing or able to be actively involved in their child's education
8. Students can attain minimum grade objectives without communication between home and school

9. Do you know of any students, who are successful academically, without parental involvement in their education? (Please circle your answer)
   1. YES       2. NO

10. How do you rate the importance of Parental Involvement in respect to effective teaching of disadvantaged students?

(Please circle your answer)

1. VERY IMPORTANT
2. SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT
3. NEUTRAL
4. SOMEWHAT UNIMPORTANT
5. UNIMPORTANT
11. How would you rate the adequacy of the information on the topic of parental involvement that you were provided during your teacher training in respect to its contribution to effective teaching of disadvantaged students?

1. ADEQUATE
2. SOMEWHAT ADEQUATE
3. SOMEWHAT INADEQUATE
4. INADEQUATE
5. DON'T KNOW

(Please circle your answer)

As a means of sharing with fellow teachers, kindly list the TITLES OF ANY SOURCES (e.g. articles, books, workshops, courses etc.,) that you have found helpful on this topic of Parental Involvement, in respect to effective teaching of 'disadvantaged students'.

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

In this section Standard English is defined as the dialect of English that is taught in SCHOOLS, or that is heard on T.V., or used in official printed material. The other dialects of English are described as Non-standard. Some students do not speak English in the standard way. For example, a student from Guyana may say, ‘Wa a da’ instead of the standard English ‘What is that?’ A Jamaican student may say ‘wa de go hapm now’, the Standard dialect of English being - ‘What’s going to happen now?’ In Metropolitan Toronto, the main non-standard dialects of English that are common in our schools are those from the Caribbean countries. Therefore, in this study we will focus on the Caribbean dialects of English.

12. What specific sources did you access to obtain your knowledge, of Standard and Non-Standard dialects of English. (Please circle your answer):

1. University course................. 1. YES 2. NO
2. In service training................. 1. YES 2. NO
3. Reading Professional Journals..... 1. YES 2. NO
4. Workshops, seminars.............. 1. YES 2. NO
5. Experience.......................... 1. YES 2. NO
6. Other_______________________ (please specify) 1. YES 2. NO

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
13. How useful has this information been in helping you teach disadvantaged students? (Please circle answer)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Useful</th>
<th>Somewhat Useful</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>Not Use</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. University Course</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In Service Training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Prof. Journals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Workshops, Seminar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please circle 1 or 2

14. Have you completed a Sociolinguistics course, e.g., one on Canadian Dialects, during your professional preparation?.......................... 1    2

15. Have you obtained information on the impact of social class on the development of language that is accepted as Standard?.......................... 1    2

16. Do you know any students who are successful academically and are fluent speakers of both standard and non-standard dialects of English?. 1    2

17. Do you think that a student is capable of competently using standard English for writing, while using a non-standard dialect of English to communicate with friends? (Please circle your answer) 1. YES 2. NO 3. DON'T KNOW

18. To be an effective teacher of ‘disadvantaged students’, how important is awareness of the impact, if any, of dialects of English?  
(Please circle your answer) 1. VERY IMPORTANT 2. SOMewhat IMPORTANT 3. NEUTRAL 4. SOMewhat UNIMPORTANT 5. UNIMPORTANT

19. In comparison to the standard dialect of English, how does a non-standard dialect of English affect a student’s attainment of functional literacy (learning of minimum objectives)?  
(Please circle your answer) 1. EXTREMELY HELPFUL 2. SLIGHTLY HELPFUL 3. NEUTRAL 4. SLIGHTLY UNHELPFUL 5. EXTREMELY UNHELPFUL
20. How would you rate the information on dialects of English that you were provided during your teacher training in respect to its contribution to effective teaching of 'disadvantaged students'?

1. ADEQUATE
2. SOMewhat ADEQUATE
(Please circle your answer)
3. SOMEWHAT INADEQUATE
4. INADEQUATE
9. DON'T KNOW

As a means of sharing with fellow teachers, kindly list the TITLES OF ANY SOURCES (e.g. articles, books, workshops, courses etc.,) that you have found very helpful on this topic of Dialects of English, in respect to effective teaching of disadvantaged students.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

In this section your opinions on the topic of SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS are being requested. This term can be simply described as parental income. A family is usually described as lower, middle, or upper class.

21. What specific sources did you access to obtain your information on Socio-Economic Status, in respect to its impact on students' learning? (Please circle your answer)

1. University course...................... 1. YES 2. NO
2. In service training...................... 1. YES 2. NO
3. Reading Prof. Journals ................. 1. YES 2. NO
4. Workshops, seminars.................... 1. YES 2. NO
5. Experience.............................. 1. YES 2. NO
6. Other_____________________________ 1. YES 2. NO
   (please specify)
22. How useful do you consider the information gained in helping you effectively teach disadvantaged students. (Please circle your answer)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Useful</th>
<th>Somewhat Useful</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Little Use</th>
<th>Not Useful</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. University Course</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In Service Training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Prof. Journals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Workshops, Seminar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please circle 1 or 2

23. Are you aware of studies that indicate that there are students from lower class, who read at or above the level of students from middle or upper class? YES NO

24. Have you completed a course on Sociology of Education, e.g., one that discussed the school environment in respect to middle and lower class expectations? YES NO

25. Do you know of any students or other individuals who are successful academically, and from a lower socioeconomic class? YES NO

In your opinion, how would the following conditions impact on the attainment of effective teaching of 'disadvantaged students'? Please use the scale below. (Please circle your answer)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extremely Helpful</th>
<th>Slightly Helpful</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Unhelpful</th>
<th>Extremely Unhelpful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. EXTREMELY HELPFUL</td>
<td>2. SLIGHTLY HELPFUL</td>
<td>3. NEUTRAL</td>
<td>4. SLIGHTLY UNHELPFUL</td>
<td>5. EXTREMELY UNHELPFUL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. The student has an educationally stimulating home environment ......... 1 2 3 4 5

27. The student is always well dressed ......... 1 2 3 4 5

28. The student is from a lower socioeconomic class ......... 1 2 3 4 5
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29. The student is from a single parent family...  
   Extremely Helpful | Slightly Helpful | Neutral | Slightly Not Helpful | Extremely Unhelpful
   1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5

30. The student is from a middle class background  
   1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5

31. How does being poor impact on a student's academic success?  
   1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5

32. How do you rate the importance of the student's Socioeconomic Status in respect to its impact on the effective teaching of 'disadvantaged students'?
   (Please circle your answer)
   1. VERY IMPORTANT
   2. SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT
   3. NEUTRAL
   4. SOMEWHAT UNIMPORTANT
   5. UNIMPORTANT

33. How would you rate the adequacy of the information on socioeconomic status that you were provided during your teacher training in respect to its contribution to effective teaching of disadvantaged students?  
   1. ADEQUATE
   (Please circle your answer)
   2. SOMEWHAT ADEQUATE
   3. SOMEWHAT INADEQUATE
   4. INADEQUATE
   5. DON'T KNOW

As a means of sharing with fellow teachers, kindly list the TITLES OF ANY SOURCES (e.g. articles, books, workshops, courses etc.) that you have found helpful on this topic of the student's Socioeconomic Status.

In this section the words TEACHER METHODOLOGY relates to the way in which instructions is delivered. For example, in presenting the lessons, does one take into consideration the learning styles of the students (audio, dialogue, rote, hands on), appropriate resources, and the total learning situation.
34. What was the specific source of your information on methodology as it relates to learning styles of students? (Please circle your answer)

1. University course................. 1. YES 2. NO
2. In service training................. 1. YES 2. NO
3. Reading Professional Journals 1. YES 2. NO
4. Workshops, seminars............ 1. YES 2. NO
5. Experience......................... 1. YES 2. NO
6. Other________________________ 1. YES 2. NO
(please specify)

35. How useful do you consider this information on teacher methodology in respect to effective teaching of disadvantaged students? (Please circle your answer)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Useful</th>
<th>Somewhat Useful</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Little Use</th>
<th>Not Useful</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Course</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Service Training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Journals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops, Seminar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36. Have you completed any courses or workshops etc. on the Brain? Example: Cognition and Emotion, Right Brain/Left Brain? (Please circle your answer)

1. YES  2. NO

37. Do you observe the main mode of communication of the student (e.g. talker, writer) before deciding on the methodology for teaching the lesson? (Please circle your answer)

1. YES  2. NO
38. Have you obtained any information on the impact of the invention of PRINTING especially on those cultures whose main style of communication is oral instead of written? (Please circle your answer)

1. YES  
2. NO

Based on the knowledge you have acquired on the topic of Teacher Methodology, please rate the following statements. 

1. STRONGLY AGREE (SA)  
2. AGREE SOMEWHAT (A)  
3. DISAGREE SOMEWHAT (D)  
4. STRONGLY DISAGREE (SD)  
9. DON'T KNOW (DK)

(Please circle your answer)

39. Some children because of hemisphere dominance NEED the structure that phonics provides when learning to read................. 1 2 3 4 9

40. For effective teaching of disadvantaged students one has to be aware of and apply different learning styles and methods, according to the needs of the students............................... 1 2 3 4 9

41. Students' learning styles are influenced by their cultural background................................................................. 1 2 3 4 9

42. How do you rate the importance of Teacher Methodology in respect to its impact on the effective teaching of 'disadvantaged students'?

1. VERY IMPORTANT  
2. SOMewhat IMPORTANT  
3. NEUTRAL  
4. SOMEWHAT UNIMPORTANT  
5. UNIMPORTANT

(Please circle your answer)

43. How does lack of consideration of students' learning styles, on the part of a teacher, affect a student's academic success?

1. EXTREMELY HELPFUL  
2. SLIGHTLY HELPFUL  
3. NEUTRAL  
4. SLIGHTLY UNHELPFUL  
5. EXTREMELY UNHELPFUL

(Please circle your answer)

44. How would you rate the adequacy of the information on Teacher Methodology that you were provided during your teacher training in respect to its contribution to effective teaching of disadvantaged students?

1. ADEQUATE  
2. SOMEWHAT ADEQUATE  
3. SOMEWHAT INADEQUATE  
4. INADEQUATE  
9. DON'T KNOW

(Please circle your answer)
As a means of sharing with fellow teachers, kindly list the TITLES OF ANY SOURCES (e.g. articles, books, workshops, courses etc.,) that you have found helpful on this topic of Teacher Methodology.

In this section, I would appreciate your opinions on the topic of TEACHER EXPECTATIONS.
As used in this survey, EXPECTATIONS refer to one’s thought structure or what one thinks about the topic. This is influenced by knowledge, beliefs, and values. Teacher Expectancy is the predicted level of performance, expected by a teacher of the student.

45. What was the source of your specific knowledge on the topic of 'Teacher Expectations' and its impact on a student learning? (Please circle your answer)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. University course</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In service training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Reading Professional Journals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Workshops, seminars</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other (please specify)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

46. How useful, do you consider the information gained in helping you effectively teach disadvantaged students? (Please circle your answer)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>VERY USEFUL</th>
<th>Somewhat Useful</th>
<th>NEUTRAL</th>
<th>LITTLE USE</th>
<th>NOT USEFUL</th>
<th>NOT Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. University Course</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In Service Training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Prof. Journals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Workshops, Seminar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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47. Are you aware of studies that examined the relationship between, 'self-fulfilling prophecy' and teacher expectations? (Please circle your answer)

1. YES  2. NO

48. Have you completed any courses, workshops etc. on Non-Verbal Communication, also called Body Language? (Please circle your answer)

1. YES  2. NO

Please provide your opinion by rating the following statements:

1. STRONGLY AGREE (SA)
2. AGREE SOMEWHAT (A)
3. DISAGREE SOMEWHAT (D)
4. STRONGLY DISAGREE (SD)
9. DON'T KNOW (DK)

PLEASE CIRCLE NUMBER  SA  A  D  SD  DK

49. Children (at the elementary school level) live up to teachers' academic expectations of them ....................... 1  2 3 4 9

50. Each individual is influenced by the beliefs and stereotypes of the society in which they grew up.............. 1  2 3 4 9

51. How do you rate the importance of Teacher Expectation in respect to its impact on the effective teaching of students?  

1. VERY IMPORTANT
2. SOMewhat IMPORTANT
3. NEUTRAL
4. SOMEWHAT UNIMPORTANT
5. UNIMPORTANT

52. How does low teacher expectation affect a student's academic success?  

1. EXTREMELY HELPFUL
2. SLIGHTLY HELPFUL
3. NEUTRAL
4. SLIGHTLY UNHELPFUL
5. EXTREMELY UNHELPFUL

53. How would you rate the adequacy of the information on Teacher Expectation that you were provided during your teacher training in respect to its contribution to effective teaching of disadvantaged students?  

1. ADEQUATE
2. SOMEWHAT ADEQUATE
3. SOMEWHAT INADEQUATE
4. INADEQUATE
9. DON'T KNOW
As a means of sharing with fellow teachers, kindly list the TITLES OF ANY SOURCES (e.g. articles, books, workshops, courses etc.) that you have found helpful on this topic of Teacher Expectations.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

54. Please RANK the following factors from 1 to 5. Number 1 being the factor with the greatest impact or the most important in relation to effective teaching of disadvantaged students. 5 being least important. Please use each number (rank) ONLY ONCE.

__________ Student from Lower socioeconomic class
__________ The expectations I hold for the child
__________ Parental involvement in the child’s education
__________ The methods I use in teaching
__________ The child’s mastery of Standard English

Questionnaires sometimes set limits on communications. I would be very interested in further discussion on the topics raised in the questionnaire. If you would like to provide additional information, I can be reached at home (787-8015) or work (394-7530).
GENERAL INFORMATION

The following anonymous information will be used for comparison purposes.

AGE (Circle number) In what type of area did you grow up? (Circle number) In which region of Canada did you grow up? (Circle number 1 or 2) YES NO
1. 20-24 1. URBAN a. EASTERN (Maritimes) 1. 2.
2. 25-29 2. SUBURBAN b. CENTRAL (Ont. & Que.) 1. 2.
3. 30-39 3. RURAL c. WESTERN (Prairies & B.C.) 1. 2.
4. 40-49 4. OTHER ______ d. NORTHERN (Yukon & N.W.T.) 1. 2.
5. 50-59 (please specify) e. OTHER COUNTRY 1. 2.
6. 60+ (please specify) 1. FEMALE

SEX 2. MALE

Which is your highest level of EDUCATION (Circle number)
1. HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA
2. COURSES for B. A.
3. BACHELORS
4. COURSES for M.A.
5. MASTERS
6. COURSES for doctorate.
7. DOCTORATE
8. OTHER (please specify)
Where did you obtain your Teacher Training? (Circle number)
1. UNIV. OF TORONTO
2. OTHER UNIV. IN ONT.
3. IN CANADA, not ONT.
4. IN U.S.A.
5. IN BRITAIN
6. ANOTHER COUNTRY
How much time do you PRESENTLY spend teaching? (Circle number)
1. FULL TIME
2. HALF TIME
3. LESS THAN HALF TIME

Language(s) you speak
1. ENGLISH
2. FRENCH
3. OTHER (please specify)
4. ENGLISH & FRENCH
5. ENGLISH & OTHER
6. FRENCH & OTHER
7. FRENCH, ENGLISH & OTHER

STUDENT POPULATION (for the school) RANK the first THREE (3) groups by SIZE ... 1 being most students.
1. AFRICANS (ESL) ________
2. CARIBBEAN BLACKS ________
3. EAST INDIANS (ESL) ________
4. SOUTH EAST ASIANS (ESL) ________
5. WHITES ________
6. OTHER ________
Is there anything else that you would like to share your opinions on with respect to working in Metropolitan Toronto, especially with students that are considered 'special needs'? If so please use this space for that purpose.

Your contribution to this study is very greatly appreciated. If you would like to obtain a copy of the list of helpful resources generated from this study, or a summary of results, please print your address on the back of the return envelope (NOT on this questionnaire). I will make certain that you get it.
Appendix B

Complete Listings of All Ranking Choices
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11111</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12345</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12435</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13254</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13542</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14325</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21111</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21233</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21345</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21435</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21534</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23145</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31122</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31245</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31425</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31524</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32145</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32212</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32514</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34125</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34215</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34251</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34251</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34251</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34251</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34251</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34251</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34251</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41325</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41352</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41523</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41532</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42122</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42135</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42153</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42315</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42513</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43125</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43152</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43215</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43512</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43521</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45213</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51234</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51243</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>66.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51323</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>66.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51324</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>66.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51423</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>73.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51432</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52155</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>74.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52314</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>75.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52431</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53124</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>85.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53214</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>86.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53412</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54123</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td>94.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54321</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>98.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54321</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>99.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54521</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing cases: 6

Total: 245
Appendix C

Bar Graphs for Rating, Ranking, Adequacy, and Sources
Figure 9. Perceived Importance of Home/School Factors Based on Ratings.
Figure 10. Perceived Importance of Home/School Factors Based on Ranking.
Figure 11. Ratings of Adequacy of Information From Teacher Training.
Figure 12. Different Sources of Information Accessed by Teachers.
Appendix D

Human Subjects Institutional Review Board Approval of Protocol
Date: August 20, 1992

To: Loraine Enniss

From: Mary Anne Bunda, Chair

Re: HSIRB Project Number: 92-03-37

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research protocol, "Relationship between Metropolitan Toronto Public Elementary School Teachers, perception of the importance of certain Home/school factors, for effective teaching of Disadvantaged students and teachers knowledge about these factors" has been approved under the exempt category of review by the HSIRB. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the approval application.

You must seek reapproval for any changes in this design. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

xc: Warfield, Ed Leadership

Approval Termination: August 20, 1993
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