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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A need for the individualization of curricula, methods and emphases for children in the public schools has long been recognized and proposed in order to meet the needs of learners with different backgrounds. Despite this recognized need by teachers of children, an examination of many programs in elementary teacher education reveals that there is little differentiation or individualization in the preservice training of elementary school teachers in anticipation of the type of school in which they may be assigned initially.

Due to the increasing numbers of minority group children who attend elementary schools in the inner-city and the relatively high turnover of teachers in such buildings, many of the first positions for beginning teachers are, and will continue to be, in these schools.

Sociologists, psychologists and educators have repeatedly stressed that an understanding of the social-psychological makeup of children is crucial for those who will teach them. On the other hand, it can be argued that insufficient attention has been devoted to the characteristics and behaviors of teachers in different school settings.

The findings of a recent research study conducted by

1
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Bellmeyer, which included 126 teacher education institutions in all fifty states, revealed that there were no significant differences in the preservice education of teachers of culturally disadvantaged students in elementary schools and the preservice education of teachers of middle class students in elementary schools, and experiences to involve prospective teachers with culturally disadvantaged youngsters in elementary schools were not required in the preservice education of teachers by teacher training institutions. A special course focused on teaching culturally disadvantaged children was required at only eighteen per cent of the reporting institutions. The study pointed out that programs to prepare teachers of culturally disadvantaged pupils were offered at only sixteen per cent of the institutions.

Bellmeyer recommended: (1) that research be conducted to determine the effective means of teaching culturally disadvantaged students; (2) that each teacher education institution should critically examine its preservice elementary program to determine what practices to include in the preparation of elementary teachers of disadvantaged children; and (3) that there is a dire need for research to ascertain the specific factors of teacher behavior that are most relevant to the success of

teaching culturally disadvantaged elementary students.

A preponderance of the recent research on the techniques of teaching elementary children from different backgrounds has focused on the child and what he brings, or does not bring, with him to the learning situation.

A statement by Chesler\(^1\) is indicative of the contemporary concern for the need to differentiate the emphases in teacher preparation programs more than is the practice at most institutions at the present time. He believes that:

"Teachers in racially integrated classrooms often need special instruction or retraining for the particular academic and social problems of their students. Targets should include the characteristic attitudes and behaviors of the students and the teachers."

Miller\(^2\) contends that:

"Although most people concerned with the education of the disadvantaged agree that the teacher is the crucial element in the problem, there has been a disappointing absence of research and evaluation that might help the schools select, train or retrain teachers for the slum school."

It was in an attempt to contribute empirical evidence to the void cited by Miller and others that this investigation was conducted.

---


Statement of the Problem

The overall purpose of this study was to determine the relation between the perceptions of teachers, based on three reference groups, and the two independent variables of teacher experience and type of school. The three reference groups were the teachers themselves, their principals and the teachers' pupils. The types of schools were inner-city and suburban elementary schools. Teachers were categorized as beginning and experienced teachers.

The specific objectives of this investigation were:

1. To determine the relation between the independent variable, type of school, and the dependent variable, perceptions of teachers, as viewed by the teachers themselves, their principals and the teachers' pupils.

2. To determine the relation between the independent variable, experience of the teacher, and the dependent variable, perceptions of teachers, as viewed by the teachers themselves, their principals and the teachers' pupils.

3. To determine the relation of the interaction between the independent variables, type of school and experience of the teacher, with the dependent variable, perceptions of the teachers, as viewed by the teachers themselves, their principals and the teachers' pupils.

4. To determine the extent of agreement regarding perceptions of teachers between the (a) teacher and principal;
In an endeavor such as teaching, it is difficult to analyze and control all of the "ingredients" of "successful" teaching. Perhaps Riessman\(^1\) has come closest to encapsulating the diverse, complex and often intangible phenomena in teaching. He stated that:

"There is a fertile area that must be plowed in teacher education and that is style. The late President John F. Kennedy had a style, a distinctive mode of expression that allowed him to summon the children. This art, springing as it does from the unique and intuitive roots of each human being, can be developed by future teachers while they are in college, and it can also be developed in the inservice programs."

The development of unique styles may be essential to the successful teaching of children in different elementary school settings.

In the attempt to measure a concept as ambiguous as "style of teaching," it was necessary to identify and measure specific characteristics and behaviors which could be considered as essential, contributing factors to the teaching-learning process.

Although numerous studies and attempts have been made to identify "The" characteristics and behaviors that are essential to good teaching, there is still a lack of overall

---

\(^1\)Riessman, Frank, "Teachers of the Poor," *The P.T.A. Magazine*, LIX (November 1964), 12-3.
agreement as to what specific characteristics and behaviors should be included in such a listing.

For the purposes of this investigation, the following twelve teacher behaviors and characteristics were identified as directly related, and essential, to the teaching-learning process:

1. Knowledge of Subject
2. Clarity of Explanations
3. Fairness
4. Classroom Control
5. Attitude Toward Pupils
6. Ability to Stimulate Interest
7. Attitude Toward Student Opinions
8. Variety in Teaching Procedures
9. Encouragement of Pupil Participation
10. Sense of Humor
11. Planning and Preparation
12. Assignments

The above listing is based on extensive previous research by Bryan.¹ A more detailed account of Bryan's investigations and instrumentation is discussed in Chapters II and III of this report.

Based on the assumption that the twelve items listed above include the behaviors and characteristics which are directly related, and essential, to effective teaching, the following questions were investigated.

Major Questions Which Were Investigated

Fifty-four specific questions were investigated in the attempt to carry out the objectives of this study. These specific questions are listed in Chapter III and in Appendix A and are analyzed and discussed in Chapter IV of this report.

Listed below are the major questions which were investigated:

1. What is the relation between the independent variable, type of school, and the dependent variable, perceptions of teachers, as viewed by the teachers themselves, their principals and the teachers' pupils?

2. What is the relation between the independent variable, experience of the teacher, and the dependent variable, perceptions of teachers, as viewed by the teachers themselves, their principals and the teachers’ pupils?

3. What is the relation of the interaction between the independent variables, type of school and experience of the teacher, with the dependent variable, perceptions of teachers, as viewed by the teachers themselves, their principals and the teachers' pupils?

4. What is the extent of agreement regarding perceptions of teachers between the (a) teacher and principal; (b) teacher and pupils; and (c) principal and pupils?
Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study, the following definitions were used:

Inner-city School: An elementary school in which the majority of the pupils were from minority racial groups

Suburban School: An elementary school with less than five per cent of its enrollment represented by pupils from minority racial groups

Beginning Teacher: A teacher with a valid state teaching certificate who was currently in his first year of teaching at the time of the study

Experienced Teacher: A teacher with tenure, who had a minimum of three years of teaching experience in his present assignment at the time of the study

Teacher-centered Items: Those characteristics and behaviors on the questionnaires which were based primarily on the knowledges, skills and methods of the teacher

Pupil-centered Items: Those characteristics and behaviors on the questionnaires which were based primarily on attitudes and interpersonal relationships between the teacher and pupils

Respondent: Any teacher, principal or pupil who completed a questionnaire

Perception: The awareness or process of becoming aware, by means of sensory processes and under the influence of set and prior experiences

Importance of the Study

Based on a review of programs at various teacher preparation institutions, it can be assumed that most elementary teacher preparation programs commonly have been bisected into
two major components: academic coursework and an "education sequence." The academic coursework is usually emphasized during the first two years of the prospective elementary teacher's college work. Its emphasis is on a cognitive understanding of a variety of disciplines. The education sequence includes and emphasizes essentially three areas: (1) the historical, philosophical, sociological and psychological foundations of public education; (2) the methods and skills of teaching specific, selected subjects which are commonly included in the elementary school curriculum; and (3) a laboratory experience, commonly called student teaching, which is usually scheduled at or near the conclusion of the preservice program.

The behaviors and characteristics which have been investigated in this study are generally included to some degree in typical teacher education programs, as presented above.

Should the findings of this study indicate that there are differences between the perceptions of teachers according to the experience of the teacher, there would be implications for the development and modification of both preservice and inservice teacher education programs. A further implication would be the need for additional research that would go beyond the scope of this investigation.

Organization of the Report

The content of this report, beyond the present chapter, will be organized in the following manner: Chapter II, Review
of Related Literature and Research, will include a summary of the recent thinking and pertinent research findings regarding teacher characteristics, pupil rating of teachers and teaching the disadvantaged.

Chapter III will describe the overall research design, the setting in which the investigation was conducted, the development of the procedures which were followed, including the selection of the sample, the administration of the instrument and preliminary activities and the collection and organization of the data.

Chapter IV, Presentation and Analysis of the Data, will present a description and analysis of the data which were collected, according to the fifty-four specific questions which were investigated.

Chapter V, Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations, will include a restatement of the problem and the procedures used, a summary of the results of the investigation, conclusions and recommendations.

Summary

This chapter has included the background of the study, the purpose of the investigation, basic considerations and definition of terms, the major questions to be investigated, the importance of the study and an overview of the total report.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

The literature and research which were related to this report have been examined according to three areas which were pertinent to the study: (1) teacher characteristics; (2) rating of teachers; and (3) teaching the disadvantaged.

Teacher Characteristics

Although numerous studies have been conducted in an attempt to determine what behavioral characteristics are essential to "effective teaching," there still is no single definition or list of characteristics and behaviors which are universally acceptable.

Not only has there been disagreement as to the essential characteristics of effective teaching, but there apparently has been a lack of research on the behaviors and characteristics of teachers in specific situations and in different cultural settings.

The most comprehensive study of teacher characteristics and behaviors in recent years was the Teacher Characteristics Study of the American Council on Education, which was directed
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by Ryans\(^1\) in 1960. This investigation was based on two primary assumptions, which in turn were based on the assumptions and findings of previous researchers. For the purpose of the study, Ryans defined teacher behavior as "the behavior, or activities, of persons as they go about doing whatever is required of teachers, particularly those activities which are concerned with the guidance or direction of others."\(^2\)

Two implications of the Ryans' definition of teacher behavior were that (1) teacher behavior is social behavior and (2) teacher behavior is relative. The teacher operates within a social milieu which minimally includes pupils who interact with the teacher and with each other, and who are presumably influenced by the behavior of the teacher.

The implication that teacher behavior is relative was one of the inherent assumptions of the investigation reported herein, which examined the perceptions of beginning and experienced elementary teachers in different school settings according to the views of the teachers themselves, their principals and the teachers' pupils.

Rabinowitz and Travers\(^3\) had discovered earlier that the


\(^2\)\textit{loc. cit.}, p. 15.

effectiveness of teacher behavior was dependent upon the extent that such behavior conformed or failed to conform to a particular culture's value system or objectives related to the activities expected of a teacher, the kinds of pupil learning desired and the methods of teaching to be employed to bring about this learning.

A broader understanding of a composite theory of teacher behavior is possible through the examination of the two major assumptions, with their respective postulates, as presented by Ryans:¹

Assumption I: Teacher behavior is a function of situational factors and characteristics of the individual teacher.

Postulate IA: Teacher behavior is characterized by some degree of consistency. It is consistent, reliable and capable of being predicted.

Postulate IB: Teacher behavior is characterized by a limited number of responses.

Postulate IC: Teacher behavior is always probable rather than certain, and behavior can be predicted only with varying degrees of probability.

Postulate ID: Teacher behavior is a function of personal characteristics of the individual teacher. Knowledge of such characteristics contributes to prediction, within limits, of teacher behavior.

Postulate IE: Teacher behavior is a function of general features of the situation in which it takes place. Information about such relevant features assists in the prediction, within limits, of teacher behavior.

¹op. cit., pp. 16-23.
Postulate IF: Teacher behavior is a function of the specific situation in which it takes place. It is determined, in part, by unique features of the particular situation in which it has its setting at a particular time.

Assumption II: Teacher behavior is observable. It may be identified objectively through approaches that provide correlative indices of teacher behaviors.

Postulate IIA: Teacher behaviors are distinguishable. Certain features are capable of being identified and described so as to be distinguishable from other teacher behaviors. These behaviors can be distinguished by observation.

Postulate IIB: Teacher behaviors are classifiable qualitatively and quantitatively. Teacher behaviors which have many resemblances to one another may be categorized by simply grouping those which may have many similarities and relatively few important differences.

Postulate IIC: Teacher behaviors are revealed through overt behavior and also by symptoms or correlates of behavior. Teacher behaviors may be revealed either (1) by the representative sampling of specific acts or (2) by specific signs, or correlates, of the behavior under consideration.

Ryans made a study of all the available teacher rating scales which incorporated teacher traits and characteristics in an attempt to identify the common and frequently appearing elements of the various devices. Among the criteria suggested by Ryans\(^1\) in selecting relevant teaching behaviors were:

1. The behavior should be within the personal-social domain.

2. The behavior should be one for which there is considerable evidence, preferably both logical and empirical, of its relation to teaching.

\(^{1}\text{op. cit., pp. 78-9.}\)
3. The behavior should be describable in unambiguous terms.

4. The behavior should be observable.

5. Insofar as possible, the behavior should be equally applicable to teachers in different kinds of school settings.

6. Selection of a behavior should be independent of a particular philosophy or theory of education.

Throughout the literature which was concerned with the characteristics and behaviors of teachers was the recurring emphasis upon the influence of situational factors.

Howsam\(^1\) expressed a concern for the effect that the situational setting has upon any assessment of effective teaching traits, characteristics and behaviors. He emphasized that future attention should be directed toward specific and situational aspects of teacher behavior, as opposed to those which may be general, regardless of the setting.

Part of a longitudinal study which was conducted in Indiana by Turner\(^2\) was concerned with the relationships between the characteristics and success of beginning teachers in school systems typed according to their characteristics. Specifically, he sought to interpret why certain teaching characteristics are differentially linked to success in different types of school


settings. An analysis of the Turner data indicated three major categories or sets of variables that seemed to affect "teacher effectiveness:" (1) those associated with the institutional context within which the teacher teaches; (2) those associated with work tasks of the teacher; and (3) those associated with the personal context generated by the teacher.

Turner found that the set of variables associated with the institutional context dominated the other two sets, in that they were found to control or moderate relationships among the variables of the three sets. He concluded that "assessments of teaching skill, success and effectiveness were directly attributable to the relationship between the characteristics of the teacher and the institutional context within which he taught."¹

Rating of Teachers

It has been pointed out that there is not a universally agreed upon definition of, nor a consensus on, the specific characteristics of "good teaching." Neither is there universal agreement as to the method which is the most effective for evaluating the process of teaching and the performance of teachers.

Based on previous experience and a survey of the literature, there appeared to be general agreement that more than a

¹loc. cit., pp. 57-8.
single source should be used in the rating and evaluating of teachers. The four main sources of such ratings have been:

(1) reports by supervisors and administrators; (2) self-evaluations by teachers; (3) reports by trained observers; and (4) ratings by pupils.

Ryans¹ pointed out that the rating of a teacher’s characteristics and behaviors must be considered to be relative to at least two major sets of conditions: (1) the social or cultural group within which the teacher operates, involving social values which frequently differ from one school to another, and (2) the grade level taught. In addition to these two major sets of conditions, rating schemes have commonly taken into consideration the experience and training of the teacher.

A review of the research on the assessment of teacher characteristics indicates the significance of the role that personal characteristics play in the rating of teacher performance. Several studies have indicated that the perceptions of the characteristics and behaviors of teachers were affected by the backgrounds and attitudes of the raters. An investigation by Bryan² disclosed that a significant relationship existed between the quality of teacher appraisal and the degree of

¹op. cit., p. 4.

similarity between rater and teacher.

Kerlinger\(^1\) found that in any attempt to determine the constituents of effective teaching, it was necessary to recognize the rater's basic orientation and some of the underlying factors which may have been operating to predispose his perceptions.

The results of an investigation by Musella\(^2\) indicated that (1) the rating of teacher effectiveness is a function of the perceptual cognitive style of the rater and ratee and (2) the personal characteristics of the rater and ratee are related to the rating of teachers by principals.

Turner's\(^3\) study suggested that a supervisor has a concept of the prevailing type of child with which his school deals and the teacher characteristics and behaviors that are most relevant to teaching children of that particular type. Specifically, he found that in appraising beginning teachers, the emphasis of supervisory personnel in "working class" schools was on teacher task performance, such as the ability to diagnose learning difficulties and to organize materials,


\(^3\)op. cit., pp. 56-7.
whereas in "middle class" schools the emphasis of the supervisory personnel shifted away from task performance toward an emphasis on the personal-social characteristics of the teacher. He suggested that although his findings must be considered tentatively, they did seem to provide partially productive leads through which subsequent research may gain better understanding of the relationships between the diverse characteristics of teachers and the kind of teaching environment to which particular subsets of these characteristics will be most adaptive.

It is possible to infer from the literature that the rating process is itself a function of the characteristics of both the rater and ratee, particularly in the instance of superordinate-subordinate interactions in school systems.

The procedure whereby the supervisor-administrator was the primary, and usually the sole, evaluator of a teacher's effectiveness has been the most common means of teacher assessment throughout the history of public education. However, a recent study by Hain and Smith\(^1\) presented a rationale for the need to share the process of teacher evaluation. They pointed out that as teachers become more militant and demanding, the area of evaluation will assume major proportions. They also stressed that it is inconceivable that the principal, alone,

\(^1\)Hain, John H. and Smith, George J., "How Principals Rate Teachers," American School Board Journal, CLV (February 1968), 17-8.
can effectively supervise and evaluate the increasing numbers of teachers. It was recommended that procedures for evaluation should be developed jointly by administrators and teachers.

A second development has been a preponderance of relatively recent research findings regarding pupils' ratings of teachers. The results of these investigations have provided a considerable impetus for the use of pupil rating instruments in teacher assessment.

Several studies have indicated that pupils' ratings are highly accurate indicators of teacher behavior. One of the strongest arguments for the use of pupil ratings is that they are based on a variety of situations on a regular basis.

Lauroesch\(^1\) and his associates contended that since the pupils in a teacher's class have an opportunity to observe all of his classroom behavior, they are in a position to be the most knowledgeable source of information about his day-to-day classroom performance. Although they believed that it would be unreasonable to expect pupils to be expert judges of all aspects of teaching performance, they posited that:

"... collectively, there are some aspects of teaching which pupils are able to observe quite reliably. If one were able to tap this source of information and have confidence in it, it would be a valuable supplement to information from other sources."\(^2\)


\(^2\)ibid.
The most careful development of a reliable procedure for soliciting student opinion has been carried out by Bryan in the Student Reaction Center at Western Michigan University for over a period of thirty years.

As early as 1941 Bryan found a significant agreement among pupils who rated the same teacher. He found a very high agreement about what the pupils considered to be strong and weak qualities of their teachers.

In a recent article, Bryan emphatically stated that student reactions are accurate reflections of teacher effectiveness. He contended that:

"Other things being equal, the teacher who conducts classes that students find challenging and interesting is more effective than the one who conducts classes that bore students; the teacher who gets cooperation in the pursuit of classroom objectives is more effective than one who fails to get students to concentrate on classroom business; and the teacher who is loved and respected is more effective than one who is hated or regarded with contempt."

An investigation by Bryan regarding the extent of

---


2 Bryan, Roy C., "Reliability, Validity and Needfulness of Written Student Reactions to Teachers," Educational Administration and Supervision, XXVII (December 1941), 513-26.


agreement between students and administrators on the item of classroom control revealed that there was considerable agreement between students' and administrators' standards of control. On two separate occasions he obtained correlations of .61 and .68 between the students' and administrators' ratings. The same study revealed that students think that beginning teachers do not control classroom behavior as well as experienced teachers who had three or more years of experience. A statistically significant difference was found on four other questionnaire items which favored the experienced teachers over the beginning teachers.

Another pertinent finding of the investigation seemed to indicate that there was a relationship between different items on the questionnaire. It was found that teachers who have poor control over students are deficient in one or more other respects. A common combination was poor control and uninteresting classes. Also, very few teachers who were lax in control had high student reaction averages on the other questions.

The findings of a study by Webb and Nolan, however, differed from those of Bryan on the question of agreement among raters. They found that when teachers rated themselves and were also rated by their principals and pupils, the pupil-ratings and self-ratings were highly correlated, whereas the

---

principals' ratings were not correlated with either the self-ratings or the pupil ratings.

A study by Amatora\textsuperscript{1} investigated three specific questions related to teacher ratings by elementary school pupils: (1) Can pupils discriminate among teachers? (2) How stable are the average pupil ratings of their teachers? (3) What is the degree of agreement among the pupil raters?

The pupils rated their teachers on the Diagnostic Teacher Rating Scale.\textsuperscript{2} The scale included seven items:

1. Liking for teacher
2. Teacher's ability to explain
3. Kindness, friendliness and understanding
4. Fairness
5. Discipline
6. Amount of work required
7. Liking for lessons

Based on the responses to the above items on a five-point value scale, Amatora found that elementary pupils were (1) fairly stable in their ratings of teachers and (2) exhibited a satisfactory degree of both agreement and discrimination. They indicated that the most important area so far as they were concerned was "fairness."

A later study by Bryan\textsuperscript{3} substantiated the stability of

\textsuperscript{1}Amatora, Sister Mary, "Teacher Rating by Younger Pupils," \textit{Journal of Teacher Education}, V (June 1954), 149-52.


students' images of their teachers. The findings revealed that marked changes in a student's image of his teacher did not take place in short periods of time.

Among the attributes which Amatora\textsuperscript{1} claimed for the use of pupils' ratings of teachers were:

1. Students are frank in their opinions of their teachers.
2. Students see their teachers daily in both good and adverse circumstances.
3. Student criticism may acquaint the teacher with hitherto unknown undesirable qualities.
4. Student rating is one easy, convenient and economical way for a teacher to see himself as he is perceived daily by his class.

Other researchers have reiterated, substantiated and extended Amatora's list in recent years. While the first reaction of many to the use of pupil ratings is usually one of aversion, the responses from those who have some acquaintance with its procedures and who have actually participated in its use have generally been favorable and at times have even been enthusiastic in endorsement of the practice.

Teaching the Disadvantaged

An abundance of literature on inner-city schools, including generalizations about urban, minority group children, what they should be taught, how they should be taught and who will teach them, has been published in recent years.

Much of the concern for urban schools was precipitated

\textsuperscript{1}Amatora, "Teacher Rating by Younger Pupils," op. cit., p. 151.
by the stark realization that far less than the required numbers of beginning teachers decided to commence their teaching careers in inner-city schools.

Although it is probably a safe assumption that some teachers are interested in schools that serve disadvantaged children, the general pattern has been one of avoidance. There have been no waiting lines for transfer into the inner-city schools.

Miller's contention that "very few teachers of either race wish to teach in minority schools" has been corroborated by other writers.

Goldberg reported that in a recent year better than one-third of the new teachers appointed to Manhattan schools declined their appointments. Although they had "prepared to teach," they apparently preferred almost any other kind of appointment, or none at all, to teaching in the slum school.

Principals in inner-city schools are finding it increasingly difficult to retain good teachers and recruit new ones. In many inner-city schools few, if any, student teachers have been assigned for student teaching during the past year.

Smiley summed up her contention that the preparation,

1 op. cit., p. 214.


recruitment and retention of teachers for "difficult" urban schools is a major educational problem with a quote from the principal of such a school. "I have made an appointment with a candidate and seen her drive up to the school, look around the neighborhood and then drive away."

The research of Havighurst\(^1\) in the Chicago schools regarding the attitudes of elementary school teachers toward their present positions in the "lower class" and slum schools revealed that only seventeen per cent held a "very favorable" attitude, as opposed to sixty-five per cent of their counterparts in the upper- and middle-class schools. Only approximately one-fourth as many teachers in the inner-city schools felt "very favorable" about their present positions than did the suburban teachers.

An even greater disparity between the teachers of the two types of schools was found regarding those who responded that their attitudes were "unfavorable" or "very unfavorable." Whereas only four per cent of the teachers in the suburban schools had "unfavorable" or "very unfavorable" attitudes toward their present positions, a total of twenty-two per cent of the teachers in the lower class and slum schools revealed that they held "unfavorable" or "very unfavorable" attitudes toward their positions.

With regard to teachers who had requested transfers, Havighurst found that two-and-one-half times as many teachers in the inner-city schools had requested transfers than had teachers in suburban schools. He also found that the median years of teaching experience of regularly assigned teachers in these "difficult" schools was only four, compared with nineteen years for teachers in the "most favored" schools and areas.

Havighurst's study also revealed that there is deep ambivalence about teaching in a "difficult" school. The elementary teachers who have had experience in such schools divide almost evenly between those who felt they were successful and enjoyed working with disadvantaged students and those who did not like their assignments.

A significant concern for the future is whether teachers who are now undergoing training and who will probably be assigned to inner-city schools are likely to contribute to the solution of problems faced by disadvantaged, urban youngsters.

Among the threads that ran throughout the literature dealing with the need for teachers who can teach successfully in schools where the pupils were predominantly from minority groups was the allegation that contemporary programs in teacher education have not been designed to train the required numbers of teachers with the requisite skills that would enable them to teach successfully in inner-city schools.
Wisniewski stated that:

"The majority of people preparing to teach have made up their minds that they would rather teach in "nice" areas, which generally means with green lawns and white residents. Even though efforts are under way at some urban universities to redirect teachers to the inner-city schools, the basic facts of teacher education have not changed. Most of our beginning teachers do not wish to become involved in the inner-city. Programs to recruit people to teach in deprived areas must be greatly expanded and the programs seeking to develop capable inner-city teachers need far more support if the pattern of avoidance is to be seriously challenged. At this juncture, most schools of education have barely begun to satisfy the great need in this area."

Wisniewski further charges that there is a vital need for a "new breed" of teachers and believes that what is sorely needed in teacher education is a far more realistic preparation program for the tasks that teachers actually face. While he recognizes that nearly all teacher training programs contain some student teaching activities which afford the neophyte a brief "apprenticeship," he contends that:

"Education is a profession in which the first-year teacher is asked to perform the same tasks and exhibit the same skills as the twenty-year veteran. There is a tremendous need, therefore, for teacher preparation programs to accomplish two tasks: (1) to train neophytes in the skills which are essential for teaching and (2) to relate this training closely to apprenticeship programs in the schools."  

Whereas most of the earlier literature emphasized the characteristics and behaviors of the urban child, much of

---


the more recent research has been directed toward the teachers in the inner-city schools in an effort to determine what areas should be emphasized in their preservice and inservice programs.

Fantini and Weinstein¹ contend that:

"Usually we talk about wanting good teachers for our schools, but we rarely talk about good teachers for what? We expect a single teacher to be able to effectively cover all kinds of subjects and objectives whether he is comfortable with them or not."

Wisniewski was concerned that the bulk of the literature has been based almost entirely on the premise that if the teacher knows the child he can be more effective and the child will like school and learn more. He stated:

"When teachers are discussed, they are often portrayed as either highly dedicated and doing well; new to the profession and floundering; incompetent but all you can get in the inner-city; or disillusioned and bitter and awaiting transfer. All of these types can indeed be found in any large inner-city school. The premise that (merely) knowing more about the life of the disadvantaged child will lead to more positive thinking must be challenged."²

Becker³ found that Chicago teachers reacted in different manners to the social classes of the children they taught.

²op. cit., p. 9.
Teachers frequently reported special problems in teaching approaches, acceptance and particularly in discipline when dealing with lower class children. The teachers felt that many of their problems were due to the fact that they were dealing with children who were not generally geared through background or attitude to the common pedagogical techniques that the teachers attempted to use with them.

The Becker study indicated that the teachers frequently felt that they had failed because they were "not reaching the students." It was reported that the students were not motivated because their lessons were not relevant to their real life experiences. Becker also found that the problems of the teachers became more aggravated in each succeeding grade as the gap became wider between what the children were "expected" to know and what they in fact did know.

Bernstein\(^1\) believed that the "average" teacher can generally do a satisfactory job with the middle class student, but is disinclined to deal with the lower class urban pupil. He feels that most teachers are apprehensive of these "products of sociopathology" and definitely have not been trained to teach them. He goes on to state that:

"The teaching of pedagogy has been limited to things that are comparatively trivial and superficial in the past. When it comes to actual

teaching, the really important things have been relegated to an intangible called 'teacher personality.' Many things that have been considered unmanageable in the teaching of pedagogy because they were parts of teacher personality now are seen to be actually paralinguistic and kinesic. 1

The findings of a recent study by Scott 2 led to several statements about differences between teaching behaviors in inner-city schools versus non-inner-city schools. Among the general differences which she found were:

1. Many situations that happen about once a week in non-inner-city classrooms occur about once a day in inner-city classrooms.

2. More situations requiring structured classroom controls and task directions occur in inner-city than non-inner-city schools.

3. A greater portion of teacher activity is given to managerial tasks in inner-city than in non-inner-city classrooms.

4. Inner-city teachers change activities more frequently than do non-inner-city teachers.

5. Non-inner-city teachers spend more time on planned social experiences than do inner-city teachers. Inner-city teachers rely more upon spontaneous situations for social experiences.

6. Inner-city teachers give more diverse attention to encouraging, reassuring and giving approval to their pupils, while non-inner-city teachers spend more time spurring pupils on to increased activity.

1loc. cit., p. 64.

While Scott came to the conclusion that most teaching behaviors that are considered to be appropriate for effective teaching in the non-inner-city schools are considered to be equally appropriate for inner-city classrooms, the frequency with which they occur, and the degree to which certain behaviors are employed showed significant differences in the two types of schools.

Goldberg\(^1\) contended that since there was little systematic data and a limited amount of empirical evidence on precisely what successful and unsuccessful teachers of the disadvantaged do, it may be worthwhile to create a hypothetical model of "the successful teacher of the disadvantaged child." She indicated that it may well be that several models of teachers will be needed to account for the great variety of pupils from different backgrounds who attend different types of schools.

It appears that the Scott study has made a contribution to the challenge made by Goldberg and others. The research findings which are revealed in this report are a further attempt to challenge or to substantiate some of the generalities of previous investigations.

The following chapter describes the research design, setting and procedures of the investigation.

\(^1\)op. cit., p. 161.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN, SETTING AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of this section of the report is to describe: (1) the overall research design; (2) the setting in which the investigation was conducted; (3) the development of the procedures which were followed, including the selection of the sample, the development and administration of the instrument and preliminary activities; and (4) the collection and organization of the data.

Review of the Problem

The overall purpose of this study was to determine the relation between the perceptions of teachers, based on three reference groups, and the two independent variables of teacher experience and type of school. The three reference groups were the teachers themselves, their principals and the teachers’ pupils. The types of schools were inner-city and suburban elementary schools. Teachers were categorized as beginning and experienced teachers. A related objective was to determine the extent of agreement regarding perceptions of teachers between the (a) teacher and principal; (b) teacher and pupils; and (c) principal and pupils.
Major Questions Which Were Investigated

Fifty-four specific questions were investigated in the attempt to carry out the purposes of this study. Questions 1-9 were designed to provide data regarding the three major questions which pertained to the relation between the perceptions of teachers and the two independent variables of teacher experience and type of school:

1. What is the relation between the independent variable, type of school, and the dependent variable, perceptions of teachers, as viewed by the teachers themselves, their principals and the teachers' pupils?

2. What is the relation between the independent variable, experience of the teacher, and the dependent variable, perceptions of teachers, as viewed by the teachers themselves, their principals and the teachers' pupils?

3. What is the relation of the interaction between the independent variables, type of school and experience of the teacher, with the dependent variable, perceptions of teachers, as viewed by the teachers themselves, their principals and the teachers' pupils?

Questions 10-18 were designed to provide data regarding the fourth major question of the investigation:

4. What is the extent of agreement regarding perceptions of teachers between the (a) teacher and principal; (b) teacher and pupils; and (c) principal and pupils?
Each question was investigated as three related questions. The perceptions of the teachers, principals and pupils were examined according to each respondent group. Listed below are the fifty-four specific questions which were investigated:

Specific Questions Which Were Investigated

1A: What is the relation between type of school and the teachers' self-perceptions on all items?

1B: What is the relation between experience of the teacher and the teachers' self-perceptions on all items?

1C: What is the relation of the interaction between type of school and experience of the teacher with the teachers' self-perceptions on all items?

2A: What is the relation between type of school and the teachers' self-perceptions on the pupil-centered items?

2B: What is the relation between experience of the teacher and the teachers' self-perceptions on the pupil-centered items?

2C: What is the relation of the interaction between type of school and experience of the teacher with the teachers' self-perceptions on the pupil-centered items?

3A: What is the relation between type of school and the teachers' self-perceptions on the teacher-centered items?

3B: What is the relation between experience of the teacher and the teachers' self-perceptions on the teacher-centered items?

3C: What is the relation of the interaction between type of school and experience of the teacher with the teachers' self-perceptions on the teacher-centered items?
4A: What is the relation between type of school and the principals' perceptions on all items?

4B: What is the relation between experience of the teacher and the principals' perceptions on all items?

4C: What is the relation of the interaction between type of school and experience of the teacher with the principals' perceptions on all items?

5A: What is the relation between type of school and the principals' perceptions on the pupil-centered items?

5B: What is the relation between experience of the teacher and the principals' perceptions on the pupil-centered items?

5C: What is the relation of the interaction between type of school and experience of the teacher with the principals' perceptions on the pupil-centered items?

6A: What is the relation between type of school and the principals' perceptions on the teacher-centered items?

6B: What is the relation between experience of the teacher and the principals' perceptions on the teacher-centered items?

6C: What is the relation of the interaction between type of school and experience of the teacher with the principals' perceptions on the teacher-centered items?

7A: What is the relation between type of school and the pupils' perceptions on all items?

7B: What is the relation between experience of the teacher and the pupils' perceptions on all items?

7C: What is the relation of the interaction between type of school and experience of the teacher with the pupils' perceptions on all items?

8A: What is the relation between type of school and the pupils' perceptions on the pupil-centered items?
8B: What is the relation between experience of the teacher and the pupils' perceptions on the pupil-centered items?

8C: What is the relation of the interaction between type of school and experience of the teacher with the pupils' perceptions on the pupil-centered items?

9A: What is the relation between type of school and the pupils' perceptions on the teacher-centered items?

9B: What is the relation between experience of the teacher and the pupils' perceptions on the teacher-centered items?

9C: What is the relation of the interaction between type of school and experience of the teacher with the pupils' perceptions on the teacher-centered items?

10A: To what extent do the responses of all teachers concur with the responses of their respective principals?

10B: To what extent do the responses of all teachers concur with the responses of their respective pupils?

10C: To what extent do the responses of all pupils concur with the responses of their respective principals?

11A: To what extent do the responses of inner-city teachers concur with their principals' responses?

11B: To what extent do the responses of inner-city teachers concur with their pupils' responses?

11C: To what extent do the responses of inner-city pupils concur with the responses of their respective principals?

12A: To what extent do the responses of suburban teachers concur with their principals' responses?
12B: To what extent do the responses of suburban teachers concur with their pupils' responses?

12C: To what extent do the responses of suburban pupils concur with the responses of their respective principals?

13A: To what extent do the responses of beginning teachers concur with their principals' responses?

13B: To what extent do the responses of beginning teachers concur with their pupils' responses?

13C: To what extent do the responses of pupils with beginning teachers concur with their principals' responses?

14A: To what extent do the responses of experienced teachers concur with their principals' responses?

14B: To what extent do the responses of experienced teachers concur with their pupils' responses?

14C: To what extent do the responses of pupils with experienced teachers concur with their principals' responses?

15A: To what extent do the responses of beginning teachers in inner-city schools concur with their principals' responses?

15B: To what extent do the responses of beginning teachers in inner-city schools concur with their pupils' responses?

15C: To what extent do the responses of pupils with beginning teachers in inner-city schools concur with their principals' responses?

16A: To what extent do the responses of experienced teachers in inner-city schools concur with their principals' responses?

16B: To what extent do the responses of experienced teachers in inner-city schools concur with their pupils' responses?
16C: To what extent do the responses of pupils with experienced teachers in inner-city schools concur with their principals' responses?

17A: To what extent do the responses of beginning teachers in suburban schools concur with their principals' responses?

17B: To what extent do the responses of beginning teachers in suburban schools concur with their pupils' responses?

17C: To what extent do the responses of pupils with beginning teachers in suburban schools concur with their principals' responses?

18A: To what extent do the responses of experienced teachers in suburban schools concur with their principals' responses?

18B: To what extent do the responses of experienced teachers in suburban schools concur with their pupils' responses?

18C: To what extent do the responses of pupils with experienced teachers in suburban schools concur with their principals' responses?

Research Design

In order to examine the relation between the independent variables, type of school and experience of the teacher, and the dependent variable, perceptions of teachers, a two-way factorial analysis, as presented by Kerlinger,¹ and as depicted in Figure 1 on the following page, was selected as the most appropriate design for the investigation of Questions 1-9. The

dependent variable in each cell of the cross-partition was the mean response for each subgroup of the entire sample. The differences yielded by such a design were reported in the form of F-ratios, as suggested by Hays.¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>Inner-City</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience of Teacher</td>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1. Factorial Analysis Cross-Partition

In order to determine the extent of agreement on the questionnaire items between the perceptions of different groups of respondents, as investigated in Questions 10-18, tables of product-moment coefficients of correlation were selected as the most appropriate means for analysis.

The statistical significance of each Pearsonian coefficient of correlation, r, was determined according to a t-test and reported as a level of confidence, p, as depicted in Figure 2 on the following page.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher x Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher x Pupils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal x Pupils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = number of responses  
r = coefficient of correlation  
p = level of confidence

Fig. 2. Coefficient of Correlation Model

Selection of the Instrument

As cited previously in Chapter II, the most comprehensive, recent study on teacher characteristics and behaviors was that of Ryans.\(^1\) His identification of characteristics and behaviors, based on an extensive survey of the literature, included the following items, which were believed to summarize the critical behaviors and characteristics of teachers:\(^2\)

1. Alertness and enthusiasm  
2. Cheerfulness and optimism  
3. Self-control  
4. Sense of humor  
5. Fairness, impartiality and objectivity in the treatment of pupils  
6. Understanding and patience in working with pupils  
7. Friendliness and courtesy toward pupils  
8. Acceptance of pupils' efforts  
9. Encouragement of pupils  
10. Planning and organization  
11. Stimulation of pupil interest  
12. Clarity of explanations  
13. Manner of discipline  
14. Clarity and thoroughness in giving directions

\(^1\)op. cit.  
\(^2\)loc. cit., p. 82.
A reliable procedure and instrument, the "Student Opinion Questionnaire," had been carefully developed and employed by Bryan over a period of thirty years. The items on Bryan's questionnaire included those items which were considered by Ryans and others to be "critical characteristics and behaviors of teachers."

Since Bryan's instrument had been proven to be reliable and useful in measuring student opinions of teachers at the secondary level, it was selected as an appropriate instrument to be adapted for use by upper elementary pupils and their teachers and principals. On it they could indicate their perceptions of the teachers according to the following twelve items:

1. Knowledge of Subject
2. Clarity of Explanations
3. Fairness
4. Classroom Control
5. Attitude Toward Pupils
6. Ability to Stimulate Interest
7. Attitude Toward Student Opinions
8. Variety in Teaching Procedures
9. Encouragement of Pupil Participation
10. Sense of Humor
11. Planning and Preparation
12. Assignments

The reliability of Bryan's scale had been checked frequently and those scales with low reliabilities had been replaced with scales with higher reliabilities. As indicated in

---

1Bryan, "Some Observations Concerning Written Reactions to High School Teachers," op. cit.
Table 1, most of the reliability coefficients for the items on Bryan's questionnaire ranged from .80 to .90.¹

**TABLE 1**

RELIABILITY OF ITEMS ON BRYAN'S STUDENT-OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Reliability Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reliability coefficients of the twelve items indicated in Table 1 were based on the responses of twenty-four to thirty-two students per class. The correlation coefficients were based on the chance halves of the averages of student responses from fifty randomly selected classes and were converted to the reported coefficients for whole classes by means of the Spearman-Brown formula for determining test reliability.

¹loc. cit., p. 3.
The work of Bryan at Western Michigan University has been continued and extended in recent years by Coats.¹ The "Student Reaction Center" has been renamed the "Educator Feedback Center," reflecting its broader scope, and the "Student-Opinion Questionnaire" has been revised to the "Teacher Image Questionnaire."

The partial findings of a recent study by Coats² revealed that one basic factor, "charisma," or "popularity," seemed to underlie students' perceptions of their teachers. The same study indicated, however, that two secondary, and less clear, factors appeared to be evident. An examination of the twelve items on the "Teacher Image Questionnaire" suggested that several of the items were primarily "teacher-centered," whereas other items seemed to be essentially "pupil-centered."

For the purposes of this investigation, the seven items which are indicated in Table 2 on the following page were classified as "teacher-centered" items in that they were based primarily on the knowledges, skills and methods of the teacher.


TABLE 2
TEACHER-CENTERED ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Knowledge of Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Clarity of Explanations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Classroom Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ability to Stimulate Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Variety in Teaching Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Planning and Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Assignments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the purposes of this investigation, the five items indicated in Table 3 were classified as "pupil-centered" items in that they were based primarily on attitudes and interpersonal relationships between the teacher and pupils.

TABLE 3
PUPIL-CENTERED ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fairness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Attitude Toward Pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Attitude Toward Student Opinions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Encouragement of Pupil Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sense of Humor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Permission was granted by the Educator Feedback Center at Western Michigan University to adapt the "Teacher Image Questionnaire" for use in this study. Three questionnaires, which included the same twelve items, were developed for the
purpose of obtaining the data for this investigation. The "Elementary Teacher Self-Questionnaire," the "Elementary Principal Questionnaire," and the "Elementary Pupil Questionnaire" and response forms are included in Appendixes B, C and D, respectively, of this report.

The Setting

The locale which served as the setting for this study was a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA) in the midwestern region of the United States. This SMSA included an entire county which had a total population of approximately one-half million persons, according to the most recent census and the estimated growth figures for the area during the nine-year interval between 1960 and the time that the investigation was conducted.

The SMSA in which the study was conducted was selected primarily because it included numerous elementary schools which could be classified as "inner-city" and "suburban," for the purposes of this study. The hub of the area was a densely-populated and highly-industrialized city which included approximately one-half of the area's total population. The city and one adjoining municipal district included an area which contained a predominantly non-white populace and that had numerous elementary schools which met the criteria for designation as "inner-city schools," as defined in this report.
The neighborhoods within the city which were located near the city limits were predominantly all-white areas. The elementary schools which served these neighborhoods met the criteria for designation as "suburban schools," as used in this study.

The populations of the municipalities and school districts which surrounded the city included predominantly white residents, and in most cases the non-white population was considerably less than one per cent of each respective census tract. All of the elementary schools in these districts met the criteria for designation as "suburban schools," as used in this report.

The remainder of the SMSA included out-county areas that were mostly rural and were not included in the population from which the samples were selected for this investigation.

Selection of the Sample

Based on statistical data which were obtained from public records and provided by officials of the school districts in the SMSA, those elementary schools which could be classified as either "inner-city" or "suburban," according to the definitions in Chapter I of this report, were identified.

The only two districts in the population which contained inner-city elementary schools were both selected to participate in the investigation. Two additional school districts were selected at random for inclusion in the study.
The appropriate administrative officer in each of the school districts was contacted by letter initially. The intent of the letter was to describe briefly the purpose of the investigation and to request a personal conference with the administrator, in order that the study could be described more specifically and that a request could be made for permission to conduct a portion of the investigation in his district.

All four of the administrators who were contacted agreed to a personal conference. During the individual conferences with the respective administrators, the general purpose of the investigation was explained and cooperation in the study was solicited. The administrators expressed a concern about the anonymity of the study with regard to the identification of the district, the individual schools and the persons who would participate as respondents to the instruments. It was found that these concerns for anonymity were conditioned by a private study which had been conducted in the area recently. Although the earlier study was not related to the proposed investigation, the manner in which it had been conducted and the method by which the findings had been disseminated were not approved by the school administration of the district in which it had been conducted. Assurances were given to each administrator that the anonymity of his district and all respondents would be maintained both during the investigation and in the final report.
Schools were selected, at random, from all of those in the districts that were classified as inner-city and suburban and which contained both fifth and sixth grade classrooms.

Personnel records were examined to determine the names of the teachers in each school who met the criteria for "beginning" and "experienced" teachers. Teachers of special subjects, such as art, music and physical education, were not included in the population from which the samples were selected. In every school, there were more experienced fifth and sixth grade teachers than there were beginning teachers at the same grade levels. Every fifth and sixth grade beginning teacher in the selected schools was included in the sample and a like number of experienced fifth and sixth grade teachers in the same building was selected at random. Table 4, below, and Table 5, on the following page, indicate the distribution of the teachers and schools which were included in the study.

**TABLE 4**

**DISTRIBUTION OF INNER-CITY SCHOOLS IN WHICH QUESTIONNAIRES WERE ADMINISTERED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Procedures for the Study**

The district administrator contacted the principals of the schools which had been selected, informed them of the general nature of the study and that it had the support of the district administration, assured them of the anonymity of the research procedures and the resultant report and told them that a prior, personal contact would be made with them, in order to arrange for the visit to each building for the administration of the questionnaires.

Private meetings were held with each of the fifteen building principals, in order to explain the study in general terms, to schedule the date and the time for the administration of the instruments and to set up the specific time schedule for the administration of the questionnaires in each classroom.
The principals were instructed to inform the teachers that they had been selected, at random, to participate in a research study which had been approved by the school district's central administration and that was to be conducted by a qualified investigator from outside of their district. The teachers were informed that the responses which would be collected in their respective classrooms were only a part of the overall study. They were assured that the individual responses which the pupils, the teachers themselves and the principal indicated on the questionnaires would not be shared with anyone.

The schedule for the administration of the instruments included the entire month of May. This month of the school year was selected intentionally, on the assumption that the longer the pupils had been with their teachers and the more time that the principals had to observe their teachers, the more opportunities each participant would have had upon which to base his responses to the items on the questionnaires.

Preliminary Activity

During the month of April, several trial administrations of the instrument were conducted in both inner-city and suburban schools in school districts which were located seven hundred miles from the area in which the actual study took place. The purposes of these trial administrations was to determine the average amount of time which was required for the administration of the instrument in each classroom, to identify
questions which were commonly asked by the respondents and to reveal any specific mechanical procedures which would enhance the standardization of the administration of the instruments and the gathering of the data.

Administration of the Instrument

A packet of materials was prepared for each classroom. Each packet included an "Elementary Teacher Self-Questionnaire" and response sheet (Appendix B), an "Elementary Principal Questionnaire" and response sheet (Appendix C) and enough "Elementary Pupil Questionnaires" (Appendix D) for each child in the class. A code number was placed on each response sheet in order that the teacher's, principal's and pupils' responses could be correlated later for purposes of analysis. A second function of the code number was to identify each packet according to the type of school and the experience of the teacher.

In addition to the code number, each Teacher and Principal Questionnaire had a separate card attached to it on which was indicated the teacher's name, room number and the time that was scheduled for the administration of the instruments in that room.

On the date assigned for each school, a brief, initial meeting was held with the principal. During this time the schedule was confirmed and the classroom locations where the instruments would be administered were pointed out. In every
instance, the administration of the questionnaires in each school building was carried out during the same half-day session, in order that the responses to the instrument could be obtained prior to any opportunity that the respondents would have to discuss their responses or reactions to the investigation with other respondents in the same building.

The principal was given an Elementary Principal Questionnaire and response sheet for each teacher in his building who was participating in the investigation. He was requested to indicate his response to each questionnaire item by marking the point on the response sheet continuum which indicated his perception of the teacher being considered. Upon completing his response sheet for each teacher, he was instructed to remove the attached card with the teacher's name on it and place both the questionnaire and the response sheet in the envelope which was provided for him. He was informed that the envelopes containing his responses would be collected after the classroom visits had been completed.

At the scheduled time, a brief meeting was held with the classroom teacher for approximately five minutes outside the classroom door while the pupils remained in the room. It was explained to the teacher that the purpose of the study was to determine how the teacher, himself, the principal and the pupils perceived the teacher according to the twelve items on the questionnaires. The teacher was instructed to respond
to each item by marking the point on the response sheet continuum which corresponded to each item on the instrument. He was told that his responses should be based on his experiences during the current school year with the pupils who were in the group that would respond to the Pupil Questionnaires. The teacher was not told that the study was based on comparisons between beginning and experienced teachers or between teachers from inner-city versus suburban schools.

The purpose of the code number on the response sheet was explained and the teacher was assured that his responses would be strictly confidential, along with the numerous other teachers' responses. The teacher retired to a private location to complete his response sheet during the same period of time that the Pupil Questionnaires were administered in the classroom. He was instructed to remove the identifying card with his name on it, place the questionnaire and the completed response sheet in the envelope which was provided for him and to remain outside the classroom until the administration of the Pupil Questionnaires had been completed.

Just prior to the administration of the Pupil Questionnaires, the pupils in each classroom had been informed that they would be requested to answer some questions for a visitor and that they were to cooperate with him.

The purpose of the visit to their classroom was explained to the pupils. They were told that their answers to the twelve questions which they would be asked, would be used, along with
the answers from hundreds of other fifth and sixth grade boys and girls, in a book that was to be written about what fifth and sixth grade pupils honestly think about their teachers.

It was stressed to the pupils that they were not to write their names, their teacher's name or the name of their school on the questionnaires. They were assured that their responses would not be shown to their teacher or to their principal, even though their names were not on the questionnaires. They were told that their responses would be fed into a computer along with the hundreds of other pupils' responses in order to provide the information which was needed for the study.

After rapport had been established with the group via the above introduction and usually a brief additional exchange, the meanings of the terms, "very good," "good," "average," "below average" and "poor," were discussed, defined and clarified. It was emphasized that only one of the five responses was to be indicated for each of the twelve questions. The pupils were informed that they were not to communicate or express their responses aloud at any time during the administration of the instrument. They further agreed that they would not discuss their responses among themselves or with their teacher.

The questionnaires were passed out and kept face down until every pupil had a copy. The pupils were told that, although the instrument might look like a test to them, there were no "right" or "wrong" answers. They were encouraged to think carefully about each question before indicating their
responses and to be as honest as they could in responding to each item.

The first question was read verbally while the pupils read it silently. After a pause, the pupils were instructed to circle the response which best indicated their perceptions of their teacher on that item. The same procedure was followed on the remaining eleven items, with each pupil responding to each question at the same time, and not until the question had been read aloud.

Upon completion of the pupils' responses to Item 12, the questionnaires were collected and placed in the appropriate envelope. The identifying card with the teacher's name and room number was removed from the pupil packet and given to the teacher in exchange for his questionnaire and completed response sheet.

The standardized procedure described above was adhered to in the fifteen schools and eighty classrooms in which the instruments were administered.

Collection and Organization of the Data

After the instruments had been administered to the entire sample of eighty teachers, principals and classrooms of fifth and sixth grade pupils, the responses were collated according to the assigned code numbers on each response sheet. The pupils' responses, in the form of a frequency distribution, were tallied on "Classroom Summary Report" forms (Appendix H), which
were completed for each of the eighty classrooms in which the instruments had been administered. The pupils' responses for each item were averaged in order to determine the mean pupil response for each item on the questionnaire. The teacher's self-responses and the principal's responses to each item were entered in the appropriate spaces on the "Classroom Summary Report."

A completed Classroom Summary Report included the teacher's response to each of the twelve items on the questionnaire, the principal's response to each item and the mean of the pupils' responses to each item. In addition, an overall mean was computed for all twelve responses of the teacher, principal and pupils.

The data from the eighty individual Classroom Summary Reports were keypunched into eighty data processing cards. A data processing program was compiled that would yield the statistical information that would be necessary for analysis according to the research design which was described earlier in this chapter. The presentation and analyses of these data are included in Chapter IV.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

In this chapter, the major findings of the study are described and analyzed. The presentation follows the sequence of the "Specific Questions to Be Investigated" in Chapter III.

The findings for questions 1-9 are reported in the form of tables of means and analysis of variance. The findings for Questions 10-18 are reported in the form of tables of product-moment coefficients of correlation.

Complete tables of the basic statistics for all combined groups and for different combinations of subgroups are presented in Appendixes E, F and G.

Questions 1-9 were concerned with the relation between the two independent variables, type of school and experience of the teacher, and the dependent variable of various perceptions. Each question was examined according to the teachers' responses, the principals' responses and the pupils' responses to: (a) all twelve items on the questionnaires; (b) the five pupil-centered items; and (c) the seven teacher-centered items.

Teachers' Perceptions

The first three questions (1-3) examined the relation between the independent variables, type of school and experience
of the teacher, and the dependent variable, teachers' perceptions, according to the teachers' self-responses to the questionnaire items.

Questions 1A, 1B and 1C examined the relation between the independent variables, type of school and experience of the teacher, and the dependent variable, teachers' perceptions, on all twelve items.

Question 1A: What is the relation between type of school and the teachers' self-perceptions on all twelve items?

The data suggest that suburban teachers rated themselves higher than did inner-city teachers. As indicated in Table 6 on the following page, the suburban teachers rated themselves with an overall average of 4.085, while the overall average of the inner-city teachers' self-responses was 3.949. According to Table 7 on the following page, the difference between the views which the teachers held of themselves according to the type of school was statistically significant at the .10 level of confidence. The nature of this relationship was such that suburban teachers seemed to have a higher view of themselves than inner-city teachers had of themselves.
TABLE 6
MEANS OF TEACHERS' RESPONSES TO ALL ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience of Teacher</th>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>Inner-City</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.782</td>
<td>3.913</td>
<td>3.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.116</td>
<td>4.257</td>
<td>4.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.949</td>
<td>4.085</td>
<td>4.017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 7
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF TEACHERS' RESPONSES TO ALL ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience of Teacher (R)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33130.0</td>
<td>16.986</td>
<td>.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of School (C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5347.0</td>
<td>2.741</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction (R x C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1950.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 1B: What is the relation between experience of the teacher and the teachers' self-perceptions on all items?

The data seem to indicate that experienced teachers rated themselves higher than did beginning teachers. According to Table 6, the experienced teachers' overall average was 4.187, as opposed to the beginning teachers' overall average of 3.848.
As indicated in Table 7, there is a statistically significant relation between the experience of the teacher and the views that teachers held of themselves. The difference was at the .0005 level of confidence. The nature of this relationship was such that experienced teachers seemed to have a much higher view of themselves than beginning teachers had of themselves.

Question 1C: What is the relation of the interaction between type of school and experience of the teacher with the teachers' self-perceptions on all items?

The data suggest quite clearly that type of school and experience of the teacher did not interact at a statistically significant level of probability, based on the teachers' self-perceptions on all twelve questionnaire items. An examination of the individual cells in Table 6 indicates that suburban teachers rated themselves consistently higher than did their inner-city counterparts, and experienced teachers rated themselves consistently higher than did beginning teachers.

The lack of a statistically significant interaction might be attributed to the highly significant difference between beginning and experienced teachers, compared with the level of confidence according to type of school. The nature of this relationship was such that the experience of the teacher seemed to be the dominant predictor variable of the teachers' self-perceptions on all twelve questionnaire items.

A summary analysis of Questions 1A, 1B and 1C, which were
concerned with the teachers' self-perceptions on all twelve items, suggested that: (1) suburban teachers seemed to have a higher view of themselves than inner-city teachers had of themselves; (2) experienced teachers appeared to have a higher view of themselves than did beginning teachers; and (3) the interaction between type of school and experience of the teacher was unrelated to perceptions of teachers.

Questions 2A, 2B and 2C examined the relation between the independent variables, type of school and experience of the teacher, and the dependent variable, teachers' perceptions, on the five pupil-centered items on the questionnaires.

Question 2A: What is the relation between type of school and the teachers' self-perceptions on the pupil-centered items?

The data suggest that the suburban teachers rated themselves higher than did the inner-city teachers. As indicated in Table 8 on the following page, the suburban teachers rated themselves with an overall average of 4.342, whereas the overall average of the inner-city teachers was 4.154. According to Table 9 on the following page, the difference between the views that teachers held of themselves according to the type of school was statistically significant at the .05 level of confidence. The nature of this relationship was such that suburban teachers seemed to have a higher view of themselves than inner-city teachers had of themselves.
TABLE 8
MEANS OF TEACHERS' RESPONSES TO PUPIL-CENTERED ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience of Teacher</th>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inner-City</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>4.068</td>
<td>4.270</td>
<td>4.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>4.239</td>
<td>4.413</td>
<td>4.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4.154</td>
<td>4.342</td>
<td>4.248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 9
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF TEACHERS' RESPONSES TO PUPIL-CENTERED ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience of Teacher (R)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1232.5</td>
<td>2.858</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of School (C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1767.2</td>
<td>4.098</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction (R x C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>431.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 2B: What is the relation between experience of the teacher and the teachers' self-perceptions on the pupil-centered items?

The data seem to indicate that experienced teachers rated themselves higher than did beginning teachers. According to Table 8, the experienced teachers' overall average was 4.326,
compared with the beginning teachers' overall average of 4.169. As indicated in Table 9, there was a statistically significant relation between experience of the teacher and the views that teachers held of themselves. The difference was at the .10 level of confidence. The nature of this relationship was such that experienced teachers seemed to have a higher view of themselves than beginning teachers had of themselves.

Question 2C: What is the relation of the interaction between type of school and experience of the teacher with the teachers' self-perceptions on the pupil-centered items?

The data suggest quite clearly that type of school and experience of the teacher did not interact at a statistically significant level of confidence with the teachers' perceptions on the pupil-centered items. An examination of the individual cells in Table 8 indicates that suburban teachers rated themselves consistently higher than did their inner-city counterparts, and experienced teachers rated themselves consistently higher than did beginning teachers. The lack of a statistically significant interaction might be attributed to the lack of appreciable differences between the means of the two independent variables.

A summary analysis of Questions 2A, 2B and 2C, which were concerned with the teachers' self-perceptions on the five pupil-centered items, seemed to indicate that: (1) suburban teachers appeared to have a higher view of themselves than inner-city
teachers had of themselves; (2) experienced teachers seemed to have a higher view of themselves than did beginning teachers; and (3) the interaction between type of school and experience of the teacher was unrelated to perceptions of teachers.

Questions 3A, 3B and 3C examined the relation between the independent variables, type of school and experience of the teacher, and the dependent variable, teachers' perceptions, on the seven teacher-centered items on the questionnaire.

Question 3A: What is the relation between type of school and the teachers' self-perceptions on the teacher-centered items?

The data suggest that inner-city and suburban teachers rated themselves about the same on the seven teacher-centered items. As indicated in Table 10 on the following page, the suburban teachers rated themselves with an overall average of 3.902, whereas the overall average of the inner-city teachers was 3.803. According to Table 11 on the following page, the difference between the views which teachers held of themselves according to type of school was statistically significant at only the .30 level of prediction. The nature of this relationship was such that the suburban teachers did not seem to have a significantly higher view of themselves than the inner-city teachers had of themselves.
TABLE 10
MEANS OF TEACHERS' RESPONSES TO TEACHER-CENTERED ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience of Teacher (R)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21582.4</td>
<td>25.899</td>
<td>.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of School (C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>965.9</td>
<td>1.159</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction (R x C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>833.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 3B: What is the relation between experience of the teacher and the teachers' self-perceptions on the teacher-centered items?

The data seem to indicate that experienced teachers rated themselves higher than beginning teachers rated themselves. According to Table 10, the experienced teachers' overall average
was 4.087, compared with the beginning teachers' overall average of 3.618. As indicated in Table 11, there was a highly significant statistical relation between experience of the teacher and the views that teachers held of themselves. The difference was at the .0005 level of confidence. The nature of this relationship was such that experienced teachers seemed to have a definitively higher view of themselves than beginning teachers had of themselves on the seven teacher-centered items.

Question 3C: What is the relation of the interaction between type of school and experience of the teacher with the teachers' self-perceptions on the teacher-centered items?

The data suggest quite clearly that type of school and experience of the teacher did not interact with the teachers' perceptions at a statistically significant level of confidence. The lack of a significant interaction may be attributable to the lack of a significant difference between types of schools and the highly significant relation according to the experience of the teacher. An examination of the individual cells in Table 10 indicates that experienced teachers in both types of schools rated themselves considerably higher than did their beginning teacher counterparts, whereas the difference according to the type of school was considerably less. It appears that the dominant controlling variable of the teachers' perceptions on the teacher-centered items was the experience of the teacher.

A summary analysis of Questions 3A, 3B and 3C, which were
concerned with the teachers' self-responses to the seven teacher-centered items on the questionnaire, seemed to indicate that: (1) suburban teachers did not have a significantly higher view of themselves than inner-city teachers had of themselves; (2) experienced teachers seemed to have a definitively higher view of themselves than did beginning teachers; and (3) the interaction between type of school and experience of the teacher was unrelated to perceptions of teachers.

The analyses of Questions 1-3, above, will be referred to later in this report in order to determine the relationship between the teachers' responses and those of the principals and pupils on the questionnaire items.

Principals' Perceptions

The following three questions (4-6) examined the relationship between the independent variables, type of school and experience of the teacher, and the dependent variable, principals' perceptions of teachers, on all twelve items.

Question 4A: What is the relation between type of school and the principals' perceptions on all items?

The data suggest that inner-city and suburban principals rated their teachers about the same on the overall questionnaire. As indicated in Table 12 on the following page, the inner-city principals rated their teachers with an overall average of 3.759, whereas the overall average rating by suburban
principals was 3.573. According to Table 13, the difference between the principals' perceptions according to type of school was statistically significant at only the .20 level of confidence. The nature of this relationship was such that inner-city principals seemed to have a slightly higher view of their teachers than did the suburban principals.

### TABLE 12
**MEANS OF PRINCIPALS' RESPONSES TO ALL ITEMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>Inner-City</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience of Teacher</td>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>3.555</td>
<td>3.353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3.963</td>
<td>3.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3.759</td>
<td>3.573</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 13
**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PRINCIPALS' RESPONSES TO ALL ITEMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience of Teacher (R)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51715.0</td>
<td>8.634</td>
<td>.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of School (C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9946.0</td>
<td>1.660</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction (R x C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>5989.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 4B: What is the relation between experience of the teacher and the principals' perceptions on all items?

The data suggest that principals rated experienced teachers higher than they rated beginning teachers. As reported in Table 12, the principals' overall average rating for experienced teachers was 3.878, as compared with an overall average rating of 3.454 for beginning teachers. As indicated in Table 13, there was a statistically significant relation between experience of the teacher and the views that principals have of them. The difference was at the .005 level of confidence. The nature of this relationship was such that principals seemed to have a much higher view of experienced teachers than they had of beginning teachers.

Question 4C: What is the relation of the interaction between type of school and experience of the teacher with the principals' perceptions on all items?

The data suggest quite clearly that type of school and experience of the teacher did not interact at a statistically significant level of confidence with the principals' perceptions to all twelve items on the questionnaire. An examination of the individual cells in Table 12 indicates that both inner-city and suburban principals rated their experienced teachers consistently higher than they rated their beginning teachers. However, the inner-city principals rated their teachers consistently higher than suburban principals rated their teachers. The lack of a statistically significant interaction might be
attributed to the highly significant difference between teachers according to experience compared with the level of confidence according to type of school. The nature of this relationship was such that the experience of the teacher seemed to be the dominant predictor variable of the principals' perceptions of teachers on all twelve items.

A summary analysis of Questions 4A, 4B and 4C, which were concerned with the principals' perceptions on all twelve items on the questionnaire, suggested that: (1) inner-city principals seemed to have a higher view of their teachers than did suburban principals, but not at a significantly high level of confidence; (2) principals seemed to have a higher view of experienced teachers than they had of beginning teachers; and (3) the interaction between type of school and experience of the teacher was unrelated to the principals' perceptions of teachers.

Questions 5A, 5B and 5C examined the relation between the independent variables, type of school and experience of the teacher, and the dependent variable, principals' perceptions, on the five pupil-centered items on the questionnaire.

Question 5A: What is the relation between type of school and the principals' perceptions on the pupil-centered items?

The data suggest that inner-city and suburban pupils rated their teachers about the same on the pupil-centered items. As indicated in Table 14, the inner-city principals rated their teachers with an overall average of 3.775, whereas the overall
average rating of suburban principals was 3.749. According to Table 15, the difference between the views of the principals according to type of school was not statistically significant at a reliable level of confidence. The nature of this relationship was such that inner-city and suburban principals seemed to have approximately the same overall views of their teachers on the pupil-centered items.

**TABLE 14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEANS OF PRINCIPALS' RESPONSES TO PUPIL-CENTERED ITEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of School</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience of Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 15**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PRINCIPALS' RESPONSES TO PUPIL-CENTERED ITEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of Variance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience of Teacher (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of School (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction (R x C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 5B: What is the relation between experience of the teacher and the principals' perceptions on the pupil-centered items?

The data seem to indicate that principals rated experienced teachers higher than they rated beginning teachers. According to Table 14, the experienced teachers' overall average was 3.960, compared with the beginning teachers' overall average of 3.564. As indicated in Table 15, there is a statistically significant relation between the experience of the teacher and the view that principals held of them. The difference was at the .01 level of confidence. The nature of this relationship was such that principals seemed to have a higher view of experienced teachers than they had of beginning teachers.

Question 5C: What is the relation of the interaction between type of school and experience of the teacher with the principals' perceptions on the pupil-centered items?

The data suggest quite clearly that type of school and experience of the teacher did not interact at a statistically significant level of confidence. The lack of a statistically significant level may be attributable to the lack of a significant difference according to type of school and the highly significant relation according to experience of the teacher. An examination of the individual cells in Table 14 indicates that the principals in both types of schools rated experienced teachers considerably higher than they rated beginning teachers, whereas the differences according to type of school were
practically negligible. It appeared that the dominant controlling variable of the principals' perceptions on the pupil-centered items was the experience of the teacher.

A summary analysis of Questions 5A, 5B and 5C, which were concerned with the principals' perceptions on the pupil-centered items, seemed to indicate that: (1) inner-city and suburban principals appeared to have approximately similar overall views of their teachers; (2) principals seemed to have a higher view of experienced teachers than they had of beginning teachers; and (3) the interaction between type of school and experience of the teacher was unrelated to perceptions of teachers.

Questions 6A, 6B and 6C examined the relation between the independent variables, type of school and experience of the teacher, and the dependent variable, principals' perceptions, on the seven teacher-centered items.

Question 6A: What is the relation between type of school and the principals' perceptions on the teacher-centered items?

The data suggest that inner-city principals rated their teachers higher than suburban principals rated their teachers. As indicated in Table 16 on the following page, the inner-city principals rated their teachers with an overall average of 3.747, whereas the suburban principals' overall average for their teachers was 3.448. According to Table 17, the difference between the views which principals held of their teachers according to type of school was statistically significant at the .05 level of confidence. The nature of this relationship was such
that inner-city principals seemed to have a higher view of their teachers than suburban principals had of their teachers.

### TABLE 16

**MEANS OF PRINCIPALS' RESPONSES TO TEACHER-CENTERED ITEMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>Inner-City</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience of Teacher</td>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>3.527</td>
<td>3.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3.967</td>
<td>3.671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3.747</td>
<td>3.448</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 17

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PRINCIPALS' RESPONSES TO TEACHER-CENTERED ITEMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience of Teacher (R)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19313.0</td>
<td>9.092</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of School (C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8799.0</td>
<td>4.142</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction (R x C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2124.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 6B:** What is the relation between experience of the teacher and the principals' perceptions on the teacher-centered items?

The data seem to indicate that principals rated experienced
teachers higher than they rated beginning teachers. According to Table 16, the experienced teachers' overall average was 3.819, compared with the beginning teachers' overall average of 3.375. As indicated in Table 17, there was a highly significant statistical relation between experience of the teacher and the view that principals held of them. The difference was at the .005 level of confidence. The nature of this relationship was such that principals seemed to have a definitively higher view of experienced teachers than they had of beginning teachers.

Question 6C: What is the relation of the interaction between type of school and experience of the teacher with the principals' perceptions on the teacher-centered items?

The data suggest quite clearly that type of school and experience of the teacher did not interact at a statistically significant level of confidence with the principals' perceptions of their teachers. An examination of the individual cells in Table 16 indicates that inner-city principals rated their teachers higher than their suburban counterparts rated their teachers. Experienced teachers in both types of schools were rated higher by their principals than were beginning teachers. The nature of this relationship was such that type of school and experience of the teacher were independent predictor variables and their interaction was unrelated to perceptions of teachers.

A summary analysis of Questions 6A, 6B and 6C, which were concerned with the principals' responses to the teacher-centered
items on the questionnaire, seemed to indicate that: (1) inner-city principals seemed to have a higher view of their teachers than suburban principals had of their teachers; (2) principals seemed to have a definitively higher view of experienced teachers than they had of beginning teachers; and (3) the interaction between type of school and experience of the teacher was unrelated to teacher perceptions.

The analyses of Questions 4-6, above, will be referred to later in this report, in order to determine the relationships between the principals' perceptions and those of the teachers and pupils on the same questionnaire items.

Pupils' Perceptions

The following three questions (7-9) examined the relation between the independent variables, type of school and experience of the teacher, and the dependent variable, pupils' perceptions of their teachers.

Questions 7A, 7B and 7C examined the relation between type of school and experience of the teacher and the dependent variable, pupils' perceptions, on all twelve items.

Question 7A: What is the relation between type of school and the pupils' perceptions on all items?

The data suggest that suburban pupils rated their teachers higher than inner-city pupils rated their teachers. As indicated in Table 18 on the following page, the suburban pupils rated
their teachers with an overall average of 3.518, whereas the overall average of the inner-city pupils' ratings was 3.375. This difference was statistically significant at the .10 level of confidence, as indicated in Table 19. The nature of this relationship was such that suburban pupils seemed to have a higher view of their teachers than inner-city pupils had of their teachers.

### TABLE 18
MEANS OF PUPILS' RESPONSES TO ALL ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>Inner-City</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience of Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>3.249</td>
<td>3.440</td>
<td>3.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3.502</td>
<td>3.595</td>
<td>3.548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3.375</td>
<td>3.518</td>
<td>3.446</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 19
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PUPILS' RESPONSES TO ALL ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience of Teacher (R)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11908.0</td>
<td>5.151</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of School (C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5815.0</td>
<td>2.516</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction (R x C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>695.0</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2311.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 7B: What is the relation between experience of the teacher and the pupils’ perceptions on all items?

The data suggest that pupils’ rated experienced teachers higher than they rated beginning teachers. As indicated in Table 18, the pupils’ overall average rating for experienced teachers was 3.548, compared with an overall average rating of 3.345 for beginning teachers. According to Table 19, there was a statistically significant relation between the experience of the teacher and the views that pupils had of them. The difference was at the .03 level of confidence. The nature of this relationship was such that pupils seemed to have a higher view of experienced teachers than they had of beginning teachers.

Question 7C: What is the relation of the interaction between type of school and experience of the teacher with the pupils’ perceptions on all items?

The data suggest that type of school and experience of the teacher did not interact with pupils’ perceptions at a statistically significant level of confidence. An examination of the individual cells in Table 18 indicates that suburban pupils rated their teachers higher than their inner-city counterparts rated their teachers. Experienced teachers in both types of schools were rated higher by their pupils than were beginning teachers by their pupils. The nature of this relationship was such that experience of the teacher and type of school were independent predictor variables, but their interaction was unrelated to perceptions of teachers.
A summary analysis of Questions 7A, 7B and 7C, which were concerned with the pupils' perceptions on all twelve questionnaire items, suggested that: (1) suburban pupils seemed to have a higher view of their teachers than did inner-city pupils; (2) pupils seemed to have a higher view of experienced teachers than they had of beginning teachers; and (3) the interaction between type of school and experience of the teacher was unrelated to the pupils' perceptions of teachers.

Questions 8A, 8B and 8C examined the relation between the independent variables, type of school and experience of the teacher, and the dependent variable, pupils' perceptions, on the five pupil-centered items on the questionnaire.

Question 8A: What is the relation between type of school and the pupils' perceptions on the pupil-centered items?

The data suggest that inner-city and suburban pupils rated their teachers about the same on the pupil-centered items. As indicated in Table 20 on the following page, the inner-city pupils rated their teachers with an overall average of 3.406, whereas the suburban pupils' overall average rating for their teachers was 3.513. According to Table 21, the difference between the views of pupils according to type of school was not statistically significant at a reliable level of confidence. The nature of this relationship was such that both inner-city and suburban pupils seemed to have approximately the same overall view of their teachers.
TABLE 20
MEANS OF PUPILS' RESPONSES TO PUPIL-CENTERED ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience of Teacher</th>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inner-City</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>3.269</td>
<td>3.439</td>
<td>3.354</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3.542</td>
<td>3.586</td>
<td>3.564</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3.406</td>
<td>3.513</td>
<td>3.459</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 21
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PUPILS' RESPONSES TO PUPIL-CENTERED ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience of Teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2205.1</td>
<td>3.278</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of School (C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>572.5</td>
<td>.851</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction (R x C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>198.3</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>672.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 8B: What is the relation between experience of the teacher and the pupils' perceptions on the pupil-centered items?

The data seem to indicate that pupils rated experienced teachers higher than they rated beginning teachers. According to Table 20, the experienced teachers' overall average was
3.564, compared with the average rating for beginning teachers of 3.354. As indicated in Table 21, there was a statistically significant relation between experience of the teacher and the view that pupils held of them. The difference was at the .08 level of confidence. The nature of this relationship was such that pupils seemed to have a higher view of experienced teachers than they had of beginning teachers.

Question 8C: What is the relation of the interaction between type of school and experience of the teacher with the pupils' perceptions on the pupil-centered items?

The data suggest that type of school and experience of the teacher did not interact with the pupils' perceptions at a statistically significant level of confidence. The lack of a statistically significant interaction might be attributed to the fact that there was a significant difference according to the experience of the teacher, whereas the difference according to type of school was not significant. The nature of this relationship was such that the experience of the teacher seemed to be the dominant predictor variable of the pupils' perceptions on the pupil-centered items.

A summary analysis of Questions 8A, 8B and 8C, which were concerned with the pupils' perceptions on the five pupil-centered items on the questionnaires, suggested that: (1) inner-city and suburban pupils seemed to have about the same overall view of their teachers; (2) pupils seemed to have a higher view
of experienced teachers than they had of beginning teachers; and (3) the interaction between type of school and experience of the teacher was unrelated to the pupils' perceptions of teachers.

Questions 9A, 9B and 9C examined the relation between the independent variables, type of school and experience of the teacher, and the dependent variable, pupils' perceptions, on the seven teacher-centered items.

Question 9A: What is the relation between type of school and the pupils' perceptions on the teacher-centered items?

The data suggest that suburban pupils rated their teachers higher than inner-city pupils rated their teachers. As indicated in Table 22 on the following page, the suburban pupils rated their teachers with an overall average of 3.521, whereas the inner-city pupils' overall average for their teachers was 3.354. According to Table 23 on the following page, the difference between the views which pupils held according to type of school was statistically significant at the .04 level of confidence. The nature of this relationship was such that suburban pupils seemed to have a higher view of their teachers than inner-city pupils had of their teachers.
TABLE 22
MEANS OF PUPILS' RESPONSES
TO TEACHER-CENTERED ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience of Teacher</th>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inner-City</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>3.235</td>
<td>3.441</td>
<td>3.338</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3.473</td>
<td>3.601</td>
<td>3.537</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3.354</td>
<td>3.521</td>
<td>3.438</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 23
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PUPILS' RESPONSES
TO TEACHER-CENTERED ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience of Teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3864.2</td>
<td>6.068</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of School (C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2737.8</td>
<td>4.299</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction (R x C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>151.2</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>636.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 9B: What is the relation between experience of the teacher and the pupils' perceptions on the teacher-centered items?

The data seem to indicate that pupils rated experienced teachers higher than they rated beginning teachers. According to Table 22, the experienced teachers' overall average was 3.537, compared with the beginning teachers' overall average.
of 3.338. As indicated in Table 23, there was a statistically significant relation between experience of the teacher and the view that pupils held of them. The difference was at the .02 level of confidence. The nature of this relationship was such that pupils seemed to have a higher view of experienced teachers than they had of beginning teachers.

Question 9C: What is the relation of the interaction between type of school and experience of the teacher with the pupils' perceptions on the teacher-centered items?

The data suggest that type of school and experience of the teacher did not interact at a statistically significant level of confidence with the pupils' perceptions of teachers. An examination of the individual cells in Table 22 indicates that suburban pupils rated their teachers higher than their inner-city counterparts rated their teachers. Experienced teachers in both types of schools were rated higher by their pupils than were beginning teachers by their pupils. The nature of this relationship was such that type of school and experience of the teacher were independent predictor variables, but their interaction was unrelated to perceptions of teachers.

A summary analysis of Questions 9A, 9B and 9C, which were concerned with the pupils' perceptions on the seven teacher-centered items, suggested that: (1) suburban pupils seemed to have a higher view of their teachers than inner-city pupils had of their teachers; (2) pupils seemed to have a higher view of
experienced teachers than they had of beginning teachers; and (3) the interaction between type of school and experience of the teacher was unrelated to perceptions of teachers.

The analyses of Questions 7-9, above, will be referred to later in this report, in order to determine the relation between the pupils' perceptions and those of the teachers and principals on the same questionnaire items.

Extent of Agreement

The following nine questions (10-18) examined the extent of agreement regarding perceptions of teachers among the teachers, principals and pupils, based on their responses to the items on the questionnaires. The findings are reported in the form of tables of product-moment coefficients of correlation for each pair-wise comparison.

The three possible pair-wise comparisons which were examined in each of the nine questions were the correlations between: (a) teacher's and principal's perceptions; (b) teacher's and pupils' mean perceptions; and (c) principal's and pupils' mean perceptions. These three pair-wise comparisons were computed for the following groups:

Question 10: All teachers
Question 11: All inner-city teachers
Question 12: All suburban teachers
Question 13: All beginning teachers
Question 14: All experienced teachers
Question 15: Beginning/inner-city teachers

Question 16: Experienced/inner-city teachers

Question 17: Beginning/suburban teachers

Question 18: Experienced/suburban teachers

Question 10 investigated the extent of agreement between pairs of respondents based on all teachers. It was examined as three related questions:

Question 10A: To what extent do the responses of all teachers concur with the responses of their respective principals?

Question 10B: To what extent do the responses of all teachers concur with the responses of their respective pupils?

Question 10C: To what extent do the responses of all pupils concur with the responses of their respective principals?

The data in Table 2 suggest that all three pair-wise comparisons were statistically significant at a high level of confidence. However, it appeared that the greatest agreement was between the principal and pupils and the least agreement was between the teacher and principal. The extent of agreement between the teacher and pupils ranked in size between the other two pair-wise comparisons. The nature of these relationships was such that, relatively, the principal and pupils seemed to agree to the greatest extent, while the teacher and principal seemed to agree the least, although all three pairs agreed at the .001 level of confidence.
Question 11, which examined the extent of agreement between pairs of respondents in all inner-city schools, was investigated as three related questions:

**Question 11A:** To what extent do the responses of inner-city teachers concur with their principals' responses?

**Question 11B:** To what extent do the responses of inner-city teachers concur with their pupils' responses?

**Question 11C:** To what extent do the responses of inner-city pupils concur with the responses of their respective principals?

The data in Table 24 seem to indicate that all three pairwise comparisons were statistically significant at the same high level of confidence, .001. It appears, however, that there was greatest agreement between the principal and pupils, while the least agreement was between the principal and teacher. The extent of agreement between the teacher and pupils ranked in size.

---

### TABLE 24

**EXTENT OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN PAIRS OF RESPONDENTS IN ALL CLASSROOMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher x Principal</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher x Pupils</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal x Pupils</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = number of responses  
$r$ = coefficient of correlation  
p = level of confidence

---
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between the other two pair-wise comparisons. The nature of these relationships was such that, relatively, the principal and pupils seemed to agree to the greatest extent, while the teacher and principal seemed to agree the least, although all three pairs agreed at the .001 level of confidence.

**TABLE 25**

**EXTENT OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN PAIRS OF RESPONDENTS IN INNER-CITY SCHOOLS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher x Principal</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher x Pupils</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal x Pupils</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>.422</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = number of responses  
*r* = coefficient of correlation  
P = level of confidence

Question 12, which examined the extent of agreement between pairs of respondents in all suburban schools, was investigated as three related questions:

**Question 12A:** To what extent do the responses of suburban teachers concord with their principals' responses?

**Question 12B:** To what extent do the responses of suburban teachers concord with their pupils' responses?

**Question 12C:** To what extent do the responses of suburban pupils concord with the responses of their respective principals?

The data in Table 26 on the following page suggest that
all three pair-wise comparisons were statistically significant at the same high level of confidence. However, it appears that there was greatest agreement between the teacher and principal and the least agreement seemed to be between the teacher and pupils. The extent of agreement between the principal and pupils ranked in size between the other two pair-wise comparisons. The nature of these relationships was such that, relatively, the teacher and principal seemed to agree to the greatest extent, whereas the least agreement was between the teacher and pupils, although all three pairs agreed at the same .001 level of confidence.

**TABLE 26**

**EXTENT OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN PAIRS OF RESPONDENTS IN SUBURBAN SCHOOLS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher x Principal</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher x Pupils</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal x Pupils</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**N = number of responses**  
**r = coefficient of correlation**  
**p = level of confidence**

Question 13, which investigated the extent of agreement between pairs of respondents based on beginning teachers only, was examined as three related questions:
Question 13A: To what extent do the responses of beginning teachers concur with their principals' responses?

Question 13B: To what extent do the responses of beginning teachers concur with their pupils' responses?

Question 13C: To what extent do the responses of pupils with beginning teachers concur with their principals' responses?

The data in Table 27 seem to indicate that all three pairwise comparisons were statistically significant at the .001 level of confidence. It appears, however, that there was greatest agreement between the teacher and pupils and the least agreement seemed to be between the teacher and principal. The extent of agreement between the principal and pupils ranked in size between the other two pairs. The nature of these relationships was such that, relatively, the teacher and pupils seemed to agree to the greatest extent, while the least agreement was between the teacher and principal.

TABLE 27

EXTENT OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN PAIRS OF RESPONDENTS, BASED ON BEGINNING TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher x Principal</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher x Pupils</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal x Pupils</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = number of responses  
r = coefficient of correlation  
p = level of confidence
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Question 14 investigated the extent of agreement between pairs of respondents based on experienced teachers only. It was examined as three related questions:

Question 14A: To what extent do the responses of experienced teachers concur with their principals' responses?

Question 14B: To what extent do the responses of experienced teachers concur with their pupils' responses?

Question 14C: To what extent do the responses of pupils with experienced teachers concur with their principals' responses?

The data in Table 28 suggest that the greatest agreement was between the principal and pupils and the least agreement was between the teacher and principal. The extent of agreement between the teacher and pupils ranked in size between the other two pair-wise comparisons. The nature of these relationships was such that the extent of agreement between the principal and pupils was both relatively and statistically greater than the extent of agreement between the teacher and principal, which seemed to have the least agreement of the three pair-wise comparisons.
TABLE 28

EXTENT OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN PAIRS OF RESPONDENTS,
BASED ON EXPERIENCED TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher x Principal</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher x Pupils</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal x Pupils</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = number of responses
r = coefficient of correlation
p = level of confidence

Question 15 examined the extent of agreement between pairs of respondents in inner-city schools with beginning teachers. It was investigated as three related questions:

Question 15A: To what extent do the responses of beginning teachers in inner-city schools concur with their principals' responses?

Question 15B: To what extent do the responses of beginning teachers in inner-city schools concur with their pupils' responses?

Question 15C: To what extent do the responses of pupils with beginning teachers in inner-city schools concur with their principals' responses?

The data in Table 29 seem to indicate that the greatest agreement was between the responses of the principal and pupils and the least agreement was between the teacher and principal. The extent of agreement between the teacher and pupils ranked in size between the other two pair-wise comparisons. The nature
of these relationships was such that the extent of agreement between the principal and pupils and between the teacher and pupils were both relatively and statistically greater than was the extent of agreement between the teacher and principal.

**TABLE 29**

EXTENT OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN PAIRS OF RESPONDENTS IN INNER-CITY SCHOOLS WITH BEGINNING TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher x Principal</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher x Pupils</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal x Pupils</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = number of responses  
**r** = coefficient of correlation  
**p** = level of confidence

Question 16, which investigated the extent of agreement between pairs of respondents in inner-city schools with experienced teachers, was examined as three related questions:

**Question 16A:** To what extent do the responses of experienced teachers in inner-city schools concur with their principals' responses?

**Question 16B:** To what extent do the responses of experienced teachers in inner-city schools concur with their pupils' responses?

**Question 16C:** To what extent do the responses of pupils with experienced teachers in inner-city schools concur with their principals' responses?

The data in Table 30 suggest that the greatest agreement
was between the responses of the principal and pupils and the least agreement was between the teacher and principal. The extent of agreement between the teacher and pupils ranked in size between the other two pair-wise comparisons. The nature of these relationships was such that the extent of agreement between the teacher and pupils and between the principal and pupils were both relatively and statistically greater than was the extent of agreement between the teacher and principal. The extent of agreement between the teacher and principal was at only the .09 level of confidence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher x Principal</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher x Pupils</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal x Pupils</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- N = number of responses
- r = coefficient of correlation
- p = level of confidence

Question 17A: To what extent do the responses of beginning teachers in suburban schools concur with their principals' responses?
Question 17B: To what extent do the responses of beginning teachers in suburban schools concur with their pupils' responses?

Question 17C: To what extent do the responses of pupils with beginning teachers in suburban schools concur with their principals' responses?

The data in Table 31 seem to indicate that the greatest agreement was between the responses of the teacher and pupils, whereas the least agreement appeared to be between the responses of the principal and pupils. The extent of agreement between the teacher and principal ranked in size between the other two pairwise comparisons. The nature of these relationships was such that, although all of the coefficients of correlation were significant at the .001 level of confidence, the extent of agreement between the teacher and pupils appeared to be relatively the greatest and the extent of agreement between the principal and pupils appeared to be the least, relative to the others.

**TABLE 31**

**EXTENT OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN PAIRS OF RESPONDENTS IN SUBURBAN SCHOOLS WITH BEGINNING TEACHERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher x Principal</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher x Pupils</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal x Pupils</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = number of responses  
\( r = \) coefficient of correlation  
\( p = \) level of confidence
Question 18, which investigated the extent of agreement between respondents in suburban schools with experienced teachers, was examined as three related questions:

Question 18A: To what extent do the responses of experienced teachers in suburban schools concur with their principals' responses?

Question 18B: To what extent do the responses of experienced teachers in suburban schools concur with their pupils' responses?

Question 18C: To what extent do the responses of pupils with experienced teachers in suburban schools concur with their principals' responses?

The data in Table 32 suggest that there was not a particularly high level of confidence on the extent of agreement between any of the pair-wise comparisons. None of the pair-wise comparisons was significant above the .09 level of confidence and the extent of agreement between the teacher and pupils showed a negative correlation of -.090 at the .10 level of statistical probability. The nature of these relationships was such that, although none of the correlations was statistically significant above the .09 level of confidence, the extent of agreement between the teacher and principal was relatively the greatest and the least relative agreement was between the teacher and pupils.
The conclusions that have been made according to the data which have been presented and analyzed in this chapter are discussed in Chapter V.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter summarizes the problem, describes the procedures used, lists a summary of the major findings, presents conclusions and proposes recommendations.

The Problem

The overall purpose of this study was to determine the relation between the perceptions of teachers, based on three reference groups, and the two independent variables of teacher experience and type of school. The three reference groups were the teachers themselves, their principals and the teachers' pupils. The types of schools were inner-city and suburban elementary schools. Teachers were categorized as beginning and experienced teachers.

In order to carry out the specific objectives of the study, four major questions were investigated:

1. What is the relation between the independent variable, type of school, and the dependent variable, perceptions of teachers, as viewed by the teachers themselves, their principals and the teachers' pupils?

2. What is the relation between the independent variable, experience of the teacher, and the dependent variable, perceptions of teachers, as viewed by the teachers themselves, their
principals and the teachers' pupils?

3. What is the relation of the interaction between the independent variables, type of school and experience of the teacher, with the dependent variable, perceptions of teachers, as viewed by the teachers themselves, their principals and the teachers' pupils?

4. What is the extent of agreement regarding perceptions of teachers between the (a) teacher and principal; (b) teacher and pupils; and (c) principal and pupils?

Procedures Used in the Study

The locale which served as the setting for the study was a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area in the midwestern region of the United States. The area included numerous inner-city and suburban elementary schools. From within the total population, inner-city and suburban schools were selected at random for inclusion in the investigation. Beginning and experienced fifth and sixth grade teachers were randomly chosen from the selected schools. The total sample included eighty teachers. There were twenty teachers in each of the following four categories: (1) beginning/inner-city; (2) experienced/inner-city; (3) beginning/suburban; and (4) experienced/suburban.

The "Teacher Image Questionnaire" from the Educator Feedback Center at Western Michigan University was modified for the purpose of measuring teacher perceptions for this study. These
revised instruments were called the "Elementary Teacher Self-Questionnaire," the "Elementary Principal Questionnaire" and the "Elementary Pupil Questionnaire." Scores on these instruments were analyzed with respect to pupil-centered variables, teacher-centered variables and total scores.

A two-way factorial analysis was selected as the most appropriate design for the investigation of the questions regarding the relation between the independent variables, type of school and experience of the teacher, and the dependent variable, perceptions of teachers.

In order to determine the extent of agreement regarding perceptions of teachers between the different respondent groups, it was agreed that coefficients of correlation would be appropriate for these analyses.

The analyses discussed above resulted in data related to fifty-four specific questions. The investigation of the first group of questions provided data on the relation between the independent variables, type of school and experience of the teacher, and the dependent variable, perceptions of teachers. The results of the second group of questions provided data on the extent of agreement regarding perceptions of teachers between the (a) teacher and principal; (b) teacher and pupils; and (c) principal and pupils.

Summary of the Findings

The results of the specific questions which were studied
were presented and analyzed in Chapter IV. The findings of the four major questions of this investigation are summarized as follows:

1. With respect to the teachers' self-perceptions, suburban teachers seemed to view themselves more favorably than inner-city teachers viewed themselves on the overall questionnaire, on the pupil-centered items and on the teacher-centered items. However, the difference between the two groups appeared to be at a considerably higher level of confidence on the pupil-centered items than on the teacher-centered items.

2. According to the teachers' self-perceptions, experienced teachers appeared to view themselves more favorably than did beginning teachers on the overall questionnaire, on the pupil-centered items and on the teacher-centered items. The difference between the two groups seemed to be at a considerably more significant level of probability on the teacher-centered items than on the pupil-centered items.

3. The principals' responses seemed to indicate that inner-city principals viewed their teachers more favorably than suburban principals viewed their teachers on the teacher-centered items. The difference was at the .05 level of confidence, whereas the difference between the inner-city and suburban principals on the pupil-centered items was not statistically significant.

4. According to the principals' responses, experienced teachers were viewed more favorably than were beginning teachers
on the overall questionnaire, on the pupil-centered items, and on the teacher-centered items. Although the differences between beginning and experienced teachers were at a high level of confidence on both the pupil-centered and teacher-centered items, the smaller difference seemed to be on the pupil-centered items.

5. With respect to the pupils' responses, there appeared to be some indication (at the .10 level of confidence) that suburban pupils viewed their teachers more favorably than inner-city pupils viewed their teachers on the overall questionnaire. The difference between suburban and inner-city pupils on the pupil-centered items was not statistically significant. However, the suburban pupils rated their teachers more favorably than did the inner-city pupils on the teacher-centered items (at the .04 level of probability).

6. The pupils' responses seemed to indicate that they viewed experienced teachers more favorably than they did beginning teachers on the overall questionnaire, on the pupil-centered items and on the teacher-centered items. However, the least significant difference between the pupils' perceptions of beginning and experienced teachers was on the pupil-centered items (at the .08 level of confidence).

7. The interaction between type of school and experience of the teacher seemed to be unrelated to all criterion measures.

8. The extent of agreement regarding perceptions of teachers among the three pairs of respondents was significant
at a high level of confidence. However, the closest agreement appeared to be between the principal and pupils and the least agreement seemed to be between the teacher and principal.

Conclusions

In so far as the techniques employed may be valid, the following conclusions seem justified:

1. Teachers, principals and pupils appeared to have a much higher view of experienced teachers than they had of beginning teachers.

2. The perceptions of all three respondent groups indicated that they viewed the differences between experienced and beginning teachers to be greater on the teacher-centered items than on the pupil-centered items.

3. Suburban teachers and pupils seemed to have a higher view of suburban teachers than inner-city teachers and pupils had of inner-city teachers. However, the differences were only at the .10 level of statistical significance. Conversely, according to the perceptions of the principals, inner-city principals seemed to have a more favorable view of their teachers than suburban principals had of their teachers, although this relationship was significant at only the .20 level of confidence.

4. The perceptions of the principals and pupils indicated that they viewed the difference between inner-city and suburban teachers to be greater on the teacher-centered items
than on the pupil-centered items. However, according to the perceptions of the teachers themselves, the difference between inner-city and suburban teachers was greater on the pupil-centered items than on the teacher-centered items.

5. The interaction between type of school and experience of the teacher was unrelated to perceptions of teachers.

6. Generally, the extent of agreement between teacher and principal, teacher and pupils and principal and pupils was quite high. However, the closest agreement was commonly between the principal and pupils and the least agreement was most frequently between the teacher and principal. Based on these findings, it would seem to be justified to conclude that there is greatest consonance between the perceptions that the principal and pupils have of teachers, whereas the greatest dissonance is between the perceptions of the teacher and principal.

In summary, there seemed to be a rather consistent relation between the perceptions of teachers and the type of school in which they taught. The nature of this relation was such that suburban teachers were viewed more favorably than were inner-city teachers. An even stronger relation was found to exist between teacher experience and perceptions of teachers. The nature of this relation was such that experienced teachers were viewed much more favorably than were beginning teachers. The interaction of school type with teacher experience seemed to be unrelated to perceptions of teachers.

Secondly, there seemed to be considerable agreement
among the three reference groups regarding perceptions of teachers. However, the principal and pupils generally seemed to be in closer agreement than were the teacher and principal.

Implications and Recommendations

The purposes of this section of the chapter are: (1) to suggest ways in which preservice and inservice teacher programs may make use of the findings of this investigation and (2) to present some of the implications of this study for further research.

Since a primary finding was that experience was related to perceptions of teachers, it is recommended that preservice teacher training programs provide more frequent and more extensive opportunities of a practical and laboratory nature than the single student teaching assignment that is most common in contemporary programs. Of course, this recommendation is based on the assumption that perceptions of teachers are related to teacher effectiveness.

In view of the fact that overall differences between the perceptions of beginning and experienced teachers seemed to be greater on the teacher-centered items than on the pupil-centered items, perhaps additional emphasis on the knowledges, skills and methods of teaching might be warranted in the preservice program and during the initial years of teaching, while increased emphasis on attitudes and interpersonal relationships may not be as essential.
Although the investigation indicated that there was a tendency for inner-city principals to view their teachers more favorably than suburban principals viewed their teachers, both inner-city teachers and pupils viewed inner-city teachers less favorably than suburban pupils viewed their teachers and less favorably than suburban teachers viewed themselves. Therefore, means should be explored and methods devised that would identify the specific causes of such lower perceptions. If improved perceptions result in more effective teaching, then ways of improving perceptions might also be studied.

Perhaps programs which are able to identify and stress the skills, techniques and methods which seem to be more successful in working with inner-city pupils could be emphasized to a greater extent in preservice and inservice programs than the placement of inordinate attention to pupil-centered activities. This recommendation is based on the conclusion that, overall, the difference between inner-city and suburban teachers was greater on the teacher-centered items than was the difference between the same groups on the pupil-centered items.

It is recommended that instruments such as the questionnaires which were used in this study could be utilized to provide feedback to teachers and principals regarding the perceptions of teachers. The provision and analysis of such feedback could be an initial step in revealing to the teacher and principal that there is dissonance in the extent to which they agree regarding their perceptions of the teacher.
With regard to the implications of this study for further research, it would appear that this exploratory project demonstrates a need for follow-up studies that go beyond the present investigation. It would seem to be of value to repeat the study with samples from similar populations in order to determine whether the conclusions which were arrived at in this investigation can be generalized to a greater extent than to the single metropolitan population upon which this study was based.

In view of the differences which were found between the perceptions of the various respondent groups and between the two categories of questionnaire items, it is suggested that an analysis of the responses to the individual questionnaire items might contribute more complete and detailed information within the teacher-centered and pupil-centered categories.

The evidence which was presented in this report with regard to perceptions of teachers according to the experience of the teacher would seem to suggest the need for follow-up inquiries of a longitudinal nature, whereby the perceptions of "beginning" teachers could be reassessed at a time when they became "experienced" teachers.

Finally, as a result of this study, there would seem to be some questions related to teacher perceptions that need to be more thoroughly investigated. Two such questions might be: Are perceptions of teachers related to meaningful measures of outcomes of the teaching-learning process; and if so, how do
changes in perceptions of teachers influence these criterion measures?
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APPENDIX A

SPECIFIC QUESTIONS WHICH WERE INVESTIGATED

1A. What is the relation between type of school and the teachers' self-perceptions on all items?

1B. What is the relation between experience of the teacher and the teachers' self-perceptions on all items?

1C. What is the relation of the interaction between type of school and experience of the teacher with the teachers' self-perceptions on all items?

2A. What is the relation between type of school and the teachers' self-perceptions on the pupil-centered items?

2B. What is the relation between experience of the teacher and the teachers' self-perceptions on the pupil-centered items?

2C. What is the relation of the interaction between type of school and experience of the teacher with the teachers' self-perceptions on the pupil-centered items?

3A. What is the relation between type of school and the teachers' self-perceptions on the teacher-centered items?

3B. What is the relation between experience of the teacher and the teachers' self-perceptions on the teacher-centered items?

3C. What is the relation of the interaction between type of school and experience of the teacher with the teachers' self-perceptions on the teacher-centered items?

4A. What is the relation between type of school and the principals' perceptions on all items?

4B. What is the relation between experience of the teacher and the principals' perceptions on all items?

4C. What is the relation of the interaction between type of school and experience of the teacher with the principals' perceptions on all items?
5A. What is the relation between type of school and the principals' perceptions on the pupil-centered items?

5B. What is the relation between experience of the teacher and the principals' perceptions on the pupil-centered items?

5C. What is the relation of the interaction between type of school and experience of the teacher with the principals' perceptions on the pupil-centered items?

6A. What is the relation between type of school and the principals' perceptions on the teacher-centered items?

6B. What is the relation between experience of the teacher and the principals' perceptions on the teacher-centered items?

6C. What is the relation of the interaction between type of school and experience of the teacher with the principals' perceptions on the teacher-centered items?

7A. What is the relation between type of school and the pupils' perceptions on all items?

7B. What is the relation between experience of the teacher and the pupils' perceptions on all items?

7C. What is the relation of the interaction between type of school and experience of the teacher with the pupils' perceptions on all items?

8A. What is the relation between type of school and the pupils' perceptions on the pupil-centered items?

8B. What is the relation between experience of the teacher and the pupils' perceptions on the pupil-centered items?

8C. What is the relation of the interaction between type of school and experience of the teacher with the pupils' perceptions on the pupil-centered items?

9A. What is the relation between type of school and the pupils' perceptions on the teacher-centered items?

9B. What is the relation between experience of the teacher and the pupils' perceptions on the teacher-centered items?
9C. What is the relation of the interaction between type of school and experience of the teacher with the pupils' perceptions on the teacher-centered items?

10A. To what extent do the responses of all teachers concur with the responses of their respective principals?

10B. To what extent do the responses of all teachers concur with the responses of their respective pupils?

10C. To what extent do the responses of all pupils concur with the responses of their respective principals?

11A. To what extent do the responses of inner-city teachers concur with their principals' responses?

11B. To what extent do the responses of inner-city teachers concur with their pupils' responses?

11C. To what extent do the responses of inner-city pupils concur with the responses of their respective principals?

12A. To what extent do the responses of suburban teachers concur with their principals' responses?

12B. To what extent do the responses of suburban teachers concur with their pupils' responses?

12C. To what extent do the responses of suburban pupils concur with the responses of their respective principals?

13A. To what extent do the responses of beginning teachers concur with their principals' responses?

13B. To what extent do the responses of beginning teachers concur with their pupils' responses?

13C. To what extent do the responses of pupils with beginning teachers concur with their principals' responses?

14A. To what extent do the responses of experienced teachers concur with their principals' responses?

14B. To what extent do the responses of experienced teachers concur with their pupils' responses?

14C. To what extent do the responses of pupils with experienced teachers concur with their principals' responses?
15A. To what extent do the responses of beginning teachers in inner-city schools concur with their principals' responses?

15B. To what extent do the responses of beginning teachers in inner-city schools concur with their pupils' responses?

15C. To what extent do the responses of pupils with beginning teachers in inner-city schools concur with their principals' responses?

16A. To what extent do the responses of experienced teachers in inner-city schools concur with their principals' responses?

16B. To what extent do the responses of experienced teachers in inner-city schools concur with their pupils' responses?

16C. To what extent do the responses of pupils with experienced teachers in inner-city schools concur with their principals' responses?

17A. To what extent do the responses of beginning teachers in suburban schools concur with their principals' responses?

17B. To what extent do the responses of beginning teachers in suburban schools concur with their pupils' responses?

17C. To what extent do the responses of pupils with beginning teachers in suburban schools concur with their principals' responses?

18A. To what extent do the responses of experienced teachers in suburban schools concur with their principals' responses?

18B. To what extent do the responses of experienced teachers in suburban schools concur with their pupils' responses?

18C. To what extent do the responses of pupils with experienced teachers in suburban schools concur with their principals' responses?
APPENDIX B

ELEMENTARY TEACHER SELF-QUESTIONNAIRE

1. KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT: Do you have a thorough knowledge and understanding of your present teaching field?

2. CLARITY OF EXPLANATIONS: Are your classroom explanations and assignments given clearly?

3. FAIRNESS: Are you fair and impartial in the treatment of all pupils?

4. CLASSROOM CONTROL: Do you feel that you have enough order and control in your classroom? Do pupils behave well for you?

5. ATTITUDE TOWARD PUPILS: Are you patient, understanding, considerate and courteous?

6. ABILITY TO STIMULATE INTEREST: Are your classes interesting and stimulating?

7. ATTITUDE TOWARD STUDENT OPINIONS: Do you treat the ideas and opinions of pupils with respect? Are differences of opinion welcomed even when the pupil disagrees with you?

8. VARIETY IN TEACHING PROCEDURES: Do you use much the same procedure every day and every week, or are different methods used at different times?

9. ENCOURAGEMENT OF PUPIL PARTICIPATION: Do pupils feel free to express opinions and ask questions? Are pupils encouraged to take part frequently?

10. SENSE OF HUMOR: Do you see and share with pupils amusing happenings and experiences?

11. PLANNING AND PREPARATION: Are plans well-made? Is class time well-spent? Is little time wasted?

12. ASSIGNMENTS: Are out-of-class assignments sufficiently challenging without being unreasonably long? Is the weight of the assignments reasonable?
## ELEMENTARY TEACHER RESPONSE SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>BELOW AVERAGE</th>
<th>AVERAGE</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>VERY GOOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX C

ELEMENTARY PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE

1. KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT: Does this teacher have a thorough knowledge and understanding of his present teaching field?

2. CLARITY OF EXPLANATIONS: Are classroom expectations and assignments given clearly?

3. FAIRNESS: Is this teacher fair and impartial in the treatment of all pupils?

4. CLASSROOM CONTROL: Does this teacher keep enough order in the classroom? Do pupils behave well for him?

5. ATTITUDE TOWARD PUPILS: Is this teacher patient, understanding, considerate and courteous?

6. ABILITY TO STIMULATE INTEREST: Are this teacher's classes interesting and stimulating?

7. ATTITUDE TOWARD STUDENT OPINIONS: Does this teacher treat the ideas and opinions of pupils with respect? Are differences of opinion welcomed even when the pupil disagrees with the teacher?

8. VARIETY IN TEACHING PROCEDURES: Does this teacher use much the same procedure every day and every week, or are different methods used at different times?

9. ENCOURAGEMENT OF PUPIL PARTICIPATION: Do pupils feel free to express opinions and ask questions? Are pupils encouraged to take part frequently?

10. SENSE OF HUMOR: Does this teacher see and share with pupils amusing happenings and experiences?

11. PLANNING AND PREPARATION: Are plans well-made? Is class time well-spent? Is little time wasted?

12. ASSIGNMENTS: Are out-of-class assignments sufficiently challenging without being unreasonably long? Is the weight of the assignments reasonable?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELEMENTARY PRINCIPAL RESPONSE SHEET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>POOR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**APPENDIX D**

**ELEMENTARY PUPIL QUESTIONNAIRE**

1. How well does your teacher know and understand the things that he teaches you?
   - POOR
   - BELOW AVERAGE
   - AVERAGE
   - GOOD
   - VERY GOOD

2. Does your teacher explain clearly what he expects of you and what assignments you are supposed to do?
   - POOR
   - BELOW AVERAGE
   - AVERAGE
   - GOOD
   - VERY GOOD

3. Is your teacher fair and equal with all pupils?
   - POOR
   - BELOW AVERAGE
   - AVERAGE
   - GOOD
   - VERY GOOD

4. Does your teacher keep enough order and control in the classroom? Do pupils behave well for your teacher?
   - POOR
   - BELOW AVERAGE
   - AVERAGE
   - GOOD
   - VERY GOOD

5. Is your teacher patient, understanding, considerate and courteous?
   - POOR
   - BELOW AVERAGE
   - AVERAGE
   - GOOD
   - VERY GOOD

6. Are your classes interesting to you?
   - POOR
   - BELOW AVERAGE
   - AVERAGE
   - GOOD
   - VERY GOOD
7. Does your teacher treat the ideas and opinions of pupils with respect? Are pupils allowed to disagree with the teacher?

POOR  BELOW AVERAGE  AVERAGE  GOOD  VERY GOOD

8. Does your teacher do about the same kinds of things every day and every week, or are different things done quite often?

POOR  BELOW AVERAGE  AVERAGE  GOOD  VERY GOOD

9. Do boys and girls feel free to ask questions and express their opinions? Are pupils encouraged to take part often?

POOR  BELOW AVERAGE  AVERAGE  GOOD  VERY GOOD

10. Does your teacher see and tell you about funny stories and events?

POOR  BELOW AVERAGE  AVERAGE  GOOD  VERY GOOD

11. Does your teacher plan well for the things that you do in class? Is your time in class spent well? Is little time wasted in class?

POOR  BELOW AVERAGE  AVERAGE  GOOD  VERY GOOD

12. Do out-of-class assignments make you think a lot? Are your assignments just about the right length?

POOR  BELOW AVERAGE  AVERAGE  GOOD  VERY GOOD
### OVERALL AVERAGES: ALL QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3.782</td>
<td>4.116</td>
<td>3.913</td>
<td>4.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>3.555</td>
<td>3.963</td>
<td>3.353</td>
<td>3.793</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QUESTION KEY:**

- (1) Knowledge of Subject
- (2) Clarity of Explanations
- (3) Fairness
- (4) Classroom Control
- (5) Attitude Toward Students
- (6) Ability to Stimulate Interest
- (7) Attitude Toward Student Opinions
- (8) Variety in Teaching Procedures
- (9) Encouragement of Pupil Participation
- (10) Sense of Humor
- (11) Planning and Preparation
- (12) Assignments
### OVERALL AVERAGES: PUPIL-CENTERED ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>4.068</td>
<td>4.239</td>
<td>4.270</td>
<td>4.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>3.593</td>
<td>3.957</td>
<td>3.535</td>
<td>3.962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>3.269</td>
<td>3.542</td>
<td>3.439</td>
<td>3.586</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Key**

3. Fairness
5. Attitude Toward Pupils
7. Attitude Toward Student Opinions
9. Encouragement of Pupil Participation
10. Sense of Humor
## APPENDIX G

### OVERALL AVERAGES: TEACHER-CENTERED ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Begin Tchrs</td>
<td>Exper Tchrs</td>
<td>Begin Tchrs</td>
<td>Exper Tchrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3.577</td>
<td>4.029</td>
<td>3.659</td>
<td>4.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>3.527</td>
<td>3.967</td>
<td>3.224</td>
<td>3.671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>3.235</td>
<td>3.473</td>
<td>3.441</td>
<td>3.601</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Key**

1. Knowledge of Subject
2. Clarity of Explanations
4. Classroom Control
6. Ability to Stimulate Interest
8. Variety in Teaching Procedures
11. Planning and Preparation
12. Assignments
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### APPENDIX H

**CLASSROOM SUMMARY REPORT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ques. No.</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tchr</th>
<th>Prin</th>
<th>Pupils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cumulative Totals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tchr</th>
<th>Prin</th>
<th>Pupils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.958</td>
<td>2.708</td>
<td>2.679</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = number of pupil respondents
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