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CHAPTER I

AN OVERVIEW OF THE PROBLEM
AND STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The study was part of an evaluation of the Jack and Jill Experimental Reading Program carried out by the Education Department of the University of Michigan-Flint at Dort Community School, Flint, Michigan, during the school year 1972-73. The program consisted of two parts: 1) formal classroom study of linguistics with special emphasis on Black dialect carried out weekly for a twenty-four week duration; 2) interaction and consultation with an urban specialist and a linguist who were in charge of the formal classroom program. The model for this program was developed by the Education Department of the University of Michigan-Flint.

While the University of Michigan-Flint was the program designer and administrator throughout the project, supporting funds for the program were garnered from the following sources:

- University of Michigan-Flint: $9,400
- Flint Board of Education: 7,696
- Mott Foundation: 8,000
- Local Contributions: 2,500
- Jack and Jill Foundation: 500

Total: $28,096

Most analysts of urban education have identified the area of language skills as a crucial area. Without the ability to read effectively, pupils have difficulty in all academic areas. Thus, many federally and privately funded urban education
programs have concentrated in this area. Commonly such
programs have searched for methods of teaching reading,
methods of increasing vocabulary and methods of altering
oral language. The problem has been defined as a problem of
method. In recent years scholars of learning theory have
suggested that the emphasis on reading method has, at least
in part, been misdirected. Various reading methods applied
to urban areas seem to make little difference when moved out
of the laboratory situation. The problem, as Labov (1972)
and Liles (1972) indicated, is in part method but even more
importantly, may be one of teacher attitude toward a student,
his culture and the language which reflects his past and
present. Literature of the late sixties and early seventies
attests to the notion that teachers in urban schools harbor
negative attitudes about their students, especially in cases
where teachers have predominately Black classrooms. The
negative attitudes, according to the works of Rosenthal and
Jacobsen (1967), affect the process, quality, and outcome of
the teaching-learning process. Hence, it appears that read­
ing programs must rely heavily upon changing teacher attitude
toward students if they are to succeed in raising the reading
levels of Black youngsters.

The purpose of this study was to look at the attitudes
of a select group of teachers toward Black dialect and to
assess if a program based on the study of linguistics could
significantly change their attitude toward Black dialect.
Also, the study sought to determine if alteration of teacher attitudes would lead to alteration of verbal interaction patterns in their classrooms. And finally, the study sought to determine if alteration in teacher attitudes would lead to a change in students' perception of their teachers.

Importance of Study

As indicated earlier, many programs designed to raise the reading levels of urban Black youngsters have relied solely on the revision and substitution of various reading methods as tools for bringing about this change. A small number of these programs have attempted to incorporate human relations training as one of the components in their methodological programs, but it has been only in the past few years that reading theorists and learning theorists have looked at teachers' attitudes toward student language as a variable which might affect the learning-to-read process. While non-data-based studies exist which discuss teachers' language attitude and its effect on students' reading, few studies have been carried out which attempt to measure teacher attitude toward Black dialect. This study attempts to explore several areas heretofore not adequately explored in current literature, namely, 1) the measurement of teacher language attitude, 2) the measurement of change in language attitude, 3) the theory of cognitive dissonance as a means to change language attitudes, and 4) the effect of language attitude on verbal classroom climate and student perception of teachers.
A study of this nature is seen as necessary if the problems associated with urban children and reading are to be fully explored. If teacher attitudes are found to be a significant variable in the learning-to-read process, it is felt that this study will add important data-based information which, while inconclusive, will be directional in its emphasis for future research.

Questions to be Answered in This Study

The specific questions this study sought to answer are listed below:

1. Would teachers involved in the Dort Project exhibit more positive attitudes toward Black dialect after in-service training?

2. Would teachers involved in the Dort Project increase their linguistic knowledge after in-service training?

3. Would there be a change in the classroom verbal interaction pattern in the classroom of teachers involved in the Dort Project after in-service training?
   a. Would there be a change in teacher initiated talk to students?
   b. Would there be a change in teacher response to students?
   c. Would there be a change in pupil response to other students and to the teacher?
   d. Would there be a change in pupil-initiated talk to other students and to the teacher?

4. Would the students of teachers involved in the Dort Project perceive their teachers more positively after in-service training?
Limitations of the Study

This study had two limitations that are immediately apparent. One limiting factor of the study was the number of subjects included in the total population. A larger population would have more adequately broadened the base for implications. The study was also limited because time, monies and human resources would not permit a more intensive study or a follow-up study in order to determine the long-range effects of the in-service training.

While each of the above factors are limiting, they are not seen as detrimental to the immediate workings of the project.

Definition of Terms

Language Attitude

In a modification of Gordon Allport's (1935) definition of attitude, Ruth Liles (1972) defined attitude toward language as a "mental or neural state of readiness, organized through experience and exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual's response to the spoken language of another person or group of persons."

In this study attitudes toward language denote teacher(s) score(s) as recorded on the Language Attitude Scale.
**Black Dialect**

Black dialect, Non-Standard Negro Dialect, Ghettoese Black English are synonymous terms used connotatively to refer to a form of English spoken by many Blacks throughout the United States. Black dialect is linguistically defined as "a separate linguistic system closely related to Standard English, but set apart from the surrounding White dialect by a number of systematic phonological, syntactical and semantic differences (Labov, p. 258)." While the definition looms as a nebulous entity, it is nevertheless one of the most widely accepted and safest definitions used by White or Black linguists.

In this study Black dialect can be defined as the language spoken colloquially by a majority of the Black students at Dort Elementary School.

**In-Service Training**

In-service training refers to that process by which teachers are trained or retrained in some aspect of their teaching profession while yet performing their teaching operation.

In this study in-service training refers to 1) the formal class in linguistics taught by members of the University of Michigan staff; and 2) interaction had between urban specialist and linguist and the teachers involved in the Dort Project.
Verbal Interaction Analysis

Verbal interaction analysis is a technique for "capturing quantitative and qualitative dimensions of teacher verbal behavior in the classroom (Amidon et al., 1967, p. 2)," by tapping the verbal behaviors of the teachers and pupils that are directly related to the social-emotional climate of the classroom.

In this study verbal interaction refers to the type of verbal behavior as coded and recorded on the verbal interaction category system developed by Edmund Amidon.

Linguistics

Linguistics is defined by Bentley (1973) as a Science of Language.

In this study linguistics refers to the set of elements and laws that govern those elements which make up oral language.

Students' Perception of Teachers

Students' perception of teachers refers to the student's opinion of his teacher.

In this study students' perception of teachers refers to the student's opinion of his teacher as measured by the Teacher Image Questionnaire.
Theoretical Basis for This Study

The theoretical strategy for this study was based on four data-supported assumptions.

1. That Black dialect had a history of social rejection in this country and that teacher attitudes toward speech patterns that differed greatly from the accepted norm were negative.

2. That negative attitudes and expectations often inhibit progress or success.

3. That attitudes could be changed.

4. That attitudes and attitude change could be measured.

Each of the assumptions is related in an integral fashion to the other and each assumption was the basis for the theoretical design of the study.

Studies by Becker (1952) conducted in the slums of Chicago found ethnicity and language deprivation to be the major cause of negative teacher attitudes toward students. Becker, commenting on Black children and their oral and written test responses stated,

Teachers unmistakably [sic] scored Black students in lower proportion than they did White children on tests, even when answers were similar. Black students who were verbal and spoke with an absence of broken speech were graded significantly higher than those Black students who spoke a rather unintelligible form of English (p. 42).

Becker's conclusions were seconded by the study conducted by Woodworth and Salzer (1971) who duplicated the oral and written testing situation with a group of sixth graders. The researchers concluded that the negative attitudes teachers held concerning Black dialect caused a multitude of non-teaching
and teaching behaviors which were reflected in lack of student academic success. With full realization of the effect that Black dialect has on the teacher-student and teaching-learning situation, the problem for this study was clearly defined: to change teacher attitude.

The whole concept of attitude change and of attitude measurement is one of controversy. While researchers have long reported that attitudes could be changed, the theoretical basis for that change has been greatly questioned. One of the most widely applauded theories is the theory of cognitive dissonance. Briefly stated, the theory of cognitive dissonance states that an individual's attitudes can be changed by introducing cognitive elements which are dissonant to the individual's current attitude.

This study attempted to use the theory of cognitive dissonance to change teacher's attitudes toward language, more specifically toward Black dialect, by introducing the linguistic legitimacy of Black dialect as the dissonant cognitive element. This study sought to measure attitude and attitude change in both the cognitive and affective domain through use of paper and pencil attitude measures, interaction analysis and student perceptions of teachers.

Organization of the Dissertation

Chapter I served as an overview of the basic problem and purpose of the study along with the theoretical basis for the
procedures used. Also included within the first chapter are a definition of terms, importance and limitations of the study and questions to be answered in the study. Chapter II, Related Literature and Rationale, contains a review of literature relating to the questions posited for inquiry, namely Black dialect, Attitude Change, Linguistics, Interaction Analysis and Student's Perceptions of Teachers.

Chapter III, Design of the Study, contains a description of the area and population under investigation. The chapter also includes a description of the methods used for data gathering, a description of the instruments used for data gathering, the specific questions to be answered by this study and the treatment of data.

Chapter IV, Presentation and Analysis of Data, includes the analyses of the data gathered in the study and Chapter V presents a summary of the study, a discussion of the major findings, the implications drawn from the findings and a statement of the recommendations.
CHAPTER II

RATIONALE AND RELATED LITERATURE

The focus of this chapter is to build a strong and logical rationale for the questions asked in Chapter I by reviewing the works of researchers who have investigated the areas of Black dialect, attitude change, linguistics, interaction analysis, and student perceptions of teachers. The organization and presentation of information will be as follows: 1) An historical view of Black dialect and the socio-linguistic attitudes toward Black dialect; 2) An overview of attitude measurement and attitude change; 3) A brief discussion of linguistics and its use in legitimatizing Black dialect; 4) An historical view of interaction analysis and the use of interaction analysis as a measure of attitude change; and 5) A discussion of the development, usefulness and reliability of student perceptions of their teachers.

Black Dialect

The discussion following will focus on two aspects of Black dialect, 1) An historical perspective of Black dialect, and 2) Social-linguistic attitudes toward Black dialect.

Historical Perspective of Black Dialect

Accurate and reliable information about the language of a vast majority of Black Americans is generally not available,
either to the public or to educators. Significant research on Black dialect in the United States, aside from Turner's *Africanisms in the Gullah Dialect* (1949) is almost entirely a product of the mid 1960's into the 1970's. During the past ten years a group of linguists have shown that Black dialect is different in grammar (in syntax) from the Standard American English of the mainstream of the White culture. They maintain that there are sources for varieties of English elsewhere than in the British regional dialects.

Writings of the early to middle Twentieth Century illustrated with some clarity the myopic view of the early students of language study. Other observations, however, were made during that period which at times offered more cogent explanations concerning Black dialect. N. S. Dodge, a contributor to *Appleton's Journal* (1870), compared American Dialect to Sierra Leone Krio and Liberian Pidgin English. There were actually many such observers who were not dialectologists but who looked at matters historically in order to understand Black dialect. The same number reverted back to the theory of the "African Anatomy" which said that Black dialect is greatly influenced by "thick lips," an untenable notion to many that physiological factors determined the language difference. Attempts to understand the origin and assess the legitimacy of Black dialect caused many researchers to delve into the fragmented history of Black Americans. From their studies a sketchy but nonetheless significant historical
origin of Black dialect has emerged.

From 1620 to almost 1700, little indirect, and no direct evidence of the speech of slaves survives. The period can be known, at present, only through comparison and reconstruction. By 1715 there clearly was an African Pidgin English known on a worldwide scale. Daniel Defoe utilized it in The Family Instructor (1715) and in The Life of Colonel Jaque (1722) as well as in the early chapters of Robinson Crusoe (1719). Defoe and other writers who portrayed their characters with dialects were not phonologists or dialectologists but writers. It appears evident that they attempted to clearly denote prevalent dialect differences in their individual or group characters. Black dialect had apparently found its way into show business by 1771. As Dillard (1972) pointed out in The Farcical Trial of Atticus Before Justice Beau, For a Rape, set in Massachusetts, Caesar, "One of our neighbour's Negroes", has two brief speeches:

Yesa, Maser, he tell me that Atticus he went to bus'em one day and a shilde cry, and so he let em alone.

Cause Maser, I bus him myself (p. 22).

In these two brief passages, the pidgin/creole characteristics of non-differentiation of pronoun genders (he, 'em and him all referring to a female) is clearly indicated. There is also the noun classifier, he (Atticus he) and some probable African language phonological interference.

This is not to imply that all Blacks during the early and middle Eighteenth Century spoke Negroish English. A
consistent number of "in house Negroes," as Read (1939) pointed out, spoke "good English." A sociolinguistic implication of that period of time in American history relative to Read's findings was that the runaway slaves were likely to be those who did attain a relative mastery of Standard English.

Near the turn of the Nineteenth Century further African tribal influence was denoted in the speech of slaves. Slaves who were transported to the "new country" together and who had lived together evidenced variations which "at times made it impossible for them to communicate (Lomax, 1968, p. 88)." While Taylor (1972) attributes these variations to purely tribal influence Dillard (1972) agrees more with the theory that variations in slaves' language were due to their role in the slave social structure.

During the early 1800's, "Black English" became a changing language; patterns of innovation within the slaves' language could be observed. As the research of Stewart (1964) has shown, the "durative, be" became an established speech pattern by 1830. Dillard (1972) offered the sentence: "I be cash crabs . . ." spoken by Cuff in Modern Chivalry and asserts that innovation had begun as early as 1792. This form, Dillard said, seems to represent an earlier de (also da or a) which is still found in Creole varieties of English.

During the period of Creolization, another change took place which resulted in apparently great differences between
American Black dialect and English Creoles. From the negative structure of Plantation Creole and the antecedent pidgin, decreolized Black English, there developed three negators (dit'n, don' and ain') as well as the elaborate double negative structure

\[
\text{It ain' no use me workin' so hard.}\n\text{You don' get no more from me.}\n\text{He dit'n give me no money.}\n\]

Literature tracing the period of 1870 to the present day showed that Black dialect had begun to solidify in its general syntactical structure. Taylor (1972) pointed out in his historical context of Black Speech that modification and solidification of Black dialect emerged as slaves became more "community oriented." This community orientation, as Liles (1972) pointed out, was initiated and maintained by slave uprisings, underground railroads, the thought of freedom, and fear of the white master. Voicing the words of an anonymous writer of that period, Bennett (1967) noted that the dialect of most Negroes in the 1930's was identical throughout the southern states. Some researchers of the early 20th Century, as Stewart (1964) pointed out, felt that Black English, known to them through the formal usage of adults, was virtually identical to southern White English. However, as Dillard pointed out, the opinion of laymen of that era that southern dialect was a result of influence of Black dialect on the speech of Whites, was rejected because of no scientific support.
Liles summed up the solidification process as well as any of the authors reviewed by this writer:

Black dialect is what it is today because of the slave's necessity to communicate. In some common language form, the common denominator was a form of English which was amended to coordinate with their indigenous language patterns (p. 38).

It must be clear from the scant review of historical literature concerning the development of Black dialect, that Black dialect is not a new entity, yet until the mid-Sixties little research or study had been seriously undertaken to discover the basis for its existence and its educational implications.

In summarizing the historical view of Black dialect it appears that Black dialect is a speech pattern that differs somewhat phonologically, morphologically and syntactically from standard spoken English. These differences are accounted for by several factors, 1) the assimilation of English and indigenous African languages spoken by Blacks, 2) the absence of mainstream public education for Blacks, and 3) segregation. Also, many people view Black dialect as a sign of ignorance and maintain that students who speak poorly are slow and deficient. This view, according to some researchers, is unfounded.

Socio-Linguistic Attitudes Toward Black Dialect

American history documents with some verbosity the attitudes held by the majority culture in America against
the Black minority culture. Blacks were first transported to this country as slaves and were treated as animal stock to be bought and sold at their owner's will. This process was continued until they were granted the status of "3/5 persons" by the Constitutional Convention of 1787. Not until 1863 were Blacks afforded acceptance in the American society as full-fledged human beings, and then, it was acceptance by law not by the larger society. Bennett (1967) stated, "through legislative practice, housing ordinances, and physical oppression, peoples of the United States throughout the past three-hundred and fifty years have shown their disfavor for Blacks (p. 38)." Noted linguists and psychologists have asserted that the level of esteem at which many whites viewed Black speech was in concert with the level at which they held Blacks socially (Green, 1967; Shuy, 1967; Stewart, 1967; Johnson, 1968; Labov, 1971). This notion is likened to the anthropological theory that Taylor (1972) purports that language and culture are synonymous, that is, that attitudes toward one are the same as the attitudes toward the other. Similar to Taylor's position is that fostered by the psychological "association theory" which says, how we feel generally about the whole is how we feel about the parts or things associated with it. If one accepts either theory, ample credence is given to the notion that attitudes toward Black dialect are sub-attitudes of the larger social attitude toward Blacks.
One of the more insightful studies assessing teachers' attitudes toward Black dialect was undertaken by William Woodworth and Richard Saltzer (1971) who assessed a total of one hundred and nineteen teachers. During two forty-five minute sessions, separated by an interval of three weeks, these teachers listened to and evaluated what were presented as children's recorded social studies reports. Identical reports were read alternately by Black and White sixth-grade male students; that is, at the second session the Black student presented the same material which the White child had read at the first meeting and vice versa. In order to conceal the nature of the investigation, another voice—that of a White male child—and two additional reports were included at each session. The factors of intervening time period, changes in the sequence of presentation, and similarity of content led the researchers to conclude:

At the conclusion of the two sessions there were no reasons to believe that any subject had become aware that some reports had been presented twice (p. 170).

Examination of the data revealed a consistent statistical difference between teacher's evaluations of materials presented orally by Black and White children. For each of the instrument variables, the White student received a substantially higher evaluation. Consistent bias was found not only in the evaluation by the total sample of teachers but was also present in both urban and suburban groups for both topics.
The researchers concluded that in view of the fact that none of the children were deficient in oral skills, and each piece was written in Standard English, teachers identified the Black child's voice with his racial background and they associated such a background with negative achievement expectations.

Taylor (1972), in one of the few studies found by this researcher specifically designed to measure language attitude and attitude change, found that:

1. Teachers of predominantly Black students felt their students' language was without any phonological or syntactical base.

2. Teachers knew virtually nothing about the study of linguistics.

3. Teachers felt that Black dialect was a mark of linguistic and social inferiority.

This view of students' language and its negative social ramifications, Taylor found, was reflected in the teaching methods employed by the teachers. Many of them taught students from a deficit model, which by definition implied that the students were totally without basic language skills. Green (1968) commented that teachers who felt that Black dialect was a mark of social inferiority often hold negative achievement expectations for speakers of that dialect. These negative achievement expectations, Green concluded, are the most detrimental component of the Black child's education. As the studies by Rosenthal and Jacobsen (1967) pointed out, teacher expectations tend to fulfill themselves
in students' performance. Hence, teacher attitude toward Black dialect, if negative, is perhaps at the center of the problems associated with teaching Black youngsters to read.

Attitude and Attitude Change

This section will focus on three aspects of attitude and attitude change, 1) Development of definitions, 2) Review of attitude measurement and techniques, and 3) Attitude change theories.

Development of Definitions

The concept of attitude has played a central role in the development of American social psychology. Before World War II social psychologists devoted a large part of their efforts to attitude measurement and scaling. Post-war psychologists have been equally dedicated to theoretical and empirical issues of attitude change. However, no single definition of attitudes emerging from either of these time periods is totally acceptable to all concerned.

Much of the disagreement over the definition of attitude and concept of attitude change was characterized by the question, "Is social attitude a consistency in response to social objects?" as espoused by Campbell (1950; 1957), or "Is social attitude a mental set, or a readiness to respond?" as Allport (1935) purported it to be.
Krech and Crutchfield (1948) defined attitude as "... an enduring organization of motivational, emotional, perceptual and cognitive process with respect to some aspect of the individual's world (p. 152)." In his pioneering article, "Attitudes Can Be Measured" (1928), Thurstone advocated a broad definition; however, later he redefined attitude. "I defined attitude as the intensity of positive or negative affect for or against a psychological object. A psychological object is any symbol, person, phrase, slogan or idea toward which people can differ as regards positive or negative affect (Thurstone, 1946, p. 39)."

Campbell (1950), in an attempt to find more common ground in the various definitions of attitude, used more behavioristic language in explaining attitude and attitude change. It was Campbell's contention that agreement on the implicit operational or pointing definition of attitudes is already present. Campbell continued:

As a tentative formulation the following definition is offered: A social attitude is or is evidenced by consistency in response to social objects. If we look at those definitions utilizing concepts of set, or readiness to respond, for example, Allport's (1935), 'An attitude is a mental or neural state of readiness organized through experience and exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual's response to all objects and situations to which it is related, and ask for the evidence of a mental and neural state of readiness, the symptoms of a directive or dynamic influence, criteria as to the objects and situations to which it is related,' these evidences will be, in the final analysis, consistency and predictability among responses (p. 32).

An individual's social attitude, then, is "a syndrome of..."
response consistency with regard to social objects (p. 32)." Bain (1928) and Horowitz (1944), whose behavioral orientation led them to a rejection of neural definitions, like Allport's, said that in research practice one should not equate isolated responses with attitude; but on the contrary, look for the appearance of response consistencies.

Campbell's (1950) analysis has for the most part been accepted by Green (1954):

It is apparent from these examples that the concept of attitude implies a consistency or predictability of responses ... This definition does not divest attitudes of their affective or cognitive properties, which may be properties of or correlates of the responses which comprise the attitude ... (p. 336).

McGuire (1968) synthesized the five dimensions of disagreement among the definitions of attitudes:

1. Disagreement about the psychological locus of attitudes.
2. Disagreement whether attitude should be defined as a response or readiness to respond.
3. Disagreement as to the degree that attitudes are organized. To what extent is a single attitude made up of separate components?
4. Disagreement regarding the extent to which attitudes are learned through previous experience.
5. Disagreement as to the extent which attitudes play a directive-knowledge or dynamic motivational function.

It would appear, in summarizing the above, that most of these issues are theoretical and empirical issues, and as McGuire concluded, they should be resolved by data rather
than by philosophical argument. All too often, social psychologists have tried to make their definition of attitude both a definition and a theory of the concept. "Definitions," Kiesler et al. concluded, "should be intimately bound up in the measurement technique; material about the function of attitudes within the personality and society about—not measurements of—attitudes (p. 56)."

**Brief Review of Attitude Measurement Technique**

The second and somewhat independent influence on the current conception of attitude is the influence stemming from the literature on attitude measurement. In contrast to the definitions and theoretical discussion, the literature on measurement techniques has contributed to the evolution of the concept of attitudes by stressing report/self-report aspects of attitude. Most attitude measurement, whatever the definition or theory, is most commonly measured by paper-pencil instrument, a measurement technique which does not make use of overt behavior. A prime reason for the absence of instruments which use recording of overt behavior lies in, 1) the disagreement as to the definitions of attitude, and more importantly, 2) the lack of sophisticated research tools by which to measure such behavior (Kiesler et al., 1969).

The following taxonomy of Cook and Selltiz (1964) distinguished four general categories of attitude measures.
1. Measures in which inferences are drawn from self-reports of beliefs, behaviors, etc.

2. Measures in which inferences are drawn from the observation of on-going behavior in natural setting.

3. Measures in which inferences are drawn from the individual's reaction to or interpretation of partially structured stimuli.

4. Measures in which inferences are drawn from physiological reaction to the attitudinal object of representations of it.

Lickert (1932) in a monograph that received considerable attention among psychologists, devised a self-report measure by which to score attitudes directly from the attitudinal responses without the need of an outside panel of judges. A great majority of present day studies employ a Lickert-type scale to measure attitude.

Self-report, paper and pencil measures have loomed over the other measures of attitude mainly because they are easy to administer and to tabulate. But self-report measures a neural attitude, a mental readiness to respond as opposed to overt behavior, which is often the type of measure needed. In the realm of observation of overt behavior few techniques were alluded to aside from observation of structured stimuli (Cook and Selltiz, 1964), performance on objective tasks (Thistlethwaite, 1950) and physiological reactions (Rankin and Campbell, 1955). While each of the above has stipulative evidence supporting their use, they each maintain a laboratory setting, thus lending the possibility of sterility and inauthenticity. Interaction analysis, which is discussed
later, and sociometric techniques, while not widely used in assessing and interpreting attitude, are some of the more realistic observations of overt behavior (Kiesler et al., 1969).

Attitude Change Theories

Literature is replete with attitude change theories ranging from the Implicit Response Theory (Doob, 1947) to the Skinnerian Behavioristic Theory (Bem, 1967) to the Inculcation Theory (McGuire, 1965). In this section a brief discussion of the consistency theory with special emphasis on cognitive dissonance will be discussed.

The basic assumption underlying consistency theories is the "need" for consistency. The focus of this striving for consistency varies somewhat from theorist to theorist. Usually most of the theories further assume that the presence of inconsistency produces "psychological tension," or at least is uncomfortable, and in order to reduce this tension, the individual "rearranges" his psychological world to produce consistency.

To more clearly explicate, the following examples are offered: A factory owner who refuses to employ Negroes does not invite them to his home for dinner; a member of the John Birch Society does not bring Christmas presents to a member of the Americans for Democratic Action, nor does he support their candidate for political office. Zajonic (1960)
pointed out:

In this respect the concept of consistency underscores and presumes rationality. It holds that behavior and attitudes are not only consistent to objective observers, but that individuals try to appear consistent to themselves (p. 280).

It continued:

But . . . while the concept of consistency acknowledges man's rationality, observation of the means of its achievement simultaneously unveils his irrationality (p. 281).

McGuire (1966) listed several ways in which inconsistency may be created within an individual who has basic strivings toward consistency. First there are human logical shortcomings, which can lead to material fallacies (McGuire, 1960). Second, inconsistency can arise as a result of the person simultaneously occupying two conflicting social roles. Third, McGuire suggested that a person's environment may change, leaving him "encumbered with a conceptual baggage that no longer accords with reality." Fourth, a person may be pressured into behaving in ways inconsistent with his attitudes. Much of the dissonance theory research concerns itself with this type of situation.

The dissonance theory, which is a consistency or balance theory, is concerned with the relations among the cognitive elements and the consequences when elements are inconsistent with one another; where cognitive elements are defined as bits of knowledge, or opinion or beliefs about oneself, about one's behavior and about one's surroundings in the environment.
In this theory as Kiesler, et al. (1969) pointed out, three possible relationships among elements are posited: 1) They may be irrelevant to one another; 2) They may be consistent with one another, referred to as consonant; and, 3) They may be inconsistent with one another, referred to as dissonant (p. 192). "It is important," Kiesler pointed out, "to emphasize that the relationship between elements need not necessarily be logically consistent or inconsistent. It could be psychological as well (p. 192)."

Festinger (1957) stated that there were two basic hypotheses to his theory:

1. The existence of dissonance creates psychological tension or discomfort and will motivate the person to reduce the dissonance and achieve consonance.

2. When dissonance exists, not only will the person attempt to reduce it but he will actively attempt to avoid situations and information which would increase the dissonance (p. 13).

Important to the discussion of dissonance and its measurement is the question: Given the question that dissonance exists between two clusters of cognitive elements, how may it be reduced? Festinger lists three ways:

1. The person may change a cognitive element related to his behavior. This could involve a change in the behavior or possibly a denial or distortion of the behavior. Consider the dissonance between "the knowledge that I smoke heavily" and "the knowledge that smoking causes cancer and related diseases." This dissonance can obviously be reduced by a change in the behavior in the association with one of the dissonant elements, i.e. quit smoking.
2. The person may change a cognitive element related to his environment. This method of reducing dissonance presumably involves changing the environment in some way, whether it be the physical environment or the psychological environment.

3. The third way that a person may reduce dissonance is to add new cognitive elements to one cluster or the other or both. Obviously this method will not completely eliminate dissonance (Festinger, 1951, p. 28).

"The dissonance theory, while clearly controversial, remains in the forefront of the theories centering around attitude change (Bramel, 1962, p. 320)."

In summarizing the section on attitude/attitude change several things were posited:

1. Attitude definitions vary and usually find their differences in their conceptualization. The major controversy is whether attitude is a cognitive or an affective phenomenon.

2. Because of the lack of sophistication in affective measurement techniques, attitude measurement has been somewhat bound to paper and pencil self-reports which measure cognitive or mental "readiness to respond."

3. The most controversial if not the most popular theories of attitude change are those which find their base in the consistency model. Cognitive dissonance, one of the consistency model theories, is based on the hypothetical construct that a person seeks to reduce dissonant circumstances in order to bring about consonance between two cognitive elements.

Linguistics

This section will briefly describe linguistics in the following manner: 1) Definitive view of linguistics, 2) Review of linguistic programs designed to train teachers.
Definitive View of Linguistics

While nearly 2500 years have passed since the Aristotelian concept of linguistics, "many of the basic assumptions contrived by scholars of early Grecian times remained the basis for the theories underlying linguistics today (Hughes, 1968, p. 83)." Even before the transformationalists, the structuralists recognized a pattern in language. According to LeFevre (1964) the two basic assumptions underlying linguistics are: 1) language is human behavior, and 2) each language has its own independent and unique structure; it requires its own independent and unique description. LeFevre also listed four methodological assumptions of linguistics:

1. Language may be studied objectively and systematically.

2. Objective study of a language yields an accurate, orderly, comprehensive description of the language system, or structure.

3. Structural linguistics is not just another nomenclature for the parts of speech of traditional grammar, or another way of parsing and diagramming sentences. It is an entirely new way of looking at language, of sorting out the data, of classifying findings.

4. Structural linguistics leads to new data, new knowledge, new insights, new understandings (1964, p. xii).

The research of Hughes (1969) indicated that scientific linguistics had no effect on the teaching of language in...
the United States until the 1940's. "Until then the majority of English and language teachers in schools were practitioners of what has been called the grammar-translation method, and indeed most were probably unaware that there was any other method (p. 121)." In the 1930's Leonard Bloomfield prepared a volume containing recommendations derived from linguistics for the teaching of language. In 1941 this volume was accepted and adopted by the American Council of Learned Societies' Intensive Language Program as theoretical basis of its program of instruction. Two years later the United States Army adapted the practices of the Intensive Language Program to its own specialized training program. From these initial instances the linguistic approach to language has moved slowly into language arts programs in public and private schools.

Review of Linguistic Programs Designed to Train Teachers in Linguistics

According to Hughes (1969) and Labov (1971), "the basic influence of linguistics on language teaching is in attitude--the attitude of finding out what language is and teaching what native speakers actually say rather than trying to dictate what the language should be (Hughes, 1969, p. 121)." Labov was in concert with Hughes' comments when he spoke of linguistics and language:

The study of linguistics opened Pandora's Box. Students trained in linguistics tend to be more open and objective in their responses to different dialects and tend to be reluctant to attest to any language or dialect as being deficient (p. 21).
In another study, Crawford (1971) combining linguistics training with human relations training, included thirty-five student teachers at Atlanta University, in efforts to change teachers' attitude toward Black dialect. Crawford summarized his study in this fashion:

... It appears then that all the student teachers involved in the project altered their attitudes concerning Black students' background, environment, social life and language. To what extent a causal relationship exists between the training and the alteration of student teachers attitudes, I am not sure, but from all indication the training sessions did have a firm impact on attitude change (p. 78).

Crawford's inconclusiveness concerning the causal effect between training and attitude change was perhaps due to the non-existence of a control group in his study.

In summary, linguistics is the scientific study of language. While the study of linguistics dates back some years it has been just recently that its impact has been felt in the area of language arts. The basic influence linguistics has had on language arts has been on the attitude individuals had toward other languages and dialects. Students of linguistics tend to be more open and accepting of dialects and languages other than their own.

Teacher-Student Verbal Interaction Analysis

The discussion will focus on two aspects of Teacher-Student Verbal Interaction Analysis, 1) historical development of interaction analysis, 2) the use of interaction analysis as an attitude measure.
Verbal interaction analysis has resulted from a need for objectivity in classroom observation. Prior to 1950, researchers were confronted with many problems in their attempt to examine teacher effectiveness. Mitzel (1960), in a discussion of the research on teacher competence, 1910-1950, expressed disappointment about the lack of classroom applicability of the findings. He felt that most studies conducted during this period were inconclusive. Mitzel's perceptions were supported by Domas and Tiedeman (1950). Domas and Tiedeman examined approximately 1,000 studies, dating back to 1890, which dealt with teacher effectiveness. They concluded that most of the studies examined consisted of subjective judgments of teachers' behavior. The need for rigor in teacher observation was further supported by Barr (1935) when he concluded, "The problem lay in the lack of objectivity in data gathering material (p. 404)."

The long used observational rating scales were slowly replaced by new behavior classification instruments, often referred to as systems. The newer instruments were objective-descriptive rather than subjective-evaluative. Jayne (1935) is credited by Spaulding (1965) as having paved the way for the development of expanded systems which included cognitive behavior. The studies of Anderson and Brewer (1945, 1946) and Anderson, Brewer and Reed (1946) resulted in the development of a system for categorizing classroom communication. The categories were divided into two groups, 1) dominative,
which tend to reduce the free interplay between individuals, and led to conformity and resistance, and 2) "integrative" acts which tend to seek a common purpose. Some evidence was obtained to support the thesis that classrooms differ markedly in kinds of interactions present and that the variations were related to personality characteristics of the teachers. Anderson and his colleagues also contributed to the establishment of systematic methods for classifying data on students and teachers. They identified twenty categories for classifying data on students and teachers. Categories 1-8 were defined as "dominative" in nature, categories 9-10 as neither "dominative" or "integrative" (I/D) in nature, categories 11-19 as integrative and category 20 as "undetermined." Withall (1949, 1965) reduced the number of categories and renamed the I/D index, "The Social-Emotional Climate." The method devised by Withall was to analyze typewritten transcripts of tape recordings of classroom behaviors along the seven category continuum from "learner-centeredness" to "teacher-centeredness." Through this system Withall was able to determine that different teachers produce dissimilar climates with the same groups of students. His findings supported those of Anderson in that the climate created by a teacher tended to remain the same year after year.

Bales (1950) developed a 12 category system for use in the observation of social interaction in small groups. Its purpose was to reveal the structure and dynamics of group
interaction. The categories were sub-divided on the basis of negative and positive reactions.

Mitzel and Rabinowitz (1953) conducted a study to determine whether Withall's system could be used reliably in actual classroom settings. While their results were not generalizable, Medley and Mitzel (1963) later analyzed these data and concluded that the reliability could be increased significantly by increasing the number of visits to the classrooms, the number of observers and the size of the sample.

Cogan (1956) developed an instrument containing three scales: 1) a scale assessing students' perceptions of teachers, 2) a scale assessing how often students completed required school work, and 3) a scale assessing how often students completed non-required school work. Cogan used these scales to examine the relationship between teacher behavior and pupil productivity. He found that students turned in more required and non-required work when they perceived the teacher as integrative.

The above studies indicate that several systems of observation and classification exist. Most of them have contributed to the development of perhaps now the most famous technique for measuring classroom climate developed by Flanders (1963). Flanders incorporated the "integrative-dominative" and "learner-centered" to teacher-centered categories developed by Anderson, Bales, Withall and others. According to Retson (1969), Flanders has made greater
contributions to the investigation of classroom climate than any other researcher.

The observational-feedback technique system of Flanders is called "interaction analysis." In this system teaching behaviors which tend to free the student to think for himself are called indirect and those teaching behaviors which tend to restrict the student's behavior are called direct. Flanders' system is a method of organizing information about teacher-student interactions by classifying all classroom verbal communication into ten categories at an average rate of one classification every three seconds. Seven categories record teacher comments, two categories record students and one category denotes silence or confusion.

Other researchers since Flanders have amended the Flanders' system in hopes of capturing more concisely classroom climate. Amidon, a student of Flanders, expanded Flanders' ten item instrument to sixteen items to accommodate more differentiation in teacher and pupil talk. Flanders' system with one category, "asks questions," does not provide a method for differentiating the type of teacher question. Amidon's Verbal Interaction Category System (VICS), on the other hand, allows for the division of teacher questions into "narrow," and "broad." The VICS system also adds the dimension of predictable or unpredictable response, and two separate categories to indicate silence or confusion, where Flanders' system has only one. While there are differences
in Flanders' scale, and Amidon's scale, both are accepted widely as scales by which to measure classroom verbal interaction.

Use of Interaction Analysis as an Attitude Measure

Several studies designed to change behavior attitudes have used interaction analysis as a means of measuring the affective change that takes place in the individual(s) or the climate of that interactive social-space. Flanders (1963) supporting the use of interaction analysis as a means of tapping teacher behavior stated, "that the behavior of the teacher is an adequate sample of his total behavior, that is, his verbal statements are consistent with his non-verbal gestures, in fact, his total behavior. This assumption seems reasonable in terms of our experience (p. 21)."

Hoover (1970) who attempted to look at changes in verbal interaction in those classrooms where teachers had undergone human relations training specifically designed to have them view "Blacks in a more favorable light," summarized that as teachers became more accepting of Black students the interaction pattern changed to reflect that change. Specifically, the researcher reported that teachers became more accepting of students, student talk increased and teachers became less rejecting in their verbal response to students.

Williams (1970) used Flanders' Interaction Analysis system as one of his measures to measure teachers' attitude.
change toward all Black and all white classrooms. Using a paper and pencil questionnaire before and after human relations training, fifteen teachers were questioned as to their attitude on teaching their all white classes and their all Black classes. The teacher classroom interaction was then recorded in both types of classrooms.

Williams found that the teachers who were not happy in all Black classrooms were:

1. Less accepting of Black students than of white students.
2. More rejecting of Black students than of white students.
3. More directive and "terse" in their approach with Black students than with white students.

At the end of the three-month training sessions, Williams found that while teachers had not become totally accepting of teaching in all Black classrooms, they had significantly changed their attitudes as recorded on the paper-pencil scale. In post-test verbal interaction analysis Williams concluded, "Teachers have become more accepting, and less directive in their teaching behavior, while not at the same level as they were in their white classes, their behavior toward Black students did change significantly (p. 81)."

In summary, the development of interaction analysis grew out of the need to view objectively teacher behavior and classroom climate. Through the years the sophistication of interaction analysis has increased, thus allowing its widespread use in recording and measuring the verbal dynamics.
Student Perceptions of Teachers

Historically, educators began writing about student reactions to teachers in the late 1920's and early 1930's. Stalkner and Remmers (1928) pioneered with an article, "Can Students Discriminate Traits Associated With Success In Teaching." Remmers (1929, 1930, 1931, 1934) contributed significantly with his research and writings on student ratings of instructors. His basic findings were further supported and amended by Boardman (1930), Bowman (1934), Starrack and others.

The primary concern of these and other educators was the reliability of student appraisals in revealing teacher behavior and effects on students. Remmers (1930) found that ratings by 10 to 20 students on a single trait for college instructors "... yielded reliabilities which compared favorably with reliabilities reported for standardized mental and educational tests (p. 62)." Bryan (1937) related that "... the average ratings by both junior and senior high schools will produce reliability coefficients of .90 and above. Bryan also contended that the reliability of these findings seems to exist in proportion to the degree of personal contact the administrator and/or teacher has with students.

Research on reliability of students ratings continued.
with the works of Hickmott (1947), Elliott (1949) and Amatora (1954). Hickmott reported reliability coefficients from .91 to .99 for ratings by pupils in grades 4, 5 and 6. After investigating pupil reactions to teachers in the later elementary grades, Amatora reported "... the reliabilities, computed by the split-half method, for the seven area scales ranged from .86 to .96 (p. 149)." Bryan (1963) in a study covering a period of two years, measured the change in response of students to their teachers using a 10-scaled instrument. The reliability coefficient for each scale ranged from .80 to .90.

Ryan (1966) while pursuing the question of student feedback, revealed the importance of establishing a reliable instrument for obtaining student opinion. The instrument developed by Ryan failed to discriminate between various criterion measures of teacher effectiveness, thus invalidating the data collected.

The "halo effect" has been a major concern in the use of student opinion as an evaluative tool. Opponents of this form of evaluation suggest that raters tend to rate the same individual similarly on all traits. A substantial amount of evidence disputes this hypothesis. Stalkner and Rammers (1928) computed a mean inter-correlation factor of .45 on their various criterion measures of effectiveness. They stated:
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... this indicates a gratifying absence of the halo effect. One would expect some positive correlation among these traits if there were no halo effect whatsoever. The amount is at present indeterminate (p. 608).

Starrack (1934) in his study on student ratings of instructors, obtained a .47 mean inter-correlation coefficient score. Bryan (1937) found that "both junior and high school pupils are able to point out specific weak and strong points in a teacher's personality and methods to a degree that makes it worthwhile to obtain ratings on a series . . . (p. 416)."

The "halo effect" was clearly a problem in the investigation of Ryan (1966). In his study students tended to respond by totally accepting or rejecting their teacher's behavior. Students were also inclined to be so complimentary of their teachers that it was difficult to see where improvement was needed. In resolution to this problem, Ryan admitted that the halo effect resulted from an inadequate and unreliable instrument to measure student opinions rather than from any natural phenomena. Ryan contended that a reliable instrument that rates teachers' skills on a scale will restrict the influence of any "halo effect."

Over the years several types of student opinion instruments have been developed. "The most careful development of a reliable procedure for soliciting student opinion has been done by Bryan over a period of thirty years" (Lauroesch, Pereira and Ryan, 1969, p. 12). Bryan's questionnaire instrument has been checked frequently for reliability on
each scale. The reliability coefficients range from .80 to .90. The inter-correlation coefficients between scales are considerably lower, indicating reasonable independence from any halo effect.

Bryan's Student Opinion Questionnaire has been twice factor analyzed. Lauroesch, Pereira and Ryan (1969) analyzed the twelve criterion measures of teacher effectiveness and found "... all the items on the questionnaire were measuring roughly the same thing when averaged over a class." The second factor analysis included 1,427 classes and 42,810 student responses in the sample. Coats found that a single factor accounted for 61.5% of the variance in test items. This factor was labeled "Teacher Charisma." The remaining 38.5% of the variance was shared evenly among the five other factors. Coats concluded:

The results of this study should help educators to recognize the limitations, strengths and meaning of student reactions to teachers. Students do not respond directly to specific questions regarding teacher effectiveness. Rather, a kind of halo effect based on teacher charisma determines to a large extent how students react to questions about their teachers. This is not to say that student ratings of teachers are not important or meaningful. Teacher charisma is probably a function of teacher effectiveness. Furthermore ... at least 40% of the variance in student ratings of teachers is independent of the charismatic factor and probably represents fairly objective student judgments (p. 11).

The influence of class size, student age and achievement marks on student perceptions of teachers have been examined. Bryan (1965) reviewed research on these three variables.
and concluded, "... the relationship between class size and student ratings appears to be negligible (p. 407)."

Studies on student opinion feedback to teachers have revealed interesting findings that serve to emphasize and illustrate the need for further study. Truckman and Oliver (1968) found that all groups rated teachers more harshly toward the end of the year than in the middle. Their explanation was "at the time when the teacher is about to evaluate and grade the student, the student perhaps replies in kind (p. 300)."

In conclusion, a reliable and useful instrument exists for measuring student's opinions of their teacher. Researchers have shown that while the instrument is heavily factored on one factor and lightly dispersed among other factorial lines, it is nevertheless an adequate instrument by which to measure student opinion of teacher behavior.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

This chapter contains a description of the school area and the population under investigation, questions to be answered by the study, instrumentation, methodology used in data gathering and treatment of data.

Review of the Problem

The primary purpose of the study was to determine if teachers who participated in the Jack and Jill Experimental Reading Program would alter their attitudes toward Black dialect and increase their linguistic knowledge about language. In addition, changes in the classroom verbal interaction of those classrooms taught by teachers enrolled in the program as well as changes in their students' perceptions of the teachers were to be investigated as to ascertain if changes in teacher attitude would be reflected in classroom verbal behavior and student perception.

Description of the School Area

The school selected for study was Dort Community School which is an elementary school located in Flint, Michigan. Flint, an industrial city, is the second largest metropolitan area in the state of Michigan and has a population of approximately 200,000 inhabitants. This population is a
shifting one. Currently 30% of the population is Black and 55% of the population is White, with Spanish surname and other groups comprising the remaining 15% of the population. There is to date limited busing of students in the Flint School System although there are several all-Black and all-White schools.

Dort Community School is nestled into the heart of the lower Black socio-economic residential area in Flint and is in many ways typical of many older urban schools located in midwestern America. Dort Community School was opened in 1911 as a high school and for about the past 60 years has undergone a physical decaying process which has left its physical plant constantly in need of repair.

The total Dort School population consists of: 1) 803 students enrolled in kindergarten through sixth grade, 99% of whom are Black; 2) 34 teachers, 70% of whom are Black and, 3) 44 paraprofessionals drawn from the local community, all of whom are Black.

Student performance at Dort Community School is in many ways typical of that in other inner city schools. Test performance is low compared to national norms on standardized tests given to sixth graders during the 1970-71 school year. The average reading scores during 1971 were a year and one half behind the national averages. Also, in the area of mathematics, students at Dort Community School appear to parallel the urban curve typified by large urban school
settings. Students at Dort Community School, by the end of sixth grade, are almost a full two years behind the national norm. While there have been several programs over the past ten years established to raise the academic achievement level of Dort Community School students, most of them have produced little, if any, alteration to the constant pattern of academic achievement.

Table 3-1
Dort Public School Enrollment 1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraprofessionals</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>859</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-2
Reading Performance on Standardized Tests Given at 6th Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>National Norm</th>
<th>Dort School</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The population for this study included twelve of the fourteen teachers teaching the fourth, fifth and sixth grades at Dort Community School and all the students enrolled in the
twelve classrooms being taught by the teachers included in the study. The two teachers who were not included in the study were not included due to personal scheduling conflict. Their students were also dropped from the student population. Table 3-3 indicates the composition of the population by grade.

Table 3-3
Classroom Composition by Grade 1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Class Size (estimate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>319</strong></td>
<td><strong>81</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions to be Answered

1. Would teachers involved in the Jack and Jill Experiment Reading Program alter their attitudes toward Black dialect after in-service training?

1a Content Category I: Would teacher attitudes become more positive towards the structure and inherent usefulness of Black dialect?

1b Content Category II: Would teacher attitudes become more positive regarding the consequences of using and accepting Black dialect in the educational setting?

1c Content Category III: Would teacher attitudes become more positive regarding their philosophies concerning the use and acceptance of Black dialect in educational and other social settings?
1d Content Category IV: Would teacher attitudes become more positive regarding the cognitive and intellectual abilities of speakers of Black dialect?

2. Would teachers involved in the Jack and Jill Experimental Reading Program increase their linguistic knowledge after in-service training?

3. Would there be a change in the verbal interaction pattern in the classrooms of teachers enrolled in the Jack and Jill Experimental Reading Program after in-service training?
   3a Would there be a change in percentage of teacher-presented information?
   3b Would there be a change in the percentage of teacher directions?
   3c Would there be a change in the percentage of narrow questions asked by the teacher?
   3d Would there be a change in the percentage of broad questions asked by the teacher?
   3e Would there be a change in the percentage of teacher acceptance of student ideas, behavior and feelings?
   3f Would there be a change in the percentage of teacher rejection of student ideas, behavior and feelings?
   3g Would there be a change in the percentage of student response to teacher?
   3h Would there be a change in the percentage of pupil response to another pupil?
   3i Would there be a change in the percentage of pupil-initiated talk to the teacher?
   3j Would there be a change in the percentage of pupil-initiated talk to another student?

4. Would the students of teachers involved in the Jack and Jill Experimental Reading Project perceive their teachers more positively after in-service training?
   4a Would students perceive their teachers as being more knowledgeable of the subject matter?
   4b Would students perceive their teachers as being clearer in their presentation?
Would students perceive their teachers as being fairer?

Would students perceive their teachers as having more control over the class?

Would students perceive their teachers as having more positive attitudes toward the students?

Would students perceive their teachers as being more successful in stimulating interest?

Would students perceive their teachers as having more enthusiasm?

Would students perceive their teachers as having a more positive attitude towards student ideas?

Would students perceive their teachers as being more encouraging of student participation?

Would students perceive their teachers as having a greater sense of humor?

Would students perceive their teachers as giving reasonable assignments?

Would students perceive their teachers as being better groomed?

Would students perceive their teachers as being more open?

Would students perceive their teachers as having more self-control?

Would students perceive their teachers as being more considerate of others?

Would students perceive their teachers as being more effective?

Instrumentation

Four instruments were required in the study to examine the questions previously posited; they were as follows:

(Copies of the LAS, CEMREL and TIQ appear in Appendix 1-3)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Language Attitude Scale (LAS) developed by Dr. Orlando Taylor at The Center for Applied Linguistics (1971).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Change in attitude toward Black dialect.</td>
<td>1. Central Midwestern Regional Educational Laboratory, Inc. (CEMREL) Linguistic test developed by the staff of CEMREL, 1970.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Increase in linguistic knowledge.</td>
<td>2. Verbal Interaction Category System (VICS) developed by Elizabeth Hunter and Edmund Amidon (1967).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Change in classroom verbal interaction patterns.</td>
<td>3. Teacher Image Questionnaire developed at Western Michigan University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Change in student's perceptions of teachers.</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Language Attitude Scale (LAS)**

The Language Attitude Scale, developed by Dr. Orlando Taylor at the Center for Applied Linguistics in Washington, D.C., 1970, is one of the few instruments specifically designed to solicit data on how teachers feel concerning Black dialect, its use in and out of the classroom and its social implications. The scale consists of 117 statements to which a respondent is requested to indicate strong agreement. The 117 items, according to Taylor, were written in such a way that attitude on four topics relating to Black dialect could be assessed. The four topics are:

1. The structure and inherent usefulness of Black dialect.
2. The consequences of using and accepting Black dialect.

3. Philosophies concerning use and acceptance of Black dialect.


Approximately one-half of the 117 statements on the LAS are positive to the concepts of Black dialect and one-half are negative to the concepts. In addition to the 117 items, an Interaction Sheet and a Biographical Information Sheet are included. Also a tape recorded sample of Black dialect was developed by Taylor to be used to acoustically acquaint or reacquaint the individual with the acoustics of Black dialect.

The LAS, like many other attitudinal measures, employs the Lickert Scale. On a Lickert format the respondent is asked to respond on a five point scale closely related to that employed by the LAS. In the Lickert Scale the respondent is asked to indicate the degree to which he agrees with the opinion statement on a five point scale. For each attitude item, five response categories are provided: strongly approve, approve, undecided, disapprove and strongly disapprove. In this study, the attitudinal measure for an individual was found by the method suggested by Kresley et al., (1969):

On an a priori basis, the investigator determines whether a disapproval or an approval response indicates a large amount of the attitude in question. One end of the scale is assigned an arbitrary value. (e.g., the numeral one) The next category is two, the next is three, the next is four and the next
is five. Each individual, then, has a score for every item on the test ranging from one to five. His scale score is then simply the sum of the scores he received on each item. (p. 13)

Central Midwestern Regional Laboratory, Inc., Linguistic Test (CEMREL) (1971)

The CEMREL Linguistic Test is a paper and pencil test devised by a group of linguists and educators at the Central Midwestern Regional Laboratory, Inc., in Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1971, and is designed to measure an individual's level of knowledge and skills in the field of dialect and non-standard composition. While the instrument was originally designed to evaluate the effectiveness of a workshop held at CEMREL focusing on "Teaching Writing to Speakers of Non-Standard Dialects," the test has been used widely in evaluating pre-experimental and post-experimental increase in linguistic knowledge.

The CEMREL Linguistic Test is divided into four sections:

Section 1 - The Nature of Non-Standard Dialect

This section is a nine question true and false section which raises questions about generalizations made concerning non-standard dialects. The individual's score is obtained by adding the number of correct responses to the true and false items.

Section 2 - Analyzing Writing

This section is composed of a seventeen-lined paragraph. The respondent is to analyze the paragraph and pick out the sentences, phrases, etc. which can be
denoted as non-standard. There is a total of twenty-one non-standard features. The individual's score is obtained by adding the correct responses.

**Section 3 - Analyzing Speech**

In this section the respondent is to write down all the non-standard features heard on a test tape (supplied by CEMREL). There are twenty-five non-standard features on the tape. The individual's score is obtained by adding the correct responses.

**Section 4 - Diagnosis and Prescription**

This portion of the test is composed of an analysis sheet on which the respondent is to indicate the features, mechanical problems and problems with communicative qualities of writing on the sample page used in Section 2. Also, the respondent is to indicate the first objective he would choose from in each of the categories for this student. The possible score for this section is twenty. The individual's score is arrived at by adding the correct responses.

**Verbal Interaction Category System (VICS)**

The Verbal Interaction Category System used to measure changes in classroom verbal interaction in this study was developed by Edmund Amidon and Elizabeth Hunter (1966). VICS is based on Flanders (1965) ten category system. While VICS includes the basic components of teacher talk and student talk, VICS attempts to look at sub-categories within those broader topics devised by Flanders. It was important to this study that the instrument measuring verbal interaction differentiate between areas such as teacher, broad and narrow questions, types of student responses and teacher
responses to student ideas, feelings and behavior in order that participants as well as the program implementor could discuss more descriptively the types of verbal interaction that occurred. VICs incorporates five major categories for analyzing classroom verbal behavior; they are: 1) Teacher-initiated talk; 2) Teacher response; 3) Pupil response; 4) Pupil-initiated talk, and 5) other.

VICs differs from other systems, i.e., Flanders, in that 1) it offers a method of differentiating types of teacher questions—broad and narrow, and 2) it allows for a method of differentiating in types of pupil response—predictable and unpredictable. VICs also encourages the recorder to use the confusion category simultaneously with other categories when the interaction in the classroom can still be followed but only when some disruption of order is occurring.

The system requires that a person planning to use it to study verbal classroom behavior begin by memorizing categories. In recording verbal interaction, the data collector makes a numerical tally representing the verbal behavior every three seconds or every time the behavior changes. These tallies are written on a tally sheet in a column at the rate of approximately twenty tallies per minute (see Appendix 4). The individual raw score in each category for the purpose of this study was proportioned and then translated into percentages. The mean percentage was then computed for each category. Table 3-4 illustrates the categories that make up VICs.
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| Teacher-initiated talk                      | 1. Presents information or opinion |
|                                      | 2. Gives directions                |
|                                      | 3. Asks narrow questions           |
|                                      | 4. Asks broad questions            |
| Teacher response                      | 5. Accepts (a) ideas (b) behavior (c) feeling |
|                                      | 6. Rejects (a) ideas (b) behavior (c) feeling |
| Pupil response                        | 7. Responds to teacher (a) predictably (b) unpredictably |
|                                      | 8. Responds to another pupil       |
| Pupil-initiated talk                  | 9. Initiates talk to teacher       |
|                                      | 10. Initiates talk to another pupil |
|                                      | 11. Silence                        |
| Other                                 | Z Confusion (Z may be used alone when confusion drowns out verbal behavior, or may be used alongside another category to indicate interfering disruption while someone is talking): |
|                                      | 1 Z                               |
|                                      | 1 Z                               |
|                                      | 3 Z                               |
|                                      | 7a Z                              |
The Teacher Image Questionnaire (TIQ)

The Teacher Image Questionnaire was used to garner student reactions to the teacher before and after in-service. The instrument is a sixteen-item questionnaire which asks the respondent to rate his teacher on a five point scale of Excellent, Good, Average, Fair and Poor. The responses are weighted in the following manner:

- Excellent: 5
- Good: 4
- Average: 3
- Fair: 2
- Poor: 1

A score is arrived at by totaling the student response for a given question and then dividing the responses by the number of students in order to achieve a mean score. This process is repeated for each question.

The TIQ, which was devised at Western Michigan University's Educator Feedback Center, has been widely used as an instrument to measure student responses toward their teachers. In this study, the TIQ was used to measure student reaction to the following areas relative to their teachers:

1. Knowledge
2. Clarity of Presentation
3. Fairness
4. Control
5. Attitude Toward Students
6. Success in Stimulating Interest
7. Enthusiasm
8. Attitude Toward Student Ideas
9. Encouragement of Student Participation
10. Sense of Humor
11. Assignments
12. Appearance
13. Openness
14. Self-Control
15. Consideration of Others
16. Effectiveness

Pre-Test Data Gathering

During the first week in September, 1973, the principal of Dort School, members of the Flint Board of Education, representatives of the Mott Foundation and this researcher met at Dort Community School for the purpose of reviewing the format of the Jack and Jill Experimental Reading Program. At this meeting several things were discussed and decided upon:

1. Twelve teachers of the fourteen teachers comprising the fourth through sixth grade teacher population would be formally enrolled in the program.

2. The program would formally begin on September 20, 1972 and terminate May 1, 1973.

3. A series of tests including the Language Attitude Scale, CEMREL Linguistic Test, Verbal Interaction Category System, and Teacher Image Questionnaire, would be used to evaluate the program.
4. Full support of each of the parties involved was given.

On September 13, prior to the initial testing, and commencement of the formal class, this researcher met with the teachers involved and briefly explained the tests which were to be administered to their students and their classrooms and to them so they would feel more comfortable and at ease with the testing situation. At this meeting teachers were told very little concerning the course content, our major objectives, or of the types of things expected of them during the year. It was felt by this researcher that an explanation of our intent or of our procedures would perhaps lead to a conditioned response from teachers on the Language Attitude Scale. That is, knowing that we were seeking to change attitudes from negative to positive, teachers would be tempted to answer questions as they perceived the researchers wanted them answered.

On September 20, 1972, pre-testing of the twelve subjects using the LAS and the CEMREL Linguistic Test was conducted. At this testing session the researcher requested from the teachers a schedule of possible times which the TIQ could be administered to the students; also teachers were asked to indicate times in the classroom when the greatest verbal interaction occurred in their classroom. From this information this researcher was able to set up a schedule for additional testing. On September 26 and 27, this researcher administered the TIQ to the students in each of the
participating teacher's classrooms.

It was felt that a true indication of the verbal climate of the classroom could not be obtained during the first three weeks of school because of the abnormal circumstances associated with the start of the school year. Thus, interaction analysis was not conducted until the first week in October, when it was felt that the normal teaching routine was well established. Two data gatherers, prior to the testing, underwent two weeks of training in verbal interaction analysis using the scale devised by Amidon and Hunter (1967). Training was accomplished through use of tape recordings of various teachers in classroom situations. The reliability of the two observers is supported by data in Appendix 5.

From October 2 through October 6, systematic observations were made in the classrooms of the twelve teachers involved in the program, classifying the verbal interaction behavior into one of the sixteen categories at an average rate of one classification every three seconds. Each observer viewed four classrooms, spending a minimum of four hours in each classroom.

Program Construction

The program was roughly divided into two parts: 1) teacher seminars held every Wednesday from 4 p.m. until 6:30 p.m. for which teachers received three hours graduate credit from the University of Michigan, and 2) interaction and
consultation with an urban specialist and linguist, whose job it was to translate formal linguistic material covered in class into meaningful classroom methods. The following is a list of the topic areas covered in the seminar:

1. Morphology
2. Syntax
3. Transformational and Mathematical Models of Language
4. Theoretical Problems in Socio-Linguistics
5. Linguistic Implications for Reading Theory
6. Linguistic Implications for Testing Procedures
7. Models, Strategies, and Designs for Urban Education

The urban specialist and linguist, in attempting to translate seminar material into teaching procedures, were at Dort Community School on Monday and Wednesday mornings from 9:30 to 12:00 noon for the purpose of meeting with teachers and showing them how the translation could be made.

Post-Test Data Gathering

The same tests used to gather pre-test data were employed to gather post-test data, namely LAS, CEMREL Linguistic Test, VICS and TIQ. During the week of April 16-20, 1973, post-data were gathered by the researcher using the LAS, CEMREL Linguistic Test and TIQ. Prior to data gathering on the VICS instrument, the same observers who were involved in pre-data collection underwent a second training in Interaction Analysis in order to insure consistency in pre- and post-data
observation. Each observer was required to re-code the same practice tape used in the first training session. Scott's coefficient was again used to test the reliability of the observers (See Appendix 6). Each observer observed the same classrooms observed in the pre-data collection. The average time spent in classroom observations was five hours.

Treatment of Data

Data collected in this study included: 1) responses to the LAS, 2) responses to the VICS, 3) responses to the TIQ, and 4) responses to the CEMREL Linguistic Test. The statistical model used for treatment of data was a $t$-test of student means and a $t$-test of proportions. The .05 level of significance was used.

In order to justify the use of a $t$-test, two assumptions had to be made: 1) the populations are normal, and 2) the population variances are homogeneous. The first assumption, that of normal distribution in the populations, according to Hays (1963) is the least important of the two. "So long as the sample size is even moderate for each group, quite severe departures from normality seem to make little practical difference in the conclusions reached (p. 322)." The second assumption, that of homogeneity of variance is more important. "In older works," Hays commented, "it was often suggested that separate tests for homogeneity of variance could be carried out before the $t$-test itself, in order to
see if the assumption was reasonable at all (p. 322)." The trouble with this process was in most circumstances where the test for homogeneity of variance was necessary (small samples) they were poorest. In concluding, Hays stated, "further more, for samples of equal size relatively big differences in the population variances seem to have relatively small consequences for the conclusions derived from a \( t \)-test (p. 322)."

I. **Analysis of LAS**

Data obtained from the Language Attitude Scale (LAS) were also separated into two groups: Pre- and Post-test. A mean score was computed for each of the four sections of the test by taking the mean score for each of the twelve teachers, adding them and then dividing them by twelve. It was this researcher's opinion, based on the literature cited earlier, that there would be more positive attitudes displayed by teachers after in-service training. For that reason, a one-tailed \( t \)-test concentrating on mean score increase was performed in order to ascertain whether the difference between pre- and post-mean scores was large enough to reject the null hypothesis of no difference between population means with eleven degrees of freedom at the .05 level of significance.

II. **Analysis of CEMREL Linguistic Test**

Utilizing the data obtained from the Central Midwestern
Regional Educational Laboratory (CEMREL) Linguistic Test, the scores for each section were analyzed as pre- and post-test scores. Mean scores were obtained from each section by adding teacher's raw score then dividing by the number of teachers. Again it was the opinion of this researcher, primarily based on the studies of Hughes (1969) and Labov (1970), that there would be an increase in linguistic knowledge after in-service training. A one-tailed t-test was performed on pre- and post-mean scores to ascertain if the mean increase was sufficient to cause rejection of the null hypothesis of no difference between population means at the .05 level of significance with eleven degrees of freedom.

III. Analysis of VICS

Utilizing the data obtained from the Verbal Interaction Category System (VICS), the mean scores in individual categories were analyzed as pre- and post-test scores. Mean scores were obtained for each category; raw scores were translated into percentages which were then added and the total divided by the number of teachers. It was realized at the onset of this study that there would be mean increases and decreases relative to the various categories inherent in the Verbal Interaction Category System; for that reason a two-tailed t-test was employed in order to ascertain whether the mean difference was between pre- and...
post-mean scores was large enough to cause rejection of the null hypothesis with eleven degrees of freedom, at the .05 level of significance.

IV. Analysis of TIQ

Data obtained from the Teacher Image Questionnaire (TIQ) were divided into two groups: pre- and post-test. Mean scores were obtained on each category by adding each teacher's mean score, then dividing by the number of teachers. It was the opinion of this researcher that students would perceive teachers more positively after in-service training. For that reason a one-tailed t-test was performed in order to ascertain whether the mean difference between pre- and post-mean scores were large enough to cause rejection of the null hypothesis with eleven degrees of freedom at the .05 level of significance.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter includes the presentation and analysis of data collected relevant to the questions inherent in the study. The organization of information within this chapter will follow the sequence of the four major questions and their constituent questions presented in the previous chapter.

Teacher Attitude Toward Black Dialect

Would teachers involved in the Jack and Jill Experimental Reading Program alter their attitudes toward Black dialect? In an attempt to examine this question, four sub-questions were established related to the four content categories inherent in the Language Attitude Scale.

Question 4-1a: Structure and Usefulness of Black Dialect

Would teacher attitudes become more positive toward the structure and inherent usefulness of Black dialect? Table 4-1a represents the data gathered from the 19 questions posed by the LAS in order to elicit information concerning the structure and usefulness of Black dialect. Using a one-tailed t-test for independent samples in order to ascertain if the difference between pre- and post-test means was large enough to reject the null hypothesis of no
The data analysis revealed a mean increase of .42 at the time of post-testing, indicating that teachers became more accepting of the structure and usefulness of Black dialect after in-service training. With eleven degrees of freedom at the .05 level of significance, the t value obtained from the data was sufficient to exceed the 1.80 or greater necessary for rejection of the null hypothesis of no difference between population means. The null hypothesis was rejected.

**Question 4-1b: Educational Usefulness of Black Dialect**

Would teacher attitudes become more positive regarding the consequences of using and accepting Black dialect in the educational setting?

**Table 4-1b**

Educational Usefulness and Acceptance of Black Dialect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4-1b represents the data gathered from 35 questions posed by the LAS in order to gain information concerning the educational usefulness of Black dialect. A one-tailed $t$-test was again employed in order to find out if the difference between pre- and post-test mean scores was large enough to reject the null hypothesis of no difference between population means with eleven degrees of freedom at the .05 level of significance. The mean increase of .48 was large enough to elicit a $t$ value which exceeded the 1.80 or greater necessary for rejection of the null hypothesis. The null hypothesis was rejected.

Question 4-1c: Philosophies Concerning Use of Black Dialect

Would teachers become more positive regarding their philosophies concerning the use and acceptance of Black dialect in educational settings?

Table 4-1c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Philosophies Concerning Use of Black Dialect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Represented in Table 4-1c are data gathered from the 36 questions asked by the LAS designed to garner information
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concerning philosophies concerning the use of Black dialect. Employing the same procedures found in questions 4-la and 4-lb, data revealed a mean increase of .57 between pre- and post-test means. While the difference was larger than the differences in questions 4-la and 4-lb the $t$ value was smaller than those obtained in the two previous questions due to the large variance found in this question. With eleven degrees of freedom at the .05 level of significance, the $t$ value obtained was large enough to exceed the 1.80 or greater necessary for rejection of the null hypothesis of no differences between population means. The null hypothesis was rejected.

Question 4-lh: Cognitive and Intellectual Abilities of Black Dialect Speakers

Would teacher attitudes become more positive concerning the cognitive and intellectual abilities of speakers of Black dialect?

Table 4-lh

Cognitive and Intellectual Abilities of Black Dialect Speakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data in Table 4.1d indicate that teachers displayed a more positive attitude concerning the cognitive and intellectual abilities of speakers of Black dialect after in-service training than before in-service training. The mean increase, with reference to the 27 questions posed by the LAS to look at this category, was .63. The $t$ value obtained by employing a one-tailed $t$ test was large enough to exceed the 1.80 or greater necessary to reject the null hypothesis of no difference between population means at the .05 level of significance with eleven degrees of freedom. The null hypothesis was rejected.

In summary, the data presented on the pre-test relative to Black dialect before in-service training indicated that teachers were in mild disagreement with the use and acceptance of Black dialect. The post-test mean scores indicated that teachers were no longer leaning to rejection of Black dialect, but neither were they leaning toward its acceptance; they were categorically "neutral."

**Linguistic Knowledge**

Would teachers involved in the Jack and Jill Experimental Reading Program increase their linguistic knowledge?

To examine this question the four content categories inherent in the CEMREL Linguistic Test were looked at as separate entities.
Question 4-2a: The Nature of Nonstandard Dialect

A one-tailed $t$-test was performed on the nine-item true and false portion of the CEMREL Linguistic Test. Table 4-2a shows the results of the data analysis. The mean increase of 4.45 between pre- and post-test mean scores was large enough to reject the null hypothesis of no difference between population means at the .05 level of significance with eleven degrees of freedom. The null hypothesis was rejected.

Table 4-2a
The Nature of Nonstandard Dialect

| Pre-Test | | Post-Test | | df | | t | | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mean | SD | Mean | SD | 11 | 28.40 | .05 |
| 3.75 | 1.10 | 8.20 | .72 | |

Question 4-2b: Analyzing Writing

Table 4-2b shows the analysis of data with reference to the writing analysis portion of the CEMREL Linguistic Test.

Table 4-2b
Analyzing Writing

| Pre-Test | | Post-Test | | df | | t | | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mean | SD | Mean | SD | 11 | 15.33 | .05 |
| 14.6 | 1.49 | 20.00 | 1.29 | | | |
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Employing the same procedures used in the previous question, the one-tailed $t$-test revealed a mean increase of 6.4 which proved to be large enough to elicit a $t$ value which exceeded the 1.80 or greater necessary for rejection of the null hypothesis of no difference between population means at the .05 level of significance with eleven degrees of freedom. The null hypothesis was rejected.

**Question 4-2c: Analyzing Speech**

The data concerning the analysis of the speech portion of the CEMREL Linguistic Test is shown in Table 4-2c.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th></th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>16.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the same procedures found in the earlier question, the mean increase of 4.92 was found to be great enough to elicit a $t$ value which exceeded the 1.80 or greater necessary for rejection of the null hypothesis of no difference between population means at the .05 level of significance with eleven degrees of freedom. The null hypothesis was rejected.
**Question 4-2d: Diagnosis and Prescription**

Table 4-2d indicates that the teacher mean score on the post-test was greater than the mean score found on the pre-test relative to the diagnosis and prescription portion of the CEMREL Linguistic Test.

**Table 4-2d**

Diagnosis and Prescription

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>14.83</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data were again analyzed using a one-tailed $t$-test to discover if the difference was large enough to reject the null hypothesis of no difference between population means at the .05 level of significance with eleven degrees of freedom. The $t$ score obtained from the data was large enough to exceed the 1.80 or greater necessary for rejection on the null hypothesis. The null hypothesis was rejected.

In summary, data recorded on the CEMREL Linguistic Test indicated that teachers increased their linguistic knowledge in each of the four areas covered by the instrument.
Verbal Interaction

Would there be a change in the verbal interaction pattern in the classrooms of those teachers involved in the Jack and Jill Experimental Reading Program?

There were essentially ten categories examined in this question, each of which dealt with specific categories or group of categories inherent in VICS.

Question 4-3a: Teacher Information

Would there be a change in the percentage of teacher presented information?

An analysis of data was performed on this category employing a two-tailed $t$-test for dependent samples. Table 4-3a shows that there was an increase in the percentage of teacher presented information. The increase, however, was not sufficient to warrant rejection of the null hypothesis of no difference between population means. With eleven degrees of freedom at the .05 level of significance the null hypothesis was accepted.

Table 4-3a
Teacher Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.67</td>
<td>12.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.63</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 4-3b: Teacher Direction

Would there be a change in the percentage of teacher direction?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-3b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>15.43</td>
<td>18.60</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td>9.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employing the identical procedure described for data analysis in Question 4-3a, data in Table 4-3b show that the mean increase of 3.27 elicited a $t$ value of .02, which was substantially less than the 2.20 or greater necessary for rejection of the null hypothesis of no difference between population means. With eleven degrees of freedom at the .05 level of significance, the null hypothesis was accepted.

Question 4-3c: Narrow Questions

Would there be a change in the percentage of narrow questions asked by the teacher?

Table 4-3c indicates a decrease in the percentage of narrow questions asked by teachers. The mean decrease of 2.78 elicited a $t$ value which did not exceed the 2.20 necessary for rejection of the null hypothesis of no difference between population means with eleven degrees of freedom at the .05
level of significance. The null hypothesis was accepted.

Table 4-3c
Narrow Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.90</td>
<td>15.12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 4-3d: Broad Questions

Would there be a change in the percentage of narrow questions asked by teachers?

Table 4-3d
Broad Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-3d, reporting data on the percentage of broad questions asked by teachers, shows a mean increase of .30. Using a two-tailed t-test to analyze the data a t value was obtained which did not exceed the 2.20 or greater necessary for rejection of the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance with eleven degrees of freedom. The null hypothesis was accepted.
Question 4-3e: Teacher Acceptance

Would there be a change in the percentage of teacher acceptance of student ideas, behavior and feelings?

Table 4-3e
Teacher Acceptance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>14.90</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 4-3e shows, there was an appreciable increase in the percentage of teacher acceptance of student ideas, behavior and feelings. The two-tailed t-test employed for analysis of data revealed that the difference of 4.3 was not sufficient to cause rejection of the null hypothesis of no difference at the .05 level of significance. The null hypothesis was accepted.

Question 4-3f: Teacher Rejection

Would there be a change in the amount of teacher rejection of student ideas, behavior and feelings?

As reflected in Table 4-3f, teacher rejection showed a decrease after in-service training. Again using a two-tailed t-test in order to ascertain if the difference between pre- and post-mean scores was large enough to cause rejection of
the null hypothesis, the analysis of data revealed that the decrease of 3.06 was statistically significant at the .05 level of significance. With eleven degrees of freedom, a $t$ value of 2.20 was necessary for rejection of the null hypothesis. A $t$ value of -3.23 was obtained. The null hypothesis was rejected.

Table 4-3f
Teacher Rejection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 4-3g: Pupil Response to Teacher

Would there be a change in the percentage of pupil response to the teacher?

Employing a two-tailed $t$ test to test the difference between population means, Table 4-3g indicates that the mean increase after in-service training was not large enough to warrant rejection of the null hypothesis of no difference between population means. At the .05 level of significance with eleven degrees of freedom, the null hypothesis was accepted.
Table 4-3g
Pupil Response to Teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.10</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>16.82</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 4-3h: Pupil Response to Pupil

Would there be a change in the percentage of pupil response to another pupil?

Table 4-3h
Pupil Response to Pupil

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-3h shows that there was very little pupil response to another student on the pre-test and an increase on the post-test in this category. A two-tailed t-test showed that the t value obtained from the data exceeded the 2.20 or greater necessary for rejection of null hypothesis of no difference between population means. At the .05 level of significance, with eleven degrees of freedom the null hypothesis was rejected.
Question 4-3i: Pupil Initiated Talk to Teacher

Would there be a change in the percentage of pupil initiated talk to the teacher?

Table 4-3i
Pupil Initiated Talk to Teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-3i indicates that a $t$ value less than the 2.20 or greater necessary for rejection of the null hypothesis of no difference between population means was obtained from the data. Again using a two-tailed $t$-test, with eleven degrees of freedom at the .05 level of significance, the null hypothesis was accepted.

Question 4-3j: Pupil Initiated Talk to Pupil

Would there be a change in the percentage of pupil initiated talk to another pupil?

Employing the identical procedures used in the above questions, Table 4-3j shows that the data revealed a decrease in the percentage of pupil initiated talk to another student.
Table 4-3j
Pupil Initiated Talk to Pupil

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data showed a $t$ value less than the 2.20 or greater needed to reject the null hypothesis of no difference between population means. The null hypothesis was accepted at the .05 level of significance with eleven degrees of freedom.

In summary, only two of the ten categories showed a mean score difference large enough to reject the null hypothesis of no difference between population means. "Teacher rejection of student ideas, behaviors and feelings" showed a negative $t$ value which was significant at the .05 level of significance, and "student response to another student" elicited a positive $t$ value significant at the .05 level. Several of the eight categories, while they were not significant at the .05 level, had appreciable mean increases, notably "teacher acceptance", which had a positive mean increase and "student initiated talk to another student", which showed a negative $t$ value.

Student Perception of Teachers

Would the students of teachers involved in the Jack and Jill Experimental Reading Program perceive their teachers...
differently after in-service training?

In order to examine this question each of the sixteen categories inherent in the TIQ were looked at separately and pre- and post-test mean scores were looked at relative to each individual question.

Question 4-4a: Knowledge of Subject Area

Would students perceive their teachers as being more knowledgeable of the subject matter?

Table 4-4a
Knowledge of Subject Matter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-4a indicates the analysis of data gathered with reference to this question. A one-tailed $t$-test was employed entertaining the same procedures used in the earlier questions. Testing the null hypothesis of no difference between population means, the data revealed a mean decrease after in-service training which resulted in a negative $t$ value. Because there was a one-tailed positive expectation, the negative $t$ value obtained from the data was deemed non-significant.
Question 4-4b: Clarity of Presentation

Would students perceive their teachers as being more clear in their presentation?

Table 4-4b

Clarity of Presentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Table 4-4b displays the results of the data analysis on this question. Testing the null hypothesis of no difference between population means, a one-tailed t-test revealed a t value which exceeded the 1.80 necessary for rejection of the null hypothesis with eleven degrees of freedom at the .05 level of significance. The null hypothesis was rejected.

Question 4-4c: Fairness

Would students perceive their teachers as being more fair?

Table 4-4c indicates that the one-tailed t-test performed on the data resulted in a t value which exceeded the 1.80 necessary for rejection of the null hypothesis of no difference between population means. The mean increase in this category was statistically significant at the .05 level of significance.
Table 4-4c

Fairness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 4-4d: Control

Would students perceive their teachers as having more control?

Table 4-4d

Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-4d reflects the analysis of data on this question. Again testing the null hypothesis of no difference between population means, a one-tailed t-test was performed on the data. The analysis revealed that while there was a mean increase it was not sufficient enough to elicit a t value which exceeded the 1.80 or greater necessary for rejection of the null hypothesis with eleven degrees of freedom at the .05 level of significance. The null hypothesis was accepted.
Question 4-4e: Attitude Toward Students

Would students perceive their teachers as having a more positive attitude toward students?

Table 4-4e
Attitudes Toward Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students, according to the data shown in Table 4-4e, did perceive teachers as having a more positive attitude toward them after in-service training. A one-tailed t-test was used to ascertain if the mean score difference was large enough to reject the null hypothesis. The analysis of data revealed a t value which exceeded the 1.80 or greater necessary for rejection of the null hypothesis of no difference between population means. At the .05 level of significance with eleven degrees of freedom the null hypothesis was rejected.

Question 4-4f: Success in Stimulating Interest

Would students perceive teachers as stimulating more interest?

Data related to this question are shown in Table 4-4f.
### Table 4-4f

**Success in Stimulating Interest**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The identical procedures used in the above questions were employed to ascertain if the difference between pre- and post-test means were large enough to reject the null hypothesis. The analysis of data showed that the increase in mean score elicited a *t* value which exceeded the 1.80 or greater necessary for rejection of the null hypothesis of no difference between population means. At the .05 level of significance with eleven degrees of freedom the null hypothesis was rejected.

**Question 4-4g: Enthusiasm**

Would students perceive their teachers as having more enthusiasm?

As Table 4-4g illustrates, students perceived their teachers as being more enthusiastic after in-service training. A one-tailed *t*-test used to test the null hypothesis of no difference between population means revealed that the *t* value obtained from data exceeded the 1.80 or greater necessary for rejection of the null hypothesis. At the .05 level of
significance with eleven degrees of freedom the null hypothesis was rejected.

Table 4-4g
Enthusiasm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 4-4h: Attitude Toward Student Ideas

Would students perceive their teachers as being more positive in their attitude toward students?

Table 4-4h indicates that there was a mean increase on this question which was large enough to exceed the 1.80 or larger t value necessary for rejection of the null hypothesis of no difference between population means.

Table 4-4h
Attitude Toward Student Ideas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21.32</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Table 4-4h shows the null hypothesis was rejected at the .05 level of significance with eleven degrees of freedom.

Question 4-4i: Encouragement of Student Participation

Would students perceive teachers as being more encouraging of student participation?

Table 4-4i

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21.88</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-4i shows the results of the data analysis on this question. The one-tailed t test used to ascertain if the mean increase on this question was large enough to reject the null hypothesis of no difference between population means revealed a t value which exceeded the 1.80 or greater necessary for rejection. With eleven degrees of freedom at the .05 level of significance the null hypothesis was rejected.

Question 4-4j: Sense of Humor

Would students perceive their teachers as having a greater sense of humor?
Table 4-4j
Sense of Humor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-4j indicates that students perceived teachers as displaying a greater sense of humor after in-service training than they displayed before in-service training. The one-tailed t-test performed on the data revealed a t value which exceeded the 1.80 or greater necessary for rejection of the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance with eleven degrees of freedom. The null hypothesis was rejected.

Question 4-4k: Assignments

Would students perceive teachers as giving more reasonable assignments?

Table 4-4k
Assignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 4-4k shows that while there was an increase in the mean score after in-service training the mean increase was not statistically significant at the .05 level of significance with eleven degrees of freedom. The one-tailed $t$ test used to analyze data revealed a $t$ value smaller than the 1.80 or greater necessary for rejection of the null hypothesis of no difference between population means. The null hypothesis was accepted.

**Question 4-41: Appearance**

Would students perceive teachers as being better groomed?

Table 4-41

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Test</td>
<td>Post-Test</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>$t$</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-41 indicates a mean increase in this category after in-service training. A one-tailed $t$-test was again used to test the null hypothesis of no difference between population means. The analysis of data revealed that the $t$ value obtained from the data was sufficient to cause rejection of the null hypothesis. With eleven degrees of freedom at the .05 level of significance the null hypothesis was rejected.
**Question 4-4m: Openness**

Would students perceive teachers as being more open?

**Table 4-4m**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-3.66</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 4-4m shows, students, after teachers had undergone in-service training, perceived their teachers as being less open than they were prior to in-service training. A one-tailed t-test used in order to ascertain whether the difference was large enough to reject the null hypothesis revealed a negative t value. Because there was a one-tailed positive expectation, the negative t value was deemed non-significant.

**Question 4-4n: Self-Control**

Would students perceive teachers as having more self-control?

Data related to this question as shown in Table 4-4n, indicate a mean increase after in-service training. Using a one-tailed t-test in order to ascertain if the difference between pre- and post-test means was large enough to reject
the null hypothesis of no difference between population means revealed a \( t \) value which exceeded the 1.80 or greater necessary for rejection of the null hypothesis. With eleven degrees of freedom at the .05 level of significance the null hypothesis was rejected.

Table 4-4n
Self-Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 4-4o: Consideration of Others

Would students perceive their teachers as being more considerate of others?

Table 4-4o
Consideration of Others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data on this question, shown in Table 4-4o, indicate a mean decrease after in-service training in this category. The one-tailed \( t \)-test was employed for data analysis revealed
a negative $t$ value. Because of the positive one-tailed expectation the negative $t$ value obtained from the data was deemed non-significant.

**Question 4-4p: Effectiveness**

Would students perceive teachers as being more effective?

**Table 4-4p**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD .22</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-4p indicates that students perceived teachers as being more effective after in-service training than they were before in-service training. Again a one-tailed $t$-test to determine if the difference was large enough to reject the null hypothesis of no difference between population means. The $t$ value obtained from the data revealed a $t$ value which exceeded the 1.80 or greater necessary for rejection of the null hypothesis. With eleven degrees of freedom at the .05 level of significance, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Summarizing the pre-test and post-test results, it appeared that students regarded their teachers as "good" teachers. No teacher received a mark of below average. There
were also no teachers who received a mark of excellent. Questions 1, 2, 4, and 16 were the most positive categories. Post-test scores indicated a general rise in thirteen of the sixteen categories. Four questions which were of special concern to this researcher because of their relationship to teacher/student oral communication were questions 2, 5, 8, and 9. While the mean score in category 2 rose slightly, category 5 rose somewhat more appreciably. Categories 8 and 9, which parallel category 5, showed gains that appeared larger than any of the other categories. Category 12 had an increase of .31. Although this was an appreciable increase, appearance has little to do with oral communication.

Conclusion

This chapter presented data concerning the pre- and post-tests of four instruments: 1) Language Attitude Scale, 2) CEMREL Linguistic Test, 3) Verbal Interaction Category System, and 4) Teacher Image Questionnaire. The data show that after in-service training teacher attitudes were more positive toward Black dialect than they were prior to in-service training and also teachers displayed an increase in linguistic knowledge after the in-service training program. The data also indicated that while there was little change in the classroom verbal interaction, students' perception of their teachers became more positive. A more concise conclusion of the findings may be found in Chapter V.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS
AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this final chapter the study is summarized and the
results obtained are discussed under three major headings:
1) Conclusions; 2) Implications, and 3) Recommendations.

Summary of Study

As mentioned in Chapter I, it was the purpose of this
study to explore several areas heretofore not explored in
current literature, namely 1) the measurement of teacher
language attitude; 2) the measurement of change in language
attitude; 3) the theory of cognitive dissonance and the
science of linguistics as a means of changing language at­
titude, and 4) the effect of language attitude on classroom
verbal interaction and student perceptions of teachers.

There were twelve subjects in the study, each a member
of the Dort Community School teaching staff, grades four
through six. The instrument used to gather data concerning
the language attitude and attitude change in the partici­
pants was the Language Attitude Scale; the instrument used
for gathering data relative to cognitive knowledge in linguis­
tics was the CEMREL Linguistics Test; the instrument used to
measure verbal interaction was the Verbal Interaction Cate­
gory System; and the instrument used to garner students'
perceptions of teachers was the Teacher Image Questionnaire. Pre-test data were collected on the subjects and their classrooms during the latter part of September and the first week in October, 1972; post data were gathered the week of April 16-21, 1973.

Summary of the Major Findings

Data pertinent to the four major questions asked in this study were analyzed and presented in Chapter IV. The findings are summarized below:

1. **Teacher attitudes toward Black dialect as measured by The LAS became more positive after in-service training.**

Pre-test investigation showed that teachers mildly rejected Black dialect. Content Category I (Teacher attitude towards the inherent usefulness of Black dialect), and Category III (Teacher attitude regarding their philosophies concerning the usefulness and acceptance of Black dialect in educational and other settings), appeared to be more positive than Category II (Educational usefulness of Black dialect), or Category IV (Teacher attitude regarding the cognitive and intellectual abilities of speakers of Black dialect).

Literally interpreting these results relative to the component structure of Taylor's LAS, it would appear that initially teachers felt 1) Black dialect was a reflection of one's cognitive and intellectual ability,
that is to say, the more nonstandard an individual's dialect, the more apt he is to be deficient in his cognitive and intellectual abilities; 2) Black dialect should be discouraged in educational settings; 3) Black dialect is useful in some forms of expressions, that is, certain situations mandate or are more amenable to use of Black dialect than standard English; 4) Black dialect should be used moderately in some social and quasi-educational settings. Post-test data revealed that in each of the four categories teacher attitudes became more positive concerning Black dialect than they were before in-service experiences. The mean scores for each of the areas increased enough to cause rejection of the null hypothesis of no difference between population means at the .05 level of significance.

As noted in Chapter IV, while there was an increase in the mean scores for each segment of the LAS on the post-test evaluation, teachers' attitudes were not altered as greatly as this researcher had supposed they would be altered. Teacher mean scores moved categorically from "mildly rejecting" Black dialect to a position of "neutrality" concerning the rejection or acceptance of Black dialect.

2. Teacher linguistic knowledge increased

Most teachers involved in the study had little knowledge of the study of linguistics prior to in-service
training. This lack of knowledge was reflected in the pre-test mean scores on the four categories inherent in the CEMREL Linguistic Test. After in-service training, teachers increased their cognitive linguistic knowledge to a point where the post-test mean score approximated the ninetieth percentile of the CEMREL Linguistic Test.

3. **Verbal interaction of teachers and students included in the population changed very little after in-service training.**

   Only two categories showed statistically significant changes using a two-tailed t-test at the .05 level of significance. "Teacher rejection" of student ideas, feelings and behaviors decreased which perhaps indicates a more neutral attitude towards students' response and actions. While teacher rejection mean scores decreased, "teacher acceptance" mean scores also increased but not at a level which was statistically significant. The other category which showed a statistically significant increase was "pupil response to another pupil." Appreciative post-test mean increases, while not significant at the .05 level, were noted in "teacher direction," and "teacher acceptance."

4. **Students perceived teachers as being more effective teachers after in-service training.**

   There was a statistically significant increase in the mean scores represented in twelve of the sixteen
categories inherent in the TIQ. Students after in-service viewed teachers as:

- Being clearer in presenting information.
- Being fairer.
- Being more positive in their attitudes toward students.
- Being more stimulating.
- Being more positive in their attitude toward student ideas.
- Being more enthusiastic.
- Being more encouraging of student participation.
- Having a greater sense of humor.
- Being better groomed.

Only in the category entitled, "Openness" was there a negative value. Teachers on the whole were viewed as "above average" on the pretest and between "above average" to "good" on the post-test.

Conclusions

It is difficult in a study of this nature to draw concrete conclusions because much of the information gathered is information that treads on ground not fully illuminated in current literature. The notions of attitude measurement, attitude change and the linguistic legitimacy of Black dialect are all controversial. This study was based on several assumptions which depict one side of those controversies. To the extent that the assumptions and techniques employed in this study
may be valid, the following conclusions based on the data seem justified.

Teacher attitude toward Black dialect was measured and found to be in mild disagreement with the usefulness and acceptance of Black dialect. Teachers also displayed little knowledge concerning the science of linguistics or its applicability in the teaching of reading. After the in-service training sessions centering around the study of linguistics with special emphasis on Black dialect, teachers' linguistic knowledge increased, and teacher attitudes became more accepting of Black dialect. Reflecting on the theoretical strategy put forth in Chapter I, it appears that the theory of cognitive dissonance, using linguistics as a dissonant cognitive element was a viable strategy. While data support this conclusion, two cautions must be noted before any absolute conclusion can be drawn: 1) data were not examined to determine the relationship between the increase in linguistic knowledge and the change in teacher attitude, and more importantly, 2) the absence of a control group made it impossible to determine if the change was in fact due to the treatment prescribed by the in-service training or was brought on by other factors.

While the above factors are limiting, in the opinion of this researcher, the attitude change strategy employed in this study was a useful one for altering teacher attitudes toward Black dialect. The results of this study relative to teacher attitudes closely approximate the results found in Taylor's
(1972) study. That is to say, that teacher attitudes, represented by pre- and post-test mean scores, tended to fall in the same locale as elementary and high school teacher scores solicited across the midwestern region of the United States.

Student perceptions of teachers became more positive after in-service training than they were prior to in-service. The student perception portion of the strategy was an attempt to garner information about change in teacher behavior which would be perceived by students. It would appear that students perceived some difference in teacher behavior which caused them to view teachers as being more effective. Caution again must be noted, lest a too literal interpretation be made of the data and an inappropriate conclusion drawn. The absence of a control group and the absence of data analysis which would have depicted the relationship between student perceptions, attitude change, and linguistic knowledge make it difficult to say to what extent change in student perception was a result of the in-service program.

Verbal interaction made the smallest change. Only two categories showed statistically significant change and only two other categories while not statistically significant, showed appreciable differences between pre- and post-test mean scores. Thus, it appears that increased linguistic knowledge and the change in attitude had little effect on the verbal interaction in classrooms of those teachers involved in the in-service program.
Implications

This study has a number of implications for the education leader, administrator, planner, teacher, researcher and others who wish to understand teacher attitude and attitude change toward Black dialect.

1. **Teacher attitudes toward Black dialect tend to be non-accepting attitudes.**

The results of this study seem to indicate, as Becker (1952) commented, that teachers of urban Black students do harbor negative attitudes toward their students' speech patterns. This study also adds cognitive data support to the study referred to in Chapter II, conducted by Woodworth and Saltzer (1971) where they found the negative attitudes concerning Black dialect being personified in teachers' evaluation of student orally-read papers. The data also support point number three in Taylor's results (1972) where he found that teachers felt Black dialect was a mark of social inferiority. Based on the above mentioned studies and this study, it would appear that the attitude change toward Black dialect is a road to travel if public education is to bring about quality and equality in education.
2. **Teacher attitudes, in a cognitive sense, can be changed concerning Black dialect.**

There will be continual disagreement over to what extent attitudes are measured, and if those attitudes are affective, cognitive, or neither. But this study attempted to measure and in the opinion of this researcher, did measure some cognitive attitudes and post-test examination showed that attitudes were in fact changed. Credence then is lent to the theories of attitude change and measurement and more importantly to in-service training as a means of bringing about attitude change. The results of this study approximated the changes in attitude found in Taylor's (1972) study. This in-service training of longer duration appeared to have been beneficial in sustaining attitude change over a year's time as opposed to Taylor's summer in-service program. What is not known concerning either study is how sustained those attitudes were after in-service experiences.

3. **Teachers had very little knowledge of linguistics.**

The absence of linguistic knowledge found on the part of the teachers involved in this study is again in concert with Taylor's (1972) findings discussed in Chapter II. This lack of knowledge concerning the acquisition of language, language
formation and other linguistic concepts hints that teacher negative attitudes toward Black dialect could be because of the general lack of knowledge about language. Linguistics, perhaps, as Hughes (1969) and Labov (1971) said, could be the tool by which attitude can be changed concerning Black dialect.

4. The theory of cognitive dissonance using linguistics as a dissonant element, can be used in altering attitudes toward Black dialect.

The dissonance theory appears, as noted earlier in this chapter, to have been a viable strategy for attitude change. Chapter II included comments by Hughes (1969) and Labov (1971) on how the study of linguistics was a means of countering social attitudes about Black dialect with scientific knowledge and how social attitudes could be changed through the introduction of linguistics. Thus, this study clearly indicates the usefulness of the theory of cognitive dissonance as theory which can be used to change attitudes.

5. Teacher image in Black classrooms can be improved when their attitudes become more positive toward their students' dialect.

It appears from the data presented in this study that teacher image can be improved when teachers become
more accepting of student language. What is not known at this point, is to what extent teacher acceptance of Black dialect is an acceptance of Black culture.

Recommendations

The findings in this study must be regarded as inconclusive because of the limitations referred to earlier in this chapter and in Chapter I. But the findings quite clearly lay the groundwork for future research in the area of attitude and attitude change toward Black dialect. The following recommendations are suggested by this researcher for future research in this area:

1. Replicate the study using a similar teacher-student population but employing a control group.

2. Replicate the study using a more racially mixed and an all-White staff employing a control group.

3. Replicate the study with a larger population with a two-year follow-up of the teachers' attitude and attitude change with a different set of students.

4. Investigate affective attitude change toward Black dialect in terms of alteration of teaching strategies.

5. Replicate study investigating verbal interaction and non-verbal interaction between students and teachers.

6. Investigate individual teacher perceptions of students whose dialect is more distant from the accepted norm and those student perceptions of their teachers versus students who dialect is
more the standard norm and their perceptions of their teacher and the teachers' perceptions of them.

This study was designed as an experimental program whose intent was to elicit information concerning teacher attitudes toward Black dialect and to discover if teacher attitudes could be changed. It is hoped that those responsible for the improvement of teacher behavior in the classroom may utilize the findings of the present study and will look closely at the recommendations for future research as they contribute to the teaching-learning process.
APPENDIX 1
Within a language, there are often recognizable differences (called dialects) in the way the language is spoken by different groups. The dialect of the group with wealth, or social status, or the largest membership, often takes on a certain prestige and becomes the "standard" variety of the language. In this country, some of the ways English is spoken are considered to be Standard English and others are referred to as Nonstandard English.

Two samples of English dialects will be played for you. These dialects are considered by many speakers of Standard English to be nonstandard. The first is a sample of Black English--so called because it is spoken by many black people in different areas of the United States, though some members of other groups have learned it also. This is the nonstandard dialect with the largest number of speakers. Here is a sample of Black English.

The second sample is Appalachian English, spoken mainly around the mountains of Tennessee, Kentucky, and West Virginia, though migrating populations have taken it elsewhere. This is a sample of Appalachian English.

Now that you have heard the samples, we would like you to read the following statements concerning dialects and give your reactions to them. Please indicate your response in the spaces provided following each statement.

SA - Strongly agree  MA - Mildly agree  N - Neither agree nor disagree

MD - Mildly disagree  SD - Strongly disagree
Center For Applied Linguistics
Washington, D.C.

LANGUAGE ATTITUDE SCALE

General Information

Code Number

WHAT GRADE(S) DO YOU TEACH?

HOW MANY YEARS HAVE YOU TAUGHT?

WHAT IS YOUR RACE?

WHAT LANGUAGE, OTHER THAN ENGLISH, WAS SPOKEN IN YOUR HOME?

INTO WHAT RELIGIOUS FAITH OR SECT WERE YOU BORN?

WHERE WERE YOU BORN?

WHERE DO YOU LIVE NOW?

HOW LONG HAVE YOU LIVED THERE?

WHERE WAS YOUR CHILDHOOD SPENT?

WHAT PROPORTION OF YOUR CLASS IS BLACK?

WHAT PROPORTION OF YOUR STUDENTS SPEAK NONSTANDARD ENGLISH?
(Blacks included)

WHAT IS THE HIGHEST ACADEMIC DEGREE YOU HAVE EARNED?

IN WHAT FIELD?

HAVE YOU HAD ANY ACADEMIC TRAINING IN LINGUISTICS OR PSYCHOLINGUISTICS? HOW MANY COURSES?
1. Greater acceptance of Black English is likely to lead to greater acceptance of black people.
   SA ____ MA ____ N ____ MD ____ SD ____

2. Black English is a misuse of Standard English.
   SA ____ MA ____ N ____ MD ____ SD ____

3. It is perfectly absurd to approve of Black English.
   SA ____ MD ____ N ____ MA ____ SA ____

4. When teachers reject the native language of a speaker of Black English, they do him great harm.
   SD ____ MD ____ N ____ MA ____ SA ____

5. Recognition of Black English as a language will serve to keep the races apart.
   SD ____ MD ____ N ____ MA ____ SA ____

6. Rejection of Black English tends to make black people anti-social.
   SA ____ MA ____ N ____ MD ____ SD ____

7. A prime consideration in this society should be the right of every member to speak whatever dialect of English he pleases.
   SD ____ MD ____ N ____ MA ____ SA ____

8. The elimination of nonstandard dialects of English is necessary for social stability.
   SA ____ MA ____ N ____ MD ____ SD ____

9. Black English should be forbidden.
   SD ____ MD ____ N ____ MA ____ SA ____
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10. The use of Black English reflects an inability to learn the proper use of English.

11. For many black people Black English allows more expression of personal feelings than Standard English.

12. Widespread approval of Black English is imperative.

13. Unless dialects such as Black English are discouraged, the English language will become disreputable.

14. Societal acceptance of Black English is important for development of self-esteem among black people.

15. If nonstandard dialects of English are permitted or encouraged, the English language will degenerate into feeble gibberish.

16. Teachers who allow Nonstandard English to be used in their classrooms should be considered incompetent.

17. The sooner we eliminate Black English, the better.

18. More favorable attitudes toward Black English would help reduce some of the psychological frustration for speakers of Black English.
19. There are good reasons for eliminating Black English.

20. The rejection of nonstandard dialects of English is unsound in principle.

21. Black English is a clear, thoughtful, and expressive language.

22. If true communication between races is to occur, Black English must be done away with.

23. Approval of Black English by white teachers would be one way to show understanding on the part of the white race toward blacks.

24. Continued use of Black English would be a disgrace to society.

25. Those who believe in rejecting Black English tend to be narrow-minded.

26. Black English is too imprecise to be an effective means of communication.

27. A teacher should not attempt to change a student's native dialect.
28. Black English should be encouraged because it is an important part of black cultural identity.

SA _____ MA _____ N _____ MD _____ SD _____

29. A child should not be corrected by teachers for speaking his native nonstandard dialect.

SA _____ MA _____ N _____ MD _____ SD _____

30. Black English has a faulty grammar system.

SA _____ MA _____ N _____ MD _____ SD _____


SA _____ MA _____ N _____ MD _____ SD _____

32. Allowing and accepting the use of Nonstandard English in the classroom will retard the academic progress of the class.

SD _____ MD _____ N _____ MA _____ SA _____

33. Acceptance of Black English would lead to ill feelings between the races.

SA _____ MA _____ N _____ MD _____ SD _____

34. Teachers should allow black students to use Black English in the classroom.

SD _____ MD _____ N _____ MA _____ SA _____

35. It is ridiculous to encourage children to speak Black English.

SD _____ MD _____ N _____ MA _____ SA _____

36. Acceptance of Nonstandard English dialects like Black English keeps us from being one-sided.

SD _____ MD _____ N _____ MA _____ SA _____
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37. I don't resent Black English

38. Teachers should avoid criticism of nonstandard dialects of English.

39. Black English should not be accepted by teachers.

40. A decline in the use of nonstandard English dialects would have a positive influence on social unity.

41. Black English sounds as good as Standard English.

42. It would be detrimental to our country's social welfare if use of Black English became socially acceptable.

43. Careless pronunciation is the major difference between Black English and Standard English.

44. If one wants to accept black people, he must accept their language.

45. Complex concepts cannot be expressed easily through nonstandard dialects like Black English.
46. When a child's native Black English is replaced by Standard English, he is introduced to new concepts which will increase his learning capacity.

47. Black English sounds rude and uncouth.

48. In any integrated school, Black English as well as Standard English should be taught.

49. The use of Nonstandard English prevents one from thinking as clearly as possible.

50. It is socially undesirable that children continue to speak nonstandard dialects of English.

51. Black English is cool.

52. In certain social situations, Black English can be more appropriate than Standard English.

53. Teachers should correct a student's nonstandard use of English even if it lowers the student's self-esteem.

54. The encouragement of Black English would be beneficial to our national interests.
55. A teacher should not attempt to eradicate a student's native dialect.

56. Nonstandard English is as effective for communication as is Standard English.

57. For many black people, Black English allows more expression of personal feelings than Standard English.

58. If use of Black English were encouraged, speakers of Black English would be more motivated to achieve academically.

59. In a predominately Black school, Black English as well as Standard English should be taught.

60. People who really think through all the issues do not endorse the use of Black English.

61. Widespread acceptance of Black English is imperative.

62. Rejection of Black English by teachers leads to feelings of alienation among Black students.

63. Children who speak only Black English lack certain basic concepts such as plurality and negation.
64. It is perfectly absurd to accept Black English.

65. Black English should be considered a bad influence on American culture and civilization.

66. Black English must be accepted if pride is to develop among Black people.

67. Attempts to eliminate Black English in schools result in a situation which can be psychologically damaging to black children.

68. When teachers reject the natural language of a student, they do him great harm.

69. Acceptance of Black English in the classroom provides a sound basis for future educational planning.

70. I am annoyed when children speak nonstandard dialects of English.

71. One of the goals of the American school system should be the standardization of the English language.

72. The use of Nonstandard English is a reflection of unclear thinking on the part of the speaker.
73. Black English should be discouraged.

74. A black child's use of Black English thwarts his ability to learn.

75. Speakers of Black English will feel more a part of society and the educational system if their language is not rejected.

76. Teachers should insist upon speakers of Black English pronouncing words the way they are pronounced in Standard English.

77. The use of Black English reveals an inability to think clearly.

78. The continued use of nonstandard dialect of English accomplishes nothing worthwhile for an individual.

79. Nonstandard English should be accepted socially.

80. Acceptance of Black English will help increase meaningful communication between the races.

81. Acceptance of nonstandard dialects of English by teachers will lead to a lowering of standards in schools.
82. A child should not be reprimanded by teachers for speaking his native nonstandard dialect.

SD _____ MD _____ N _____ MA _____ SA _____

83. Non-acceptance of Black English threatens a basic democratic principle—the right of each person to speak any dialect he pleases.

SA _____ MA _____ N _____ MD _____ SD _____

84. It is perfectly legitimate for native speakers of Black English to use this dialect in conversation.

SA _____ MA _____ N _____ MD _____ SD _____

85. Encouragement of Black English would be socially expedient.

SA _____ MA _____ N _____ MD _____ SD _____

86. The possible benefits to be gained from approval of Black English do not alter the fact that such approval would be basically wrong.

SA _____ MA _____ N _____ MD _____ SD _____

87. A teacher should interrupt a student to correct his use of Nonstandard English.

SA _____ MA _____ N _____ MD _____ SD _____

88. We should encourage the continued use of Nonstandard English dialects.

SA _____ MA _____ N _____ MD _____ SD _____

89. A black person who speaks Standard English should be preferred for employment over a black person who speaks Black English.

SA _____ MA _____ N _____ MD _____ SD _____
90. The scholastic level of a school will fall if teachers allow Black English to be spoken.

SD _____ MD _____ N _____ MA _____ SA _____

91. Black English is an inferior language system.

SA _____ MA _____ N _____ MD _____ SD _____

92. Forcing Black students to use Standard English in the classroom can be psychologically frustrating for them.

SD _____ MD _____ N _____ MA _____ SA _____

93. A child who says "I don't got no book" does not understand the concept of negation.

SA _____ MA _____ N _____ MD _____ SD _____

94. The grammatical structure of Standard English is superior to that of Nonstandard English.

SA _____ MA _____ N _____ MD _____ SD _____

95. The stability of our social system requires the acceptance of Black English.

SD _____ MD _____ N _____ MA _____ SA _____

96. A teacher should correct a student's use of Nonstandard English.

SD _____ MD _____ N _____ MA _____ SA _____

97. When Black people talk together in Black English they do not communicate effectively.

SA _____ MA _____ N _____ MD _____ SD _____

98. Teachers have a duty to insure that students do not speak nonstandard dialect of English in the classroom.

SA _____ MA _____ N _____ MD _____ SD _____
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99. Rejecting Black English and encouraging Standard English will tend to make black children feel more important.

100. Acceptance of Black English by white society would help alleviate the alienation felt by a black child who speaks this language.

101. Black people should encourage their children to speak Standard English rather than Black English.

102. One successful method for improving the learning capacity of speakers of Black English would be to replace their dialect with Standard English.

103. Black English is a poorly structured system of language.

104. Acceptance of Black English by teachers would create a more favorable climate for learning Standard English.

105. There is much danger involved in accepting Black English.

106. Acceptance of Black English is vitally necessary for the welfare of the country.

107. A teacher's criticism and correction of a child's native English dialect may cause the child to lose interest in his school work.
108. **Black English sounds sloppy.**

SD ______ MD ______ N ______ MA ______ SA ______

109. **Allowing Black English to be spoken in schools will undermine the school's reputation.**

SA ______ MA ______ N ______ MD ______ SD ______

110. **To criticize a child for using nonstandard dialect of English while praising another child for using Standard English is a form of discrimination.**

SA ______ MA ______ N ______ SD ______ MD ______

111. The sooner we eliminate nonstandard dialects in English, the better.

SA ______ MA ______ N ______ MD ______ SD ______

112. By not allowing Black English to be spoken in class, teachers are limiting their students' personal freedom.

SA ______ MA ______ N ______ SD ______ MD ______

113. Students should be allowed to speak their nonstandard dialects only on the playground.

SD ______ MD ______ N ______ MA ______ SA ______

114. I see no value in encouraging the various nonstandard dialects of English.

SA ______ MA ______ N ______ SD ______ MD ______

115. Black English is a less efficient way of communicating than Standard English.

SD ______ MD ______ N ______ MA ______ SA ______

116. To reject Black English is to reject an important aspect of the self-identity of black people.

SD ______ MD ______ N ______ MA ______ SA ______
117. There is no such thing as Black English.

SD _____ MD _____ N _____ MA _____ SA _____
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PERSONAL DATA SHEET

Name ____________________________ Sex ___ M ___ F
School System ______________________ Building ______
(Name of system not number)
Code Number ________________________ Age ______
(Use last four digits of social security number or phone number.)

DIRECTIONS: Please answer every item in the spaces at the left.

1. What is the highest college degree you hold?
2. What was your undergraduate major?
3. What was your undergraduate minor?
4. How many hours of graduate credit beyond your undergraduate degree do you have? (Indicate quarter or semester hours.)
5. What is/was your graduate degree major?
6. Do you have access to a spool tape recorder?
7. Do you have access to a cassette tape recorder?
8. Indicate (by checking) in which of the following subjects you have had instruction:
   Modern Grammars
   Structural Linguistics
   Transformational Grammar
   Dialectology
   History of English Language
   Teaching Linguistics
   Phonetics
   Speech Therapy
9. List the professional magazines you read regularly which contain articles about English Language Arts.

The following questions pertain to teachers involved in in-service training, and need not be answered by other participants:

10. Have you participated in previous in-service education in language arts?

11. Including the current school year, how many years have elapsed since you last earned college credit?

12. Counting the current school year as a full year, how many years of teaching experience have you had?

13. Considering your entire teaching experience, at which grade levels have you most commonly taught?

14. At what grade level(s) are you currently teaching?

15. Do you have an aide?

16. Do you use a layreader?
You are about to take a test which will measure the level of knowledge and skills you have in the field of dialect and composition. You are NOT expected to be able to answer all of the questions. This test is for research purposes primarily. We need to know what you know when you begin the course as contrasted to what you know upon completion of the course. Please do NOT feel discouraged if you do not do well on the test. Please DO try to complete as much of the test as you can. We are confident that you will find that the skills and knowledges tested will be developed during your study of Teaching Writing to Speakers of Nonstandard Dialects. You will have another opportunity to show your knowledge and skill in this area at the conclusion of the course. The main purpose of this test is to determine what skills and knowledges you have now.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE TEST

Please use pencil to record your responses so that you may erase easily. Please erase thoroughly if you wish to change an answer.

For Section 3 you will need a tape recorder. (In some instances, an instructor will play the test tape for you.) The tape you will need is labeled. Please insert the tape into your player now.

All ready? Turn the page to the first section of the test. In the upper right hand corner place the last four numerals of your Social Security Number or your telephone number. This will be your code number to be used throughout the program. The code number serves to protect your privacy and also to permit rapid handling of the data. Supply this same number whenever it is called for.

After you have inserted the number in the blank, begin the test, following the instructions for each section carefully.
Section One--The Nature of Nonstandard Dialects

Read the following nine generalizations commonly made about language. Indicate in the blank to the right whether the generalization is true (T) or false (F). If a generalization is false, rewrite the statement so that it is true. Make your changes right in the sentences themselves.

1. Some people do not speak a dialect. ___

2. In the United States there are a series of regionally standard dialects, not one standard English. ___

3. People who do not speak one of the regionally standard dialects of English speak sub-standard English. ___

4. Children from the ghettos and the slums are not non-verbal--although they may choose not to talk in a classroom situation. ___

5. The language used by the nonstandard speaker is different, not deficient. ___

6. The speech of a nonstandard dialect speaker is non-systematic. ___

7. The language used by the nonstandard speaker is logical. ___

8. The language of the nonstandard dialect speaker is nonfunctional. ___

9. It is the responsibility of the schools to correct the language used by speakers of non-standard dialects. ___
Section Two—Analyzing Writing

Read the following student theme. Underline those features which are NOT appropriate in expository writing. Identify each nonstandard feature eq., something omitted, something added, etc.

For example, if you saw the sentence: "He like to swim and boat." You would underline the word "_ike" and write "omitted s" above it.

There is a retired mechanic named Mr. Kent who live on our block. Sometimes he helps fix my brother Paul car. He is always say Paul should be a mechanic. He ain't got no kids so he spends alot of time with Paul. Him an Paul fixed up a really old car and sold it. Mr. Kent wanted Paul to keep all the money for hisself but he wouldn't do it. He gave Mr. Kent half of the 3 hundred dollar.

Every morning Mr. Kent walk the two block to the bus stop. Rain or shine, I see him everyday at ten minute after eight heading for the bus stop with a shopping bag fill with books and papers. I used to wonder what he was doing. Last night at the community house I saw a book on the library des—a book for boys about fixing cars. The I saw the authur was Samuel Kent.
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1. Check the statement that is most accurate:
   
   ____ Nonstandard features in writing occur as a consequence of a set of grammatical and
   pronunciation rules.
   
   ____ Nonstandard features in writing result from the erroneous application of standard English rules.

2. Check the statement that is most accurate:
   
   ____ If a nonstandard feature such as "ten cent_" occurs in the writing of a student, you may expect that the plural "s" will be deleted almost all of the time.
   
   ____ If a nonstandard feature such as Øpl (plural) occurs in the writing of a student, you may expect that it may be deleted occasionally, but not at all times.

3. Check the statement that is most accurate:
   
   ____ Most nonstandard features occur more frequently in speech than in writing.
   
   ____ Most nonstandard features occur more frequently in writing than in speech.

4. Fill in the blank below with the word that most accurately completes the sentence:
   
   Nonstandard grammatical and ______ rules can contribute to spelling "errors" in writing.

5. The rules governing nonstandard dialects in writing, as well as ______, may contribute to deletions of words and parts of words.

6. Define the following symbols:
   
   Ø
   
   +
   
   ⇔
Section Three—Analyzing Speech

Listen to the test tape. In the spaces below, write down all the nonstandard features you hear. You may start and stop the tape as needed.

1. 
2. 
3. 
4. 
5. 
6. 
7. 
8. 
9. 
10. 
11. 
12. 
13. 
14. 
15. 
16. 
17. 
18. 
19. 
20. 
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Section Four--Diagnostic and Prescription

INSTRUCTIONS:

1. Using the analysis sheet on the reverse page, record the nonstandard features, mechanical problems, and problems with communicative qualities of writing in the writing sample on page_. As you evaluate the writing, please label those problems above the place in the line where they occur.

2. Then, using the Curriculum Card on page_ and the data from your analysis of writing, please indicate the first objective you would choose in each of the three categories for this student.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Paper #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Øs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Øed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Øpl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ØBE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Øposs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subj ↔ Obj</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rpn ↔ Rpn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Øaux</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Øprep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Øing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Øpre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a ↔ an</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Øart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE ↔ v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+pn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>got(s) ↔ aux</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v ↔ v+ed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is ↔ am/are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>was ↔ were</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v ↔ v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ain't ↔ nv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it ↔ there</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+aux</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aux ↔ aux</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+pl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+comp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+prep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/I/ ↔ /E/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ØF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ØFCC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ↔ ing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Paper #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run-ons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctuation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling errors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### COMMUNICATIVE QUALITIES OF WRITING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>OK</th>
<th>Needs Work</th>
<th>Paper #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detail/depth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redundancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence Variety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER

---

### DOES ESPECIALLY WELL:

---
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### TEACHER-IMAGE QUESTIONNAIRE

**WHAT IS YOUR OPINION CONCERNING THIS TEACHER'S:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>1. KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT:</strong> (Does he have a thorough knowledge and understanding of his teaching field?)</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>AVERAGE</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>EXCELLENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>2. CLARITY OF PRESENTATION:</strong> (Are ideas presented at a level which you can understand?)</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>AVERAGE</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>EXCELLENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>3. FAIRNESS:</strong> (Is he fair and impartial in his treatment of all students in the class?)</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>AVERAGE</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>EXCELLENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>4. CONTROL:</strong> (Is the classroom orderly but also relaxed and friendly?)</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>AVERAGE</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>EXCELLENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>5. ATTITUDE TOWARD STUDENTS:</strong> (Do you feel that this teacher likes you?)</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>AVERAGE</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>EXCELLENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>6. SUCCESS IN STIMULATING INTEREST:</strong> (Is this class interesting and challenging?)</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>AVERAGE</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>EXCELLENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>7. ENTHUSIASM:</strong> (Does he show interest in and enthusiasm for the subject? Does he appear to enjoy teaching this subject?)</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>AVERAGE</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>EXCELLENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>8. ATTITUDE TOWARD STUDENT IDEAS:</strong> (Does this teacher have respect for the things you have to say in class?)</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>AVERAGE</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>EXCELLENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>9. ENCOURAGEMENT OF STUDENT PARTICIPATION:</strong> (Does this teacher encourage you to raise questions and express ideas in class?)</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>AVERAGE</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>EXCELLENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>10. SENSE OF HUMOR:</strong> (Does he share amusing experiences and laugh at his own mistakes?)</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>AVERAGE</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>EXCELLENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>11. ASSIGNMENTS:</strong> (Are assignments sufficiently challenging without being unreasonably long?)</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>AVERAGE</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>EXCELLENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>12. APPEARANCE:</strong> (Are his grooming and dress in good taste?)</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>AVERAGE</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>EXCELLENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>13. OPENNESS:</strong> (Is this teacher able to see things from your point of view?)</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>AVERAGE</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>EXCELLENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>14. SELF-CONTROL:</strong> (Does this teacher become angry when little problems arise in the classroom?)</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>AVERAGE</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>EXCELLENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>15. CONSIDERATION OF OTHERS:</strong> (Is he patient, understanding, considerate, and courteous?)</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>AVERAGE</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>EXCELLENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>16. EFFECTIVENESS:</strong> (What is your overall evaluation of your teacher's effectiveness?)</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>AVERAGE</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>EXCELLENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Observer 1</th>
<th>Observer 2</th>
<th>Percent of 1</th>
<th>Percent of 2</th>
<th>Percent Diff</th>
<th>(Ave. %)²/100</th>
<th>Scott's Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>29.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1239</td>
<td>1242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.96*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A Scott Coefficient of 0.85 or higher is a reasonable level of significance.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Observer 1</th>
<th>Observer 2</th>
<th>Percent of 1</th>
<th>Percent of 2</th>
<th>Percent Diff</th>
<th>(Ave. %)2</th>
<th>Scott's Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>29.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1240</td>
<td>1241</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.94*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A Scott Coefficient of 0.85 or higher is a reasonable level of significance.*
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