





This is to certify that the

dissertation entitled

THE SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS RELATIONSHIP OF  
TEACHER AND STUDENT, AND TEACHER BEHAVIOR

presented by

Carol A. VandenBoogert

has been accepted towards fulfillment  
of the requirements for

PhD. degree in Administration and  
Curriculum

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Kenneth L. Harding". The signature is written over a horizontal line.

Major professor

Dr. Kenneth L. Harding

Date October 25, 1983.



RETURNING MATERIALS:

Place in book drop to  
remove this checkout from  
your record. FINES will  
be charged if book is  
returned after the date  
stamped below.

MAR 13 1 2002

DO NOT CIRCULATE

ROOM USE ONLY

THE SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS RELATIONSHIP  
OF TEACHER AND STUDENT,  
AND  
TEACHER BEHAVIOR

By

Carol Ann VandenBoogert

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to  
Michigan State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration and Curriculum

1983



# ABSTRACT

## THE SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS RELATIONSHIP OF TEACHER AND STUDENT, AND TEACHER BEHAVIOR

By

Carol Ann VandenBoogert

The purpose of this study was to consider the teacher socioeconomic status background and the pairing of teacher and student by similar/dissimilar socioeconomic status background on the following:

- (1.) teacher classroom orientation;
- (2.) teacher grading practices;
- (3.) teacher satisfaction and mobility;
- (4.) teacher perception of the importance of the consideration of teacher-student socioeconomic status background pairing or race in teacher placement.

The study considered responses from teachers who shared a similar socioeconomic status background with their students (thereby constituting matched groups) in relation to those teachers who did not share a similar socioeconomic status background with their students (thereby constituting unmatched groups).

Underlying support for the study was presented with a review of related literature concerning:

- (1.) teacher characteristics and socioeconomic status background;

Is

te

19

th

Th

st

ba

le

se

su

in

eco

nu

- (2.) student-home characteristics and socioeconomic status background;
- (3.) teacher-student socioeconomic status background match.

Teacher questionnaires were distributed to third, fourth, and fifth grade teachers in three Michigan public school districts at the close of the 1982-83 school year. Of the 132 teachers contacted, 68 participated in the study.

The questionnaires were color coded to indicate either the high or low status of the schools to which they were distributed. School status was based upon school level percentage data for hot lunch participation:

- (1.) high status was correlated with a high percentage of students who paid the full amount for hot lunch;
- (2.) low status was correlated with a high percentage of students who paid a reduced amount for hot lunch or received hot lunch at no charge.

Teacher socioeconomic status background was determined on the basis of self-reported information concerning his/her major source of childhood support.

In order to examine the degree of association between the level of socioeconomic status and the items on the teacher questionnaire for the eight null hypotheses addressed by the study, the chi-square test was utilized.

The major findings revealed by the study indicate that teacher socioeconomic status background is not associated with his/her work values, authority roles, and grading practices. They further indicate that teacher-student socioeconomic status background match is not associated with teacher satisfaction with teaching.

To My Parents

Fred and Evelyn VandenBoogert

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to acknowledge her committee members for their concern and guidance throughout the course of the doctoral program. Special appreciation is expressed to: Dr. Kenneth Harding, chairperson of the committee, for acting as a positive influence when barriers seemed insurmountable; Dr. Linda Anderson for providing invaluable assistance in the development of the study; Dr. George Ferree for offering constructive ideas; and Dr. William Ewens for his willingness to serve on the committee.

Appreciation is further extended to the school administrators and teachers whose cooperation made this study a reality.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	vi
 Chapter	
I. THE PROBLEM . . . . .	1
Introduction . . . . .	1
The Problem . . . . .	2
Importance of Study . . . . .	3
Definition of Terms . . . . .	4
Limitations of Study . . . . .	5
Procedures and Methodology . . . . .	5
Summary . . . . .	6
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE . . . . .	8
Introduction . . . . .	8
Relevancy of Social Class for Education . . . . .	11
Teacher Characteristics and SES Background . . . . .	12
Student-Home Characteristics and SES Background . . . . .	16
Teacher-Student SES Background Match . . . . .	24
Summary . . . . .	31
III. PROCEDURES AND METHODOLOGY . . . . .	36
Introduction . . . . .	36
Hypotheses . . . . .	36
Sample Population . . . . .	38
Instrumentation . . . . .	42
Data Analysis Procedures . . . . .	49
Summary . . . . .	50
IV. DATA ANALYSIS . . . . .	52
Introduction . . . . .	52
Analysis of Data . . . . .	52
Summary . . . . .	99

	Page
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	101
Summary . . . . .	101
Conclusions . . . . .	108
Recommendations . . . . .	111
Afterword . . . . .	112
APPENDICES	
A. 1982-83 INCOME GUIDELINES FOR FEDERALLY SUBSIDIZED SCHOOL MEALS . . . . .	113
B. TEACHER LETTER OF EXPLANATION AND TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE . . . . .	114
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	131
General References . . . . .	133



# LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
3.1	Hot Lunch Participation Data Utilized in Determining Low (L) and High (H) School Status . . . . .	40
3.2	Demographic Characteristics of Respondents . . . . .	41
3.3	Total Scale Scores on "Problems in Schools Questionnaire" by Teacher-Student SES Background . . .	47
4.1	Chi-square Breakdown of Association of "Problems in Schools Questionnaire" to Teacher Childhood SES . . .	53
4.2	Chi-square Breakdown of Association of Form in Teacher Grading Practices to Teacher Childhood SES . .	56
4.3	Chi-square Breakdown of Association of Neatness in Teacher Grading Practices to Teacher Childhood SES . .	57
4.4	Chi-square Breakdown of Association of Grammatical Aspects in Teacher Grading Practices to Teacher Childhood SES . . . . .	58
4.5	Chi-square Breakdown of Association of Originality of Ideas in Teacher Grading Practices to Teacher Childhood SES . . . . .	59
4.6	Chi-square Breakdown of Association of Follows Directions in Teacher Grading Practices to Teacher Childhood SES . . . . .	60
4.7	Chi-square Breakdown of Association of Completion on Time in Teacher Grading Practices to Teacher Childhood SES . . . . .	61
4.8	Chi-square Breakdown of Association of Teacher Determination to Remain in Present School to Teacher Childhood SES . . . . .	64
4.9	Chi-square Breakdown of Association of Teacher Determination to Remain in Present System, but Transfer to Another School to Teacher Childhood SES .	65

Table	Page
4.10 Chi-square Breakdown of Association of Teacher Determination to Transfer to Another School System to Teacher Childhood SES . . . . .	66
4.11 Chi-square Breakdown of Association of Teacher Determination to Leave the Educational Profession to Teacher Childhood SES . . . . .	67
4.12 Teacher Mobility Within Present System . . . . .	69
4.13 Educational Commitment . . . . .	70
4.14 Chi-square Breakdown of Association of Teacher Perception of the Importance of Teacher-Student SES Background Match in Teacher Placement to Teacher Childhood SES . . . . .	73
4.15 Chi-square Breakdown of Association of Teacher Perception of the Importance of Teacher-Student Racial Match in Teacher Placement to Teacher Childhood SES . . . . .	74
4.16 Chi-square Breakdown of Association of "Problems in Schools Questionnaire" to Teacher-Student SES Background Match . . . . .	75
4.17 Chi-square Breakdown of Association of Form in Teacher Grading Practices to Teacher-Student SES Background Match . . . . .	79
4.18 Chi-square Breakdown of Association of Neatness in Teacher Grading Practices to Teacher-Student SES Background Match . . . . .	80
4.19 Chi-square Breakdown of Association of Grammatical Aspects in Teacher Grading Practices to Teacher- Student SES Background Match . . . . .	82
4.20 Chi-square Breakdown of Association of Originality of Ideas in Teacher Grading Practices to Teacher- Student SES Background Match . . . . .	83
4.21 Chi-square Breakdown of Association of Follows Directions in Teacher Grading Practices to Teacher-Student SES Background Match . . . . .	85

Table		Page
4.22	Chi-square Breakdown of Association of Completion on Time in Teacher Grading Practices to Teacher- Student SES Background Match . . . . .	86
4.23	Chi-square Breakdown of Association of Teacher Determination to Remain in Present School to Teacher-Student SES Background Match . . . . .	90
4.24	Chi-square Breakdown of Association of Teacher Determination to Remain in Present System, but Transfer to Another School to Teacher-Student SES Background Match . . . . .	91
4.25	Chi-square Breakdown of Association of Teacher Determination to Transfer to Another School System to Teacher-Student SES Background Match . . . .	92
4.26	Chi-square Breakdown of Association of Teacher Determination to Leave the Educational Profession to Teacher-Student SES Background Match . . . . .	93
4.27	Chi-square Breakdown of Association of Teacher Perception of the Importance of Teacher-Student SES Background Match in Teacher Placement to Teacher-Student SES Background Match . . . . .	97
4.28	Chi-square Breakdown of Association of Teacher Perception of the Importance of Teacher-Student Racial Match in Teacher Placement to Teacher- Student SES Background Match . . . . .	98

## Chapter I

### THE PROBLEM

#### Introduction

Members of different social classes, by virtue of enjoying (or suffering) different conditions of life, come to see the world differently - to develop different conceptions of social reality, different aspirations and hopes and fears, different conceptions of the desirable (Kohn, 1972, p. 110).

As the preceding quotation suggests, social class influences individual perceptions of the world. It further impacts upon and shapes behavior.

This notion has special significance in the educational realm, as well, since schools often mirror society. It is important to understand that student experiences may vary according to the type of school setting - affluent suburban school, middle class suburban school, urban ghetto school, or rural school.

It is not sufficient, however, to simply be concerned with the social class of the student within a particular educational setting. The social class background of the teacher needs to be taken into consideration, as well. This rationale is allied with many of the current conceptualizations which assume that teacher and student mutually affect one another.

The basic values and attitudes exhibited by both mingle to create a given learning environment.

More specifically, the teacher-student interaction process can be considered from the standpoint of evaluation:

. . . recent sociological research documents the relationship between the way in which students are evaluated and social background variables such as SES and ethnicity (Boocock, 1980, p. 154).

It would appear then, that teacher-student interaction might be affected by socioeconomic status (SES) - related perceptions of the world. Teacher orientation toward work values, authority roles, and teaching practices may be related to his or her own SES background. Likewise, student orientation toward authority roles may be related to his or her SES background. If conflicting standards of effort and/or conduct arise between teacher and student, then an unsatisfactory relationship may develop. Thus, teacher-student SES background match may be of importance in the development of a satisfactory learning situation.

### The Problem

The purpose of this study is to consider the teacher socioeconomic status background and the pairing of teacher and student by similar/dissimilar socioeconomic status background on the following:

- (1.) teacher classroom orientation;
- (2.) teacher grading practices;
- (3.) teacher satisfaction and mobility;

- (4.) teacher perceptions of the importance of consideration of teacher-student socioeconomic status background pairing or race in teacher placement.

This study considers responses from teachers who share the same socioeconomic status background as their students (thereby constituting matched groups) in relation to those teachers who do not share the same socioeconomic status background as their students (thereby constituting unmatched groups).

#### Importance of Study

It may be beneficial to consider the implications of such a study in relation to an actual situation. For example, Dworkin (1980) reports in his study of urban area faculty turnover that teachers who plan to leave the field of education are generally under 35, white, and from higher class origins.

It might be hypothesized, from this example, that teachers who generally plan to leave the field of education are from middle SES backgrounds and as such might exhibit a strong orientation toward work and conformance. Furthermore, since urban schools are represented in the study, it might be concluded that the students are generally from low SES backgrounds and may exhibit a laissez-faire attitude toward school and authority figures. Such circumstances could create a teacher-student interaction pattern based on conflicting standards.

The

sha

wo

is

ha

i

s

c

H

t

S

a

S

h

O

Therefore, it can be hypothesized that had the teacher and student shared the same SES background, the teacher-student interaction pattern would probably be more positive, thus resulting in higher teacher satisfaction with teaching.

Race might be considered another important factor in this example. It is indicated, however, that new teachers, regardless of their race, are significantly more likely to leave the field of education if they perceive their assignment as undesirable.

Hence, with this example in mind, the following questions are of particular interest:

- (1.) Does teacher SES background relate to his/her work values, authority roles, and teaching practices?
- (2.) Does teacher-student SES background match indicate satisfaction?

Such considerations represent perspectives which seem to be of importance since:

Research has not explored the kinds of hypothetical demographic and behavioral changes which could modify the existing regime of social influences on educational attainment (Mare, 1981, p. 72).

#### Definition of Terms

Socioeconomic Status (SES): a statistic compiled from either a single factor or a combination of factors such as occupation, income, education, or area of residence.



### Limitations of Study

The samples used in this study are taken from schools which exhibit distinct socioeconomic status differences. Therefore, the results can not be generalized beyond this population. Information generated from this study is subject to the limitations associated with self-report devices.

### Procedures and Methodology

#### Sample

The total population sample for this study includes third, fourth, and fifth grade teachers from selected schools within Michigan.

#### Instrumentation

Teacher questionnaires were distributed to third, fourth, and fifth grade teachers in selected schools representing distinctly high or low SES students. The questionnaires were color coded to indicate either the high or low status of the schools to which they were distributed.

School status was based upon school level percentage data for hot lunch participation:

- (1.) low status was correlated with a high percentage of students who paid a reduced amount for hot lunch or received hot lunch at no charge;

- (2.) high status was correlated with a high percentage of students who paid the full amount for hot lunch.

Teacher SES background was determined on the basis of self-reported information concerning his or her major source of childhood support. A modified version of the Hollingshead Scale, as described by Stricker (1972), was utilized to determine the specific SES background of each teacher in the sample population.

### Analysis

In order to examine the degree of association between the level of SES and the items on the teacher questionnaire, the chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) test was utilized. A .10 level of confidence (level of confidence and level of significance were considered to be synonymous) was established. The chi-square seems to be especially appropriate for utilization in this study because it is a nonparametric statistical test which is often utilized when research data are in the form of frequency counts.

### Summary

It is the intent of Chapter I to provide an overview of the study with: an introduction to the problem; a statement of the problem and its importance; a definition of terms; a delineation of the limitations of the study; and a presentation of the procedures and methodology utilized in the study.

The following chapters are designed to further enhance the reader's understanding of the study. Underlying support for the study is presented with a review of related literature in Chapter II. Chapter III provides for consideration of the instrumentation procedures utilized. An analysis of the data is put forth in Chapter IV. Chapter V presents a summarization of the study with conclusions and recommendations.

## Chapter II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

#### Introduction

Terms referring to social classes - working class, middle class, upper class, lower class - have become increasingly common in American discourse, references to one or another class are taken for granted in the mass media. Concepts reflecting in one way or another an understanding that American society is stratified into various levels in terms of power, status, and economic resources are important parts of the intellectual technology used by the various institutions of this society - by government, by business, by voluntary organizations, by political groups, and by citizens and community groups of all kinds. The issue of social stratification - who gets what and how - has become central to the discussion of important problems of the day (Coleman, Rainwater, and McClelland, 1978, p. 4).

In order to develop an initial understanding of social stratification, some of the characteristics associated with upper, middle, and lower class structure will be considered.

The upper class, according to Domhoff (1970), is a governing class which maintains a disproportionate amount of America's wealth and contributes a disproportionate number of its members to governmental decision making bodies.

Conversely, Mills (1969) explains that what he terms the new middle class - white-collar people on salary - earn a living by working for the upper two or three percent of the population who own forty or fifty percent of the private property in America. He further indicates that the labor market determines middle class chances of receiving income, exercising power, and enjoying prestige.

Furthermore, the employees who comprise the middle class form a pyramid (with the bulk of workers at the lower end of the pay scale) - within the structure of society. This is very different from the horizontal layer found in the upper and lower class strata.

Unfortunately, any resemblance of the lower class to either the middle or upper class ends at this point. Patterson (1981) indicates that the lower class must tolerate minimal pay and/or welfare, low level job training, and the absence of prestige.

Such differences in SES background seem, accordingly, to be related to variations in work values. For example, the following work values have been hypothesized from three major sets of social factors:

- (1.) socialization and other types of life experiences which occur prior to the individual's entry into the labor force and which shape one's view of the importance of the various dimensions of work;
- (2.) nonwork social roles which impose constraints and contingencies on the types of meanings that the individual can seek from the work activity;
- (3.) work experiences which affect the mature worker's valuation of the potential rewards associated with work (Kalleberg, 1977, pp. 141-142).

Perhaps a more direct link can be formulated between SES background and the variation in work values by considering the socialization of children in upper, middle, and lower class homes in relation to parental occupations and the resultant standards of conduct and orientation to authority roles.

Members of the upper class generally deal with ideas in the occupational realm. Therefore, they need to be flexible with their thought processes in order to provide not only for the development, but also the instrumentation of those ideas. Upper class members generally assume a position of authority whereby they are conceivably more able to implement their ideas. It seems then, that upper class parental values will be focused on flexibility and the importance of autonomy and self-direction.

Middle class occupations also deal with the manipulation of ideas - although to a lesser extent than is found in the upper class strata. Traditionally, middle class occupations are those which require the handling of interpersonal relations. Members of the middle class are, however, more subject to externally imposed rules and regulations than members of the upper class. Hence, members of the middle class are not "free" to develop and institute policy decisions. Consequently, it seems that middle class parents will value the exploration of ideas, but at the same time expect their children to learn to share and cooperate.

Members of the lower class tend to have occupations which deal with the manipulation of things - rather than ideas or interpersonal relations.

Furthermore, lower class occupations tend, on the whole, to impose structure on people. They subject people to standardization and direct supervision. Therefore, lower class occupations do not allow for a variety of developmental experiences. It appears then, that it will be more difficult for lower class parents to provide a structure around which their children can organize meaning in terms of exploration of ideas. This lack of structure may further result in a laissez-faire orientation by lower class parents toward their children's conduct.

Therefore, it seems reasonable to assume that upper class, middle class, and lower class parents will value different characteristics in their children because of differences in occupational circumstances.

This supposition does not assume that parents consciously train their children to meet future occupational requirements; it may simply be that their own occupational experiences have significantly affected parents' conceptions of what is desirable behavior, on or off the job, for adults or for children (Kohn, 1972, p. 116).

#### Relevancy of Social Class for Education

The preceding information represents important considerations regarding the impact of social class upon the institutions of our society. The concern of this study, however, lies in the educational realm. Thus, consideration will move to the relevancy of social class upon the field of education:

the  
con  
tu  
po  
ge

in  
o

(

in  
is

Bye  
cha



. . . in modern societies education is a highly developed institution. It has a network of rules creating public classifications of persons and knowledge. It defines which individuals belong to these categories and possess the appropriate knowledge. And it defines which persons have access to valued positions in society. Education is a central element in the public biography of individuals greatly affecting their life chances (Meyer, 1977, p. 55).

What then, are some specific components which might be necessary in the consideration of the impact of social class upon the educational institution? It seems that the home, student, and teacher would all be important components. Since greater precision appears to be needed, these general areas will be embellished to encompass the following:

- (1.) teacher characteristics and SES background;
- (2.) student-home characteristics and SES background;
- (3.) teacher-student SES background match.

In order to establish some credence for such deliberation, a sampling of the literature will be assessed in relation to each preceding area.

#### (1.) TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS AND SES BACKGROUND

Why should educational research concern itself with teacher characteristics and SES background?

As the urban schools become filled with greater numbers of children from low income families and teachers of middle class backgrounds . . . communication and effective role modelling is diminished (Dworkin, 1980, p. 72).

Ryans (1972) explains with greater specificity that the following characteristics have been identified in relation to a sample of teachers'

fin

Tea

In

te

fr

st

te

or

Fu

ti

di

Hi

Me

Low

financial and cultural status during childhood using the "G - 70/2

Teacher Characteristic Schedule:"

- (1.) change, innovation, and liberalism are shown to be most valued by teachers coming from above-average financial backgrounds;
- (2.) work and conformance are shown to have the highest mean for teachers from average financial backgrounds;
- (3.) work and conformance are shown to have the lowest mean for teachers from below-average financial backgrounds.

In attempting to draw some parallels between the above teacher characteristics and classroom behavior - it might be anticipated that teachers from above-average financial backgrounds would tend to advocate greater student freedom than teachers from average financial backgrounds. The teachers from average financial backgrounds might exhibit greater control or restraint with their students.

Furthermore, in making a comparison of the "G - 70/2 Teacher Characteristic Schedule" findings and the parental SES background characteristics discussed previously - the following relationships can be noted:

	<u>Parents</u>	<u>Teachers</u>
High SES	flexibility & autonomy	innovation & liberalism (highly valued)
Middle SES	share & cooperate	work & conformance (highest mean)
Low SES	laissez-faire	work & conformance (lowest mean)

Therefore, since parents seem to transfer their values to their children and teachers appear to exhibit similar SES background values - it might be inferred that the teacher-student SES background match may be of importance. Very little research appears to have been done, however, in relation to teacher SES background characteristics and how they might be exhibited in classroom behavior.

Hence, the problem of this study involves consideration of teacher SES background in relation to student SES background. It will be studied by operationalizing the following:

- (1.) teacher valuing of autonomy versus conformity;
- (2.) teacher valuing of form versus meaning.

In order to examine the teacher SES background in relation to teacher autonomy versus control behavior, the "Problems In Schools Questionnaire" (Deci et al., 1981) will be utilized. This instrument is designed to assess adults' (especially teachers') orientations toward control versus autonomy with children. It has been shown to be externally valid since teachers who were considered to be more autonomy-oriented on the instrument were rated in a similar manner by their students. This instrument reflects the following dimensions:

"Problems In Schools Questionnaire"

Highly Controlling;  
Moderately Controlling;  
Moderately Autonomous;  
Highly Autonomous.

Teacher grading practices seem to be further related to student classroom

be

be

co

if

gr

ba

The

ut.

ba

er

gr

Sim

cat

qui

ent.

as

will

por

behavior. Brophy and Good (1974) indicate that grades - rather than being indicators of actual student competence - are often more closely correlated to the classroom behavior standards established by the teacher. If teacher classroom behavior is somehow related to teacher SES background, teacher grading practices might also be related to teacher SES background.

The preceding information suggests that the manner in which a teacher utilizes authority within the classroom may be related to his or her SES background. Does the educational organization, however, allow the teacher to exhibit behavior which may be related to his or her SES background?

The tight control educational organizations maintain over the ritual or formal classification systems is central to our understanding of education as an institution. To a considerable extent, educational organization functions to maintain the societally agreed on rites defined in societal myths (or institutional rules) of education. Education rests on and obtains enormous resources from central institutional rules about what valid education is. These rules define the ritual categories of teacher, student, curricular topic, and type of school. When these categories are properly assembled, education is understood to occur (Meyer and Rowan, 1975, pp. 84-85).

Simply considering such a description as having face validity may indicate that teachers perform in relation to specific classification requirements and have little opportunity to demonstrate individual orientations toward autonomy or control. It is generally considered that as higher levels of coordination are required, bureaucratic controls will develop to provide structure for these activities. It is important to note that this view does not fit educational organizations.

There is a great deal of evidence that educational organizations (at least in the United States) lack close internal coordination, especially of the content and methods of what is presumably their main activity - instruction. Instruction tends to be removed from the control of the organizational structure, in both its bureaucratic and its collegial aspects (Meyer and Rowan, 1975, p. 79).

This lack of internal coordination of educational organizations led Weick (1976) to apply the term "loosely coupled system" to educational organizations. This means that the structure is disconnected from the technical or work activity, and the activity is disconnected from its effects. In other words, instructional activities are often left uninspected by large educational bureaucracies. Teaching lends itself to this decoupling process because it often occurs in the isolated self-contained classroom, removed from organizational control.

In this case, what kinds of information do loosely coupled systems provide members around which they can organize meaning?

There is a rather barren structure that can be observed, reported on, and retrospected in order to make sense. Given the ambiguity of loosely coupled structures, this suggests that there may be increased pressure of members to construct or negotiate some kind of social reality they can live with (Weick, 1976, p. 6).

Familiar SES background characteristics may then provide teachers with the logical starting point for the construction of such a "social reality."

## (2.) STUDENT-HOME CHARACTERISTICS AND SES BACKGROUND

It is important to bear in mind that educational organizations do not function in a vacuum. The education of a child or youth is influenced

by th

have

beha

Diff

of s

Medw

scho

duct

pare

for

they

les

to p

as

sib

Per

of n

sta



by the home, as well as the school. Upon arrival at school, students have already been affected by their family SES background and parental behavioral expectations.

Differences in parental and teacher expectations in relation to standards of student conduct may lead to conflict. For example, Vernberg and Medway (1981) conducted attribution interviews with parents who had school-related disagreements with their child's teacher. They also conducted interviews with teachers who had similar disagreements with a parent. The parents generally tended to hold the teachers responsible for the problems. They held characteristics of their children which they deemed not under their personal control to be responsible to a lesser extent. Teachers, however, attributed most of the responsibility to parent-home factors. They assigned controllable child characteristics as the next most important factor. They did not attribute any responsibility for the problems to themselves.

Perhaps consideration of school values in relation to the backgrounds of middle and lower class children will provide a more precise understanding of why such perceptual discrepancies may occur.

The school is an institution where every item in the present is finely linked to a distant future, consequently there is not a serious clash of expectations between the school and the middle class child. The child's developed time-span of anticipation allows the present activity to be related to a future, and this is meaningful. There is little conflict of values between the teacher and child and, more importantly, the child is predisposed to accept and respond to the language structure of communication . . . The middle class child is predisposed towards the ordering of symbolic

re  
re  
fo  
ir  
(b

As was  
less fo  
child d  
class (  
ward an  
may be  
than sp  
in oper  
be of g

The  
pre  
chi  
met  
of  
of  
pat  
cla  
ava  
lar

Upon ref  
relevant  
municati  
of secti  
Here, Dw  
er class

relationships and, more importantly, imposing order and seeing new relationships. His level of curiosity is high. There is a conformity to authority and an acceptance of the role of the teacher, irrespective of psychological relationships to his personality (Bernstein, 1971, pp. 29-30).

As was previously noted, however, the lower class family structure is less formally organized than the middle class structure in regard to child development. Bernstein (1971) indicates further that the working class (lower class) notion of authority is not related to a stable "reward and punishment system." Additionally, members of the lower class may be characterized as maintaining general ideas about the future rather than specific long-term goals. An external locus of control seems to be in operation with an emphasis on chance. Present activities appear to be of greater value than concern with a future goal.

The working class (lower class) child is concerned mainly with the present, and his social structure, unlike that of the middle class child, provides little incentive or purposeful support to make the methods and ends of the school personally meaningful. The problems of discipline and classroom control result not from isolated points of resistance or conflict but from the attempt to reorient a whole pattern of perception . . . . The way the receptivity of the working class (lower class) child has been structured is such that which is available to perception is determined by the implications of the language-use of his class environment (Bernstein, 1971, pp. 36-37).

Upon reflection, it appears that a common thread connects the review of relevant literature thus far - the notion of language structure/communication and its SES relationship. It first appeared at the beginning of section one, dealing with teacher characteristics and SES background. Here, Dworkin's (1980) idea was considered that as greater numbers of lower class students encounter teachers from middle class backgrounds that

communication is diminished. Furthermore, according to the information presented in section two about student-home characteristics and SES background, it seems that language-use perceptions may be determined by class environment.

The relationship of language development to SES would, therefore, seem to warrant closer investigation. Anastasiow and Hanes (1976) explain that language provides a major means for the transmittal of human culture. Hence, the study of a child's language is significant because it determines the developmental sequence through which the child becomes competent in communicating with other individuals in his or her culture.

Linguistic differences, other than dialect, occur in the normal social environment and status groups may be distinguished by their forms of speech. This difference is most marked where the gap between the socio-economic levels is very great. It is suggested that the measurable interstatus differences in language facility result from entirely different modes of speech found within the middle class and the working class (lower class). It is proposed that the two distinct forms of language-use arise because of the organization of the two social strata is such that different emphases are placed on language potential. Once the emphasis or stress is placed, then the resulting forms of language-use progressively orient the speakers to distinct and different types of relationships to objects and persons, irrespective of the level of measured intelligence (Bernstein, 1971, p. 61).

Furthermore, Anastasiow and Hanes (1976) indicate that there are generally major differences in the manner in which lower class and middle class mothers teach language to their children.

It seems that middle class mothers who attempt to understand their children's speech, encourage playing with words (e.g., rhyming words),

and p

prepa

Such

clas

They

their

This

was

mat.

and

wer

tea

For

sen

son

and provide language models utilizing strong overcorrection - help to prepare their children for easy adjustment to school.

Such techniques are not often utilized by lower class mothers. Lower class mothers do not tend to expand upon a child's spoken language. They further appear to be limited in terms of verbal interaction with their children.

This notion is exemplified in a study by Hess and Shipman (1965) which was designed to discover how the teaching styles of mothers shape information processing and learning styles in their children. The mothers and their children represented various SES levels. Large differences were found among the status groups in terms of the ability of mothers to teach and of their children to learn.

For example, note the variation in characteristics between two representative pairs on a task requiring the mother to teach the child to sort a small number of toys:

First Pair .

- Mother provides explicit information about the task;
- She explains what she expects of the child;
- She offers support;
- She makes it clear that the child is to perform.

Second Pair

- Mother relies more on nonverbal communication;
- She does not define the task;

- She does not provide the child with information to be utilized in solving the problem;
- She does not explain what she expects of the child.

Assessment was made on the basis of the child's:

- (1.) ability to sort the objects;
- (2.) ability to verbalize the principle on which the sorting was performed.

Children from middle class homes scored well above children from working class (lower class) homes - especially in terms of verbal explanations of the sorting procedure.

Over 60 per cent of the middle class children placed the objects correctly on all tasks; the performance of working class (lower class) children ranged as low as 29 per cent correct. Approximately 40 per cent of these middle class children who were successful were able to verbalize the sorting principle; working class (lower class) children were less able to explain the sorting principle, ranging downward from the middle class level to one task on which no child was able to verbalize correctly the basis of his sorting behavior. These differences clearly paralleled the relative abilities and teaching skills of the mothers from differing social-status groups (Hess and Shipman, 1965, pp. 882-883).

The role performed by parents in early language development seems to be of importance. Further justification for this notion may be found through consideration of specific language development characteristics. Horton (1970) explains that disadvantaged children exhibit consistent linguistic difficulties. These include the following:

- (1.) a limited vocabulary;
- (2.) a predominant use of nouns and verbs;
- (3.) a limited and/or rigid use of adjectives and adverbs;

- (4.) deficient syntactical development;
- (5.) deficient auditory discrimination;
- (6.) deviations in articulation.

Such difficulties are then paired with perceptual and intellectual patterns of development which differ from those of middle class children.

Consequently, middle class and lower class children appear to have differential access to language development. More specifically, it is found that:

Two general types of (language) code can be distinguished: elaborated and restricted. They can be defined, on a linguistic level, in terms of the probability of predicting for any one speaker which syntactic elements will be used to organize meaning across a representative range of speech (Bernstein, 1971, p. 125).

Perhaps a comparison of the Bernstein (1971) and Hess and Shipman (1965) description of elaborated and restricted codes will provide further enlightenment:

	<u>Elaborated</u>	<u>Restricted</u>
Bernstein:	-the individual chooses from a relatively extensive number of alternatives such that the probability of prediction of organizing elements is reduced considerably;	-the individual chooses from what is often a greatly limited number of alternatives such that the probability of prediction of organizing elements is highly increased;
Hess and Shipman:	-individualized communication; -message is specific to a particular situation, topic, or person; -it permits a more complex range of thought.	-stereotyped; -limited; -condensed; -sentences are short and simple, they are often unfinished.



Bernstein (1971) indicates that middle class children can be expected to maintain both an elaborated and a restricted code, while lower class children can be expected to be limited to a restricted code. This presents important implications in terms of school success.

Burling (1970) considers Bernstein's conclusions, if further substantiated, to suggest that in order to provide lower class children with equal educational opportunities - outside sources need to begin to help them very early if they are to be able to rise above the restricted code to which their family and social class background would limit them.

While the exact meaning of "cultural deprivation" is a bit obscure, it does seem to suggest that something can be missing from a child's early environment that, quite apart from any question of his native intelligence, can condemn him to educational disabilities (Burling, 1970, p. 166).

Furthermore, when focusing on language perceptions in relation to teacher and student, the educational issue becomes even more complex. Williams (1973) reports in a study of black, white, and Mexican-American student teachers and teachers - and of middle and lower class black, white, and Mexican-American students that teachers tend to utilize stereotyped sets of attitudes as "anchor points" in their evaluation of children's speech samples.

The generalizations from this study were: (1.) that one could readily obtain anticipated or stereotyped attitudes associated with a particular type of child, (2.) that these would be consistent, (3.) that they could be interpreted on the two-factor model, and (4.) that they would show an interpretable relation with ratings of videotape samples (Williams, 1973, p. 120).

It seems then, that the interaction of both teacher and student should be considered. Feldman and Theiss (1982) contemplate how teacher and student expectations jointly affect one another within the educational setting. They support the notion that the expectations of both do have an effect on the outcome and "feelings of success" of the teacher and the student.

It is further important to understand that the teacher-student interaction process can be confounded by different teacher-student SES or racial backgrounds.

### (3.) TEACHER-STUDENT SES BACKGROUND MATCH

The teacher-student SES background match becomes important when the larger context of teacher-student interaction is considered; e.g., especially the role teacher perceptions/expectations play in student conduct and effort.

Teachers communicate to students what is expected of them in terms of behavioral standards. They additionally indicate whether or not students are measuring up to their behavioral expectations. Research indicates that student SES background may play an important role in the formulation of teacher perceptions.

In order to gain a better understanding of how the teacher-student interaction process might operate, the following theory is proposed to explain teacher expectation communication and performance influence:

Ora  
ent  
cha  
"po

it  
tri  
int  
add  
imp  
viol  
tea

Eube  
tro.  
Mush

- (1.) Variations in student ability and background lead teachers to form differential expectations for student performance.
- (2.) These expectations, in conjunction with the interaction context, influence teacher perceptions of control over student performance . . . .
- (3.) Teacher perceptions of personal control influence classroom climate and choice feedback contingencies . . . .
- (4.) Negative climate and feedback patterns may decrease student initiations . . . .
- (5.) Feedback contingencies also may influence student effort-outcome covariation beliefs . . . .
- (6.) Finally, effort-outcome covariation beliefs may influence student performance . . . . (Cooper, 1979, p. 406).

Crawford, Brophy, Evertson, and Coulter (1977) further report that differential findings for high and low SES classrooms suggest that student characteristics - even as determined by a variable such as SES - can be "powerful moderators" of the outcome of many teaching strategies.

It seems, then, that consideration of individual student traits or attributes in relation to teacher perceptions of personal control may be integral to the understanding of teacher-student interaction. SES may, additionally, play an important role in this interaction process. The importance of SES in terms of student characteristics has been previously noted, but it may also be important from the standpoint of teacher perceptions of personal control.

Huber and Form (1973) report a link between the notion of personal control and SES in a study of the general public which was conducted in Muskegon, Michigan. They asked two open-ended questions:

(1.) "why are rich people rich?"

(2.) "why are poor people poor?"

The data show that favorable personal traits are seen as responsible for wealth by 72 percent of the rich whites, 35 percent of the middle-income and poor whites, 29 percent of the middle-income blacks, and 17 percent of the poor blacks. Unfavorable personal traits were viewed as causing poverty by 62 percent of the rich, 41 percent of the middle-income whites, 30 percent of the poor whites, 19 percent of the middle-income blacks, and 17 percent of the poor blacks.

In this study, higher SES individuals viewed more personal control in relation to both wealth and poverty than lower SES individuals. Do higher SES teachers, therefore, attribute more responsibility for student behavior to the student himself or herself?

To further embellish this notion - the following attribution research has been demonstrated to be valuable in classroom application:

Research in the attributional domain has proven definitively that causal ascriptions for past performance are an important determinant of goal expectancies. For example, failure that is ascribed to low ability or to the difficulty of a task decreases expectation of future success more than failure that is ascribed to bad luck, mood or a lack of immediate effort (Weiner, 1979, p. 9).

More specifically, teacher perceptions give rise to sympathetic response in dealing with students considered to be exhibiting problem behavior when the problem is viewed as:

- (1.) caused by factors in the environment that affect the person rather than by factors internal to the person (such as moral defects or illegitimate goals and motives);
- (2.) not within the person's control;
- (3.) unintentional (an involuntary response to situational pressures rather than a preconceived, deliberate act);
- (4.) temporary due to unusual outside pressures (and not as a stable problem reflecting some kind of character defect);
- (5.) situational (responsive to particular stress factors, rather than global or generalized across situations such that it constitutes normal or expected behavior for this person) (Brophy and Evertson et al., 1981, p. 164).

When such teacher perceptions hold, the student is viewed as deserving of help. If, however, teacher perceptions to the contrary hold, the student is likely to be held responsible for his or her behavior and thus deserving of punishment. Hence, if SES influences perceptions of personal control, teachers may value different behavioral characteristics and thus utilize different bases for the expectation of future performance.

Additionally, Bar-Tal (1978) suggests that the attributions students present to explain their own success or failure are related to their willingness to "put forth effort" on future assignments. If they view failure as external to their own effort, they are not likely to apply themselves in situations in which they are expected to achieve.

Perhaps deeper insight can be gained into how a mismatch of teacher-student SES might lead to stronger expectation effects by considering research dealing with classroom seating and content of curriculum.

32433

Brook

divid

to th

and i

the r

decid

It h

as t

find

the

the

den

333

of

wit

sec

en

It

la

## CLASSROOM SEATING

Brooks, Silven, and Wooten (1978) examine classrooms which have been divided into different zones. It appears that students seated closer to the teacher are more likely to become involved in answering questions and in class decision making. Conversely, students seated farther from the teacher are less likely to participate in class discussions and decision making.

It has been observed that in some instances teachers utilize student SES as the basis for determining classroom seating. Rist (1970) notes such findings in following a small group of students from kindergarten through the second grade. He indicates that the kindergarten teacher grouped the students according to high, middle, and low SES. The high SES students were seated together and placed closest to the teacher. The low SES students were seated farthest away from the teacher. Over a period of time, the teacher was found to interact more frequently and favorably with the high SES students than the low SES students. The first and second grade teachers' behavior seemed to further maintain the differences between the high and low SES students.

It is important, however, to place such a study within the context of larger operational mechanisms such as those discussed in section two:

- (1.) parents seem to transmit different value systems in terms of behavioral expectations at various SES levels;



- (2.) children appear to develop different language abilities at various SES levels which render them either more or less able to benefit from school knowledge.

#### CONTENT OF CURRICULUM

Anyon (1981) further describes how expectations of students at various SES levels may penetrate to include the content of curriculum. While her interviews and observations include schools at all SES levels, consider the following teacher perceptions at a low SES school:

A fifth grade teacher indicated that she presented social studies lessons by putting notes on the board and requiring students to copy them . . .

I (Anyon) asked why she did that, and she said, "Because the children in this school don't know anything about the U.S., so you can't teach them much." The fifth-grade teacher said, "You can't teach these kids anything. Their parents don't take care about (of) them and they're not interested." A second-grade teacher when asked what was important knowledge for her students said, "Well, we keep them busy (Anyon, 1981, p. 7)."

How do such examples of teacher perceptions and expectations of student conduct and effort relate to the earlier consideration of teacher control behavior?

A teacher's perception of control over interaction with students has been suggested as a possible mediator of the expectation communication process . . . . The within classroom analysis found, as predicted, that teachers viewed interactions with low-expectation students as less controllable than those with high-expectation students and that teacher initiations were perceived as more controllable than child initiations (Cooper, Hinkel, and Good, 1980, p. 345).

This

con

the

"G

also

the

the

low

it s

rela

conc

may

Hence

raci

for

This research further indicates the following in relation to teacher control behavior:

Efforts to control student nonacademic behavior showed their strongest relations at the within - classroom level of analysis. Less perceived control over a student was related to more behavioral initiations by the teacher (Cooper, Hinkel, and Good, 1980, p. 353).

This notion might be illustrated more clearly by considering the "G - 70/2 Teacher Characteristic Schedule" as reported by Ryans (1972) along with possible student SES background characteristics:

	<u>Students</u>	<u>Teachers</u>
High SES	flexibility & autonomy	innovation & liberalism (highly valued)
Middle SES	share & cooperate	work & conformance (highest mean)
Low SES	laissez-faire	work & conformance (lowest mean)

It seems, then, that orientation toward work and authority roles may be related to SES background. If conflicting standards of effort and/or conduct arise between teacher and student, an unsatisfactory relationship may develop.

Hence, consideration of teacher-student matching according to SES or racial background may be of importance. Brophy and Good (1974) discuss, for example, the concept of optimal matching of teacher and student.

That is, interactions between particular teacher and student characteristics might make it possible, if prediction and

measurement were sufficiently accurate, to match students and teachers so as to insure maximum benefit and satisfaction for both (Brophy and Good, 1974, p. 241).

Consequently, it seems reasonable that teacher-student SES background match might be important when the larger context of teacher-student interaction is considered.

### Summary

In summary, it appears that the concept of socioeconomic status plays a visible role in the functioning of society. It is not unusual, for example, upon being introduced to an individual to inquire about the nature of his or her occupation. Such information may then be utilized, perhaps even unwittingly, to characterize the individual according to status, income, or power.

Some ramifications of SES seem, furthermore, to be transferred to the children of this society. It appears - possibly as a result of different occupational backgrounds - that upper, middle, and lower class parents may transfer different behavioral expectations to their children:

- (1.) upper class parental values focus on flexibility and the importance of autonomy and self-direction;
- (2.) middle class parental values consider the importance of the exploration of ideas, but at the same time expect their children to learn to share and cooperate;
- (3.) lower class parental values maintain a laissez-faire orientation toward their children's conduct.

On  
the  
vio  
que

Sim  
era

(1.

Work

Acco  
thre  
soci  
plac  
vidu

nyans  
have  
and c  
teris

Children then, enter the school environment having been influenced by their SES background. Teachers, by the same token, have been previously influenced by their SES background. Hence, the following questions are of particular interest:

- (1.) Does teacher SES background relate to his/her work values, authority roles, and teaching practices?
- (2.) Does teacher-student SES background match indicate satisfaction?

Since these questions are of major concern to this study, specific literature pertaining to each will be summarized.

- (1.) Does teacher SES background relate to his/her work values, authority roles, and teaching practices?

### Work Values

According to Kalleberg (1977), work values might be hypothesized from three major sets of social factors. Among them is the notion that socialization, along with other kinds of life experiences which take place before the individual enters the labor force, may form the individual's perception as to the importance of "various dimensions of work."

Ryans (1972) explains, for example, that the following characteristics have been identified in relation to a sample of teachers' financial and cultural status during childhood using the "G - 70/2 Teacher Characteristic Schedule:"

Aut

The

nan

tho

nan

stu

Tea

Tea

grac

than

corr

Such

ing

tant

done

nigh

- (1.) change, innovation, and liberalism are shown to be most valued by teachers coming from above-average financial backgrounds;
- (2.) work and conformance are shown to have the highest mean for teachers from average financial backgrounds;
- (3.) work and conformance are shown to have the lowest mean for teachers from below-average financial backgrounds.

#### Authority Roles

Therefore, it might be anticipated that teachers from above-average financial backgrounds would tend to advocate greater student freedom than those from average financial backgrounds. The teachers from average financial backgrounds might exhibit greater control or restraint with their students.

#### Teaching Practices

Teacher authority orientation seems to be additionally related to teacher grading practices. Brophy and Good (1974) indicate that grades - rather than being indicators of actual student competence - are often more closely correlated to the classroom behavior standards established by the teacher.

Such findings suggest then, that work values, authority roles, and teaching practices might be related to teacher SES background. It is important to note, however, that very little research appears to have been done in relation to teacher SES background characteristics and how they might be exhibited in classroom behavior.



(2.) Does teacher-student SES background match indicate satisfaction?

Feldman and Theiss (1982) contemplate how teacher-student expectations jointly affect one another. They support the notion that the expectations of both effect the outcome and "feelings of success" of teacher and student.

It seems, in this case, that consideration of individual student traits or attributes in relation to teacher perception of personal control may be integral to understanding teacher-student interaction. For example, Cooper, Hinkel, and Good (1980) discuss findings which point toward more behavioral initiations by the teacher when the teacher feels less perceived control over a student.

Crawford, Brophy, Evertson, and Coulter (1977) also report differential findings for high and low SES classrooms which suggest that student characteristics - even as determined by a variable such as SES - can be "powerful moderators" of the outcome of many teaching strategies.

It seems important, therefore, to illustrate the teacher-student SES background relationship. The following relationships can be noted when comparing possible student background characteristics and the "G - 70/2 Teacher Characteristic Schedule" as reported by Ryans (1972):

	<u>Students</u>	<u>Teachers</u>
High SES	flexibility & autonomy	innovation & liberalism (highly valued)
Middle SES	share & cooperate	work & conformance (highest mean)
Low SES	laissez-faire	work & conformance (lowest mean)

Consequently, it appears reasonable to assume that a satisfactory relationship might develop between teacher and student of similar SES background since the standards of effort and/or conduct seem to be mutually agreeable.

In conclusion, perhaps it would be prudent for educators to consider that the direction a teacher-student relationship follows within the educational process may be related to previous SES-related experiences on the part of both teacher and student.

## Chapter III

### PROCEDURES AND METHODOLOGY

#### Introduction

The procedures and methodology for the study will be subsumed under the following topics: (1.) Hypotheses; (2.) Sample population; (3.) Instrumentation; and (4.) Data analysis procedures.

#### Hypotheses

This study has been designed to address eight hypotheses. The hypotheses are organized by two independent variables:

- (1.) teacher childhood SES;
- (2.) teacher-student SES background match;

and four dependent variables:

- (1.) teacher classroom orientation;
- (2.) teacher grading practices;
- (3.) teacher satisfaction and mobility;
- (4.) teacher perceptions of the importance of consideration of teacher-student SES background match or race in teacher placement.

Hypothesis One

Teacher SES background is not associated with his/her classroom orientation according to the Deci et al., "Problems in Schools Questionnaire."

Hypothesis Two

Teacher SES background is not associated with his/her grading practices according to survey questions on grading student assignments.

Hypothesis Three

Teacher SES background is not associated with his/her job satisfaction and mobility according to survey questions on self-reported teacher determination to:

- (1.) remain in the present school system;
- (2.) transfer to another school system;
- (3.) leave the educational profession.

Hypothesis Four

Teacher SES background is not associated with his/her perception of teacher-student SES background match or race as criteria for assisting in the determination of teacher placement according to survey checklist question on teacher placement.

Hypothesis Five

The teacher-student SES background match is not associated with the teacher classroom orientation according to the Deci et al., "Problems in Schools Questionnaire."

#### Hypothesis Six

The teacher-student SES background match is not associated with teacher grading practices according to survey questions on grading student assignments.

#### Hypothesis Seven

The teacher-student SES background match is not associated with teacher job satisfaction and mobility according to survey questions on self-reported teacher determination to:

- (1.) remain in the present school system;
- (2.) transfer to another school system;
- (3.) leave the educational profession.

#### Hypothesis Eight

The teacher-student SES background match is not associated with teacher perception of teacher-student SES background match or race as criteria for assisting in the determination of teacher placement according to survey checklist question on teacher placement.

#### Sample Population

The study was conducted in three Michigan public school districts near the close of the 1982-83 school year. Third, fourth, and fifth grade teachers constituted the sample population. The rationale for selecting teachers at these particular grade levels involved the notion that students at these levels are generally less likely to be striving to please the teacher as might be expected of younger children and also less likely

to exhibit behavior confounded by peer pressure as might be anticipated of older children. Moreover, it was felt that conducting the study after the teachers had presumably spent an academic year teaching these students might produce more candid teacher responses.

In order to establish a general understanding of student socioeconomic status at the school level, percentage data for hot lunch participation was tabulated:

- (1.) low status was correlated with a high percentage of students who pay a reduced amount for hot lunch or receive hot lunch at no charge (1982-83 Income Guidelines for Federally Subsidized School Meals appear in Appendix A);
- (2.) high status was correlated with a high percentage of students who pay the full amount for hot lunch.

Schools displaying a similar percentage of students in both categories were deleted from the study. The 25 schools selected for the sample population were considered to be generally representative of students from high and low socioeconomic status backgrounds (Table 3.1).

The total population, therefore, included 60 teachers from high status schools and 72 teachers from low status schools. Of the 132 teachers, respondents included 36 teachers from high status schools and 32 teachers from low status schools. Hence, a total of 68 teachers participated in the study (Table 3.2).

Table 3.1 - Hot Lunch Participation Data\* Utilized in Determining  
Low (L) and High (H) School Status

School Code	Percent of Students Paying Full Amount for Hot Lunch	Percent of Students Receiving Hot Lunch at Reduced Amount/ Free	School Status
01	2	98	L
02	2	98	L
03	3	97	L
04	3	97	L
05	4	96	L
06	4	95	L
07	5	95	L
08	5	94	L
09	7	93	L
10	8	88	L
11	15	85	L
12	15	78	L
13	4	77	L
14	33	67	L
15	25	49	L
16	12	46	L
17	10	44	L
18	92	8	H
19	90	10	H
20	85	15	H
21	82	18	H
22	82	18	H
23	75	25	H
24	73	27	H
25	63	37	H

\* Some schools do not have 100% student participation in the hot lunch program. It should additionally be noted that the percent listed does not include kindergarten classes.

Table 3.2 - Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

VARIABLE	TEACHERS N=68	VARIABLE	TEACHERS N=68
Teacher Status		Race	
Low	33	Black	4
High	34	White	63
No Response	1	No Response	1
School Status		Age	
Low	32	21-30 years	6
High	36	31-40 years	29
Teacher(T)-Student(S)		41-50 years	13
Paired Status		51-60 years	15
Low T-Low S	20	61-70 years	5
High T-High S	22	Marital Status	
Low T-High S	13	Single	10
High T-Low S	12	Married	49
No Response	1	Divorced	7
Grade Level Taught		Widowed	2
Grade 3	19	Major Source of	
Grade 4	18	Childhood Support	
Grade 5	19	Father	58
Combination Grade 3-4	7	Mother	6
Combination Grade 4-5	5	Other	3
Teaching Experience		No Response	1
2-3 years	3	Parental Marital	
4-5 years	4	Status for Major	
6-10 years	6	Portion of Childhood	
11-15 years	24	Married	63
16-20 years	16	Divorced	3
21-25 years	9	Widowed	1
26 years or more	6	No Response	1
Sex		Questionnaires	N=132
Female	53	Returned	68
Male	15	Not Returned	64



### Instrumentation

Questionnaires were distributed to third, fourth, and fifth grade teachers in June, 1983. The questionnaires were color coded to indicate either the high or low status of the schools to which they were distributed.

It was further necessary to determine teacher SES background since the study considered teacher responses from the standpoint of teacher SES background and the effects of pairing teacher and student by similar/dissimilar SES background. Therefore, teachers were queried as to who provided his or her major source of childhood support and the major lifetime occupation of that individual.

The prestige level of each occupation was then determined using a modified version of the Hollingshead Scale, as described by Stricker (1972). This scale classifies occupations into seven categories. It ranges from one which is representative of a low level of occupational prestige to seven which is representative of a high level of occupational prestige.

For the purposes of this study, all occupations were assigned to one of the following categories:

- (1.) low status which included all occupations in levels one through three;
- (2.) high status which included all occupations in levels four through seven.

This particular division was instituted because level four is the first level to include occupations which are commonly considered to be middle class, e.g., technicians, clerical and sales workers, and owners of little businesses. Thus, low status was represented by those occupations considered to be below the middle class level and high status was represented by those occupations considered to be at or above the middle class level.

Teacher SES background status was, therefore, designated as being either high or low according to the occupational status level of his or her major source of childhood support.

It was then possible to pair teacher and student by similar/dissimilar SES background. Each teacher-student pair was placed into one of the following categories:

- (1.) low status teacher - low status student;
- (2.) high status teacher - high status student;
- (3.) low status teacher - high status student;
- (4.) high status teacher - low status student.

Hence, the two independent variables:

- (1.) teacher childhood SES;
- (2.) teacher-student SES background match;

were generally identified.

The study additionally provided for consideration of four dependent variables:

- (1.) teacher classroom orientation;
- (2.) teacher grading practices;
- (3.) teacher satisfaction and mobility;
- (4.) teacher perceptions of the importance of consideration of teacher-student SES background match or race in teacher placement.

In order to present a closer examination of the dependent variables, each variable is described separately.

(1.) TEACHER CLASSROOM ORIENTATION

Consideration of teacher classroom orientation was instrumented through the inclusion of the "Problems In Schools Questionnaire" (Deci et al., 1981). This instrument is designed to assess adults' (especially teachers') orientations toward control versus autonomy with children. It has been shown to be externally valid since teachers who were considered to be more autonomy-oriented on the instrument were rated in a similar manner by their students. The instrument reflects the following dimensions:

- Highly Controlling (H.C.);
- Moderately Controlling (M.C.);
- Moderately Autonomous (M.A.);
- Highly Autonomous (H.A.).

The questionnaire contains eight vignettes which describe problems typically observed in schools. Each vignette is followed by four items representing possible courses of action. These items each represent one

of four points on a continuum from highly controlling to highly autonomous (H.C., M.C., M.A., and H.A.).

The teachers were requested to read each vignette and then to consider the responses. They were to rate each item on a scale of 1 to 7 according to how appropriate they considered the response to be in terms of dealing with the situation.

A 1 indicated that, given that person's style, the response was highly inappropriate, a 4 indicated that it was moderately appropriate, and a 7 indicated that it was highly appropriate. Thus, a respondent was instructed to rate 32 items, four responses to each of eight vignettes. Eight of the items, therefore, were highly controlling, eight were moderately controlling, eight were moderately autonomous, and eight were highly autonomous. The four responses were counterbalanced for order across the eight vignettes. The responses to each of the eight items on each of the four subscales were averaged to give four subscale scores, each with a range from 1 to 7. A total score was calculated by weighting the highly controlling subscale score with -2, the moderately controlling subscale score with -1, the moderately autonomous subscale score with +1, and the highly autonomous subscale score with +2, and then summing the weighted values. Thus, the total scale score could range from -18 to +18 (Deci et al., 1981, pp. 643-644).

The total scale score was then viewed as a reflection of teacher orientation toward control versus autonomy, with a lower (or more negative) number indicating a stronger control orientation and a higher number indicating a stronger autonomy orientation.

To gain an understanding of the control versus autonomy orientation of the study participants, it was determined that the range of scores would be divided as closely as possible to the midpoint. This would then create a control-oriented group and an autonomy-oriented group.

Thus, since the range of scores in the study extended from 0 to 12, the groups were divided between 6 and 7. Therefore, the control-oriented group included scores from 0 to 6 and the autonomy-oriented group included scores from 7 to 12 (Table 3.3).

## (2.) TEACHER GRADING PRACTICES

Research indicates that behavioral standards established by the teacher may be additionally related to grades. Teacher grading practices appear to be open to a considerable degree of subjectivity. Consequently, the question of whether or not there might be an association between teacher SES background or teacher-student SES background match in the use of specific grading practices seemed reasonable. For example, are teachers from low SES backgrounds more concerned with the form of a written assignment than teachers from high SES backgrounds?

Therefore, the following hypothetical variables were identified as possible criteria for utilization in grading a student's written language arts assignment:

- (1.) Form;
- (2.) Neatness;
- (3.) Grammatical Aspects;
- (4.) Originality Of Ideas;
- (5.) Follows Directions;
- (6.) Completion On Time.

The participants were asked to indicate their orientation as to the value of each variable at one of three levels: (1.) very important; (2.) somewhat important; or (3.) not important.

Table 3.3 - Total Scale Scores On "Problems In Schools Questionnaire" By Teacher-Student SES Background\*

Teacher-Student SES Background	Total Scale Score												Totals	
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Low T/Low S	2	1	1	4	3	1	1	1	2	2		2		N=20
High T/High S			1	2	7	2	2	5	1	1		1		N=22
Low T/High S				1	1		4	4	2	1				N=13
High T/Low S	1		3	1		1		1	2	1			2	N=12
Totals	3	1	5	8	11	4	7	11	7	5	0	3	2	N=67

(Scores 0-6 Considered More Control-Oriented)(Scores 7-12 Considered More Autonomy-Oriented)

\* 1 Missing Observation

### (3.) TEACHER SATISFACTION AND MOBILITY

Teacher classroom orientation and grading practices might also be viewed as possible components of over-all teacher satisfaction with teaching. Thus, the study considered teacher inclination to: remain in the present school; remain in the present system, but transfer to another school; transfer to another school system; and obtain a position outside the field of education. It further examined initial teacher commitment to the educational profession, attained level of formal education, and future plans for formal education.

The rationale for inclusion of these particular variables in the study is that they allowed for inspection into a possible change in the initial level of commitment to the educational profession after actual teacher placement. Information regarding teacher interest in transferring to another teaching assignment or out of the educational profession could then be considered in relation to teacher-student SES background similarity or dissimilarity. Such data might, furthermore, lend insight into teacher satisfaction with teaching with regard to various teacher-student SES background relationships.

### (4.) TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF CONSIDERATION OF TEACHER-STUDENT SES BACKGROUND MATCH OR RACE IN TEACHER PLACEMENT

Since the study considered teacher satisfaction with teaching, it seemed reasonable to question teachers about their perceptions of the utilization of teacher-student SES background or race in teacher placement.

Therefore, a list was developed of seven possible measures which might be considered in teacher placement. Of the seven measures, only two were of actual concern to the study:

- (1.) race of teacher relative to that of student;
- (2.) teacher childhood socioeconomic status relative to that of student.

The other five measures on the list were intended as foils and were consequently not tabulated.

#### Data Analysis Procedures

The degree of association between the level of teacher SES background or teacher-student SES background match was examined in relation to the items on the teacher questionnaire through utilization of the chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) test. The chi-square is a nonparametric statistical test often utilized when research data are in the form of frequency counts. In this test, differences are considered between expected and observed frequencies. The chi-square value becomes larger as the difference increases between the expected and observed frequencies.

The chi-square test seemed most suitable for this study because frequency was considered in terms of how often the same sequence of values was observed during a variation of the independent variables - teacher SES background and teacher-student SES background match.

Since this was a relatively small study, the significance level was set



at .10. Therefore, in order to reject the null hypothesis, the chi-square value had to be equal to or greater than the expression listed under .10 on a Chi-square Table for the required degrees of freedom.

Additionally, those hypotheses which considered multiple relationships were reduced to sub-hypotheses to allow for the inspection of individual relationships. All of the sub-hypotheses presented under a major hypothesis were required to be rejected in order to reject the major hypothesis.

It should further be noted that one respondent did not provide any teacher SES background information. Thus, the case was deleted from calculations involving teacher SES background and teacher-student SES background match.

### Summary

Chapter III was structured to elucidate the procedures and methodology of the study. In order to provide the groundwork for the study, the hypotheses were presented first. The procedures utilized in the selection of the sample population were then described. Next, under instrumentation, the methodologies for determination of the independent variables: (1.) teacher childhood SES; and (2.) teacher-student SES background were delineated. Furthermore, consideration was given to the development and testing of the dependent variables: (1.) teacher classroom orientation; (2.) teacher grading practices; (3.) teacher satisfaction and mobility; and (4.) teacher perceptions of the importance

of consideration of teacher-student SES background match or race in teacher placement. Finally, the data analysis procedures were described.

## Chapter IV

### DATA ANALYSIS

#### Introduction

This chapter is designed to provide a detailed analysis of the data. The hypotheses presented in Chapter III are further defined. Those hypotheses which consider multiple relationships are reduced to sub-hypotheses to allow for examination of single relationships. It should be noted that all of the sub-hypotheses presented under a major hypothesis are required to be rejected in order to reject the major hypothesis. The hypotheses are, furthermore, stated in the null form and organized by two independent variables:

- (1.) teacher childhood SES;
- (2.) teacher-student SES background match;

and four dependent variables:

- (1.) teacher classroom orientation;
- (2.) teacher grading practices;
- (3.) teacher satisfaction and mobility;
- (4.) teacher perception of the importance of consideration of teacher-student SES background match or race in teacher placement.

#### Analysis of Data

The following analysis of the data considers the results obtained from testing each hypothesis identified by the study.

Table 4.1 - Chi-square Breakdown of Association of "Problems in Schools Questionnaire" to Teacher Childhood SES

Teachers	"Problems in Schools Questionnaire"		Totals
	Control-Oriented	Autonomy-Oriented	
Low SES	19	14	33
High SES	20	14	34
Totals	39	28	67

$\chi^2 = 0$                       1 d.f.                      no significance

#### Hypothesis One

Teacher SES background is not associated with his/her classroom orientation according to the Deci et al., "Problems in Schools Questionnaire."

Chi-square was utilized to test Hypothesis I on a 2 x 2 table. The chi-square had to be equal to or greater than 2.71 in order to reject Hypothesis I at the .10 level of confidence. The findings are presented in Table 4.1.

Evaluation of Table 4.1 revealed that the chi-square value was equal to zero. This value indicated agreement between the observed and expected frequencies on the "Problems in Schools Questionnaire" by teachers from low and high SES backgrounds. Therefore, Hypothesis I, which states that

teacher SES background is not associated with his/her classroom orientation according to the Deci et al., "Problems in Schools Questionnaire," was accepted.

#### Hypothesis Two

Teacher SES background is not associated with his/her grading practices according to survey questions on grading student assignments.

#### Sub-hypothesis IIa

Teacher SES background is not associated with his/her grading practice on form according to survey question on grading student assignments.

#### Sub-hypothesis IIb

Teacher SES background is not associated with his/her grading practice on neatness according to survey question on grading student assignments.

#### Sub-hypothesis IIc

Teacher SES background is not associated with his/her grading practice on grammatical aspects according to survey question on grading student assignments.

#### Sub-hypothesis IIId

Teacher SES background is not associated with his/her grading practice on originality of ideas according to survey question on grading student assignments.

Sub-hypothesis IIe

Teacher SES background is not associated with his/her grading practice on follows directions according to survey question on grading student assignments.

Sub-hypothesis IIf

Teacher SES background is not associated with his/her grading practice on completion on time according to survey question on grading student assignments.

Chi-square was utilized to test each sub-hypothesis considered under Hypothesis II. The chi-square had to be equal to or greater than the expression listed under .10 on a Chi-square Table for the required degrees of freedom in order to reject a sub-hypothesis. All sub-hypotheses were required to be rejected in order to reject Hypothesis II. The results are presented in Tables 4.2-4.7.

Table 4.1 - Chi-square breakdown of Association of Form In Teacher Grading Practices to Teacher Childhood SES

Form	Teacher SES Background		Totals
	Low	High	
Very Important	9	7	16
Somewhat Important	18	19	37
Not Important	6	8	14
Totals	33	34	67

$\chi^2 = .548$

2 d.f.

significance = .80

#### Sub-hypothesis IIa

Chi-square was utilized to test the sub-hypothesis on form in teacher grading practices on a 2 x 3 table. The chi-square value had to be equal to or greater than 4.61 in order to reject the sub-hypothesis at the .10 level of confidence.

Consideration of Table 4.2 indicated no significant difference at the .10 level between low and high SES teachers with regard to the use of form in teacher grading practices. Thus, the sub-hypothesis that teacher SES background is not associated with form in teacher grading practices was accepted.

Table 4.3 - Chi-square Breakdown of Association of Neatness in Teacher Grading Practices to Teacher Childhood SES

Neatness	Teacher SES Background		Totals
	Low	High	
Very Important	17	20	37
Somewhat Important	14	14	28
Not Important	2	0	2
Totals	33	34	67

$\chi^2 = 2.23$       2 d.f.      significance = .50

#### Sub-hypothesis IIb

Chi-square was utilized to test the sub-hypothesis on neatness in teacher grading practices on a 2 x 3 table. The chi-square value had to be equal to or greater than 4.61 in order to reject the sub-hypothesis at the .10 level of confidence.

Consideration of Table 4.3 indicated no significant difference at the .10 level between low and high SES teachers with regard to the use of neatness in teacher grading practices. Thus, the sub-hypothesis that teacher SES background is not associated with neatness in teacher grading practices was accepted.



Table 4.4 - Chi-square Breakdown of Association of Grammatical Aspects  
In Teacher Grading Practices to Teacher Childhood SES

Grammatical Aspects	Teacher SES Background		Totals
	Low	High	
Very Important	20	24	44
Somewhat Important	13	10	23
Totals	33	34	67

$\chi^2 = .364$

1 d.f.

significance = .70

#### Sub-hypothesis IIc

Chi-square was utilized to test the sub-hypothesis on grammatical aspects in teacher grading practices on a 2 x 2 table. The chi-square value had to be equal to or greater than 2.71 in order to reject the sub-hypothesis at the .10 level of confidence.

Consideration of Table 4.4 indicated no significant difference at the .10 level between low and high SES teachers with regard to the use of grammatical aspects in teacher grading practices. Thus, the sub-hypothesis that teacher SES background is not associated with grammatical aspects in teacher grading practices was accepted.

Table 4.5 - Chi-square Breakdown of Association of Originality of Ideas  
In Teacher Grading Practices to Teacher Childhood SES

Originality of Ideas	Teacher SES Background		Totals
	Low	High	
Very Important	26	25	51
Somewhat Important	7	9	16
Totals	33	34	67

$\chi^2 = .043$

1 d.f.

significance = .90

#### Sub-hypothesis IId

Chi-square was utilized to test the sub-hypothesis on originality of ideas in teacher grading practices on a 2 x 2 table. The chi-square value had to be equal to or greater than 2.71 in order to reject the sub-hypothesis at the .10 level of confidence.

Consideration of Table 4.5 indicated no significant difference at the .10 level between low and high SES teachers with regard to the use of originality of ideas in teacher grading practices. Thus, the sub-hypothesis that teacher SES background is not associated with originality of ideas in teacher grading practices was accepted.

Table 4.6 - Chi-square Breakdown of Association of Follows Directions In Teacher Grading Practices to Teacher Childhood SES

Follows Directions	Teacher SES Background		Totals
	Low	High	
Very Important	28	34	62
Somewhat Important	5	0	5
Totals	33	34	67

$$\chi^2 = 3.59$$

1 d.f.

significance = .10

#### Sub-hypothesis IIe

Chi-square was utilized to test the sub-hypothesis on follows directions in teacher grading practices on a 2 x 2 table. The chi-square value had to be equal to or greater than 2.71 in order to reject the sub-hypothesis at the .10 level of confidence.

Consideration of Table 4.6 indicated a significant difference at the .10 level between low and high SES teachers with regard to the use of follows directions in teacher grading practices. Thus, the sub-hypothesis that teacher SES background is not associated with follows directions in teacher grading practices was rejected.

Table 4.7 - Chi-square Breakdown of Association of Completion on Time in Teacher Grading Practices to Teacher Childhood SES

Completion on Time	Teacher SES Background		Totals
	Low	High	
Very Important	18	28	46
Somewhat Important	14	6	20
Not Important	1	0	1
Totals	33	34	67

$\chi^2 = 6.36$

2 d.f.

significance = .05

#### Sub-hypothesis III

Chi-square was utilized to test the sub-hypothesis on completion on time in teacher grading practices on a 2 x 3 table. The chi-square value had to be equal to or greater than 4.61 in order to reject the sub-hypothesis at the .10 level of confidence.

Consideration of Table 4.7 indicated a significant difference at the .05 level between low and high SES teachers with regard to the use of completion on time in teacher grading practices. Thus, the sub-hypothesis that teacher SES background is not associated with completion on time in teacher grading practices was rejected.

Hence, the following results were established for the sub-hypotheses delimited under Hypothesis II:

- (1.) Sub-hypothesis IIa on form - accepted;
- (2.) Sub-hypothesis IIb on neatness - accepted;
- (3.) Sub-hypothesis IIc on grammatical aspects - accepted;
- (4.) Sub-hypothesis IIId on originality of ideas - accepted;
- (5.) Sub-hypothesis IIe on follows directions - rejected;
- (6.) Sub-hypothesis IIIf on completion on time - rejected.

Since only two of the six sub-hypotheses were rejected, Hypothesis II, which states that teacher SES background is not associated with his/her grading practices according to survey questions on grading student assignments, was accepted.

### Hypothesis Three

Teacher SES background is not associated with his/her job satisfaction and mobility according to survey questions on self-reported teacher determination to:

- (1.) remain in the present school system;
- (2.) transfer to another school system;
- (3.) leave the educational profession.

### Sub-hypothesis IIIa

Teacher SES background is not associated with his/her job satisfaction and mobility according to survey question on teacher determination to remain in the present school.

Sub-hypothesis IIIb

Teacher SES background is not associated with his/her job satisfaction and mobility according to survey question on teacher determination to remain in the present school system, but transfer to another school.

Sub-hypothesis IIIc

Teacher SES background is not associated with his/her job satisfaction and mobility according to survey question on teacher determination to transfer to another school system.

Sub-hypothesis IIId

Teacher SES background is not associated with his/her job satisfaction and mobility according to survey question on teacher determination to leave the educational profession.

Chi-square was utilized to test each sub-hypothesis considered under Hypothesis III on a 2 x 3 table. The chi-square had to be equal to or greater than 4.61 in order to reject a sub-hypothesis at the .10 level of confidence. All sub-hypotheses were required to be rejected in order to reject Hypothesis III. The findings are presented in Tables 4.8-4.11.

Table 4.8 - Chi-square Breakdown of Association of Teacher Determination to Remain In Present School to Teacher Childhood SES\*

Remain In Present School	Teacher SES Background		Totals
	Low	High	
Yes	17	17	34
No	3	5	8
Uncertain	12	12	24
Totals	32	34	66

$\chi^2 = .440$       2 d.f.      significance = .90

\* 1 Missing Observation

#### Sub-hypothesis IIIa

Appraisal of Table 4.8 demonstrated no significant difference at the .10 level between low and high SES teachers with regard to teacher determination to remain in the present school. A chi-square value equal to or greater than 4.61 was required in order to reject the sub-hypothesis. Therefore, the sub-hypothesis that teacher SES background is not associated with teacher determination to remain in the present school was accepted.

Table 4.9 - Chi-square Breakdown of Association of Teacher Determination to Remain In Present System, but Transfer to Another School to Teacher Childhood SES\*

Remain In Present System, but Transfer to Another School	Teacher SES Background		Totals
	Low	High	
Yes	6	9	15
No	14	16	30
Uncertain	12	9	21
Totals	32	34	66

$\chi^2 = 1.10$       2 d.f.      significance = .70

\* 1 Missing Observation

#### Sub-hypothesis IIIb

Appraisal of Table 4.9 demonstrated no significant difference at the .10 level between low and high SES teachers with regard to teacher determination to remain in the present system, but transfer to another school. A chi-square value equal to or greater than 4.61 was required in order to reject the sub-hypothesis. Therefore, the sub-hypothesis that teacher SES background is not associated with teacher determination to remain in the present system, but transfer to another school was accepted.



Table 4.10 - Chi-square Breakdown of Association of Teacher Determination to Transfer to Another School System to Teacher Childhood SES

Transfer to Another School System	Teacher SES Background		Totals
	Low	High	
Yes	1	3	4
No	23	26	49
Uncertain	9	5	14
Totals	33	34	67

$\chi^2 = 2.31$

2 d.f.

significance = .50

#### Sub-hypothesis IIIc

Appraisal of Table 4.10 demonstrated no significant difference at the .10 level between low and high SES teachers with regard to teacher determination to transfer to another school system. A chi-square value equal to or greater than 4.61 was required in order to reject the sub-hypothesis. Therefore, the sub-hypothesis that teacher SES background is not associated with teacher determination to transfer to another school system was accepted.

Table 4.11 - Chi-square Breakdown of Association of Teacher Determination to Leave the Educational Profession to Teacher Childhood SES

Leave the Educational Profession	Teacher SES Background		Totals
	Low	High	
Yes	5	7	12
No	21	18	39
Uncertain	7	9	16
Totals	33	34	67

$\chi^2 = .799$

2 d.f.

significance = .70

#### Sub-hypothesis IIId

Appraisal of Table 4.11 demonstrated no significant difference at the .10 level between low and high SES teachers with regard to teacher determination to leave the educational profession. A chi-square value equal to or greater than 4.61 was required in order to reject the sub-hypothesis. Therefore, the sub-hypothesis that teacher SES background is not associated with teacher determination to leave the educational profession was accepted.

Thus, the findings for the sub-hypotheses delimited under Hypothesis III indicated the following:

- (1.) Sub-hypothesis IIIa on determination to remain in the present school - accepted;
- (2.) Sub-hypothesis IIIb on determination to remain in the present system, but transfer to another school - accepted;
- (3.) Sub-hypothesis IIIc on determination to transfer to another school system - accepted;
- (4.) Sub-hypothesis IIId on determination to leave the educational profession - accepted.

Since all four of the sub-hypotheses were accepted, Hypothesis III, which states that teacher SES background is not associated with his/her job satisfaction and mobility according to survey questions on teacher determination to: (1.) remain in the present school system; (2.) transfer to another school system; and (3.) leave the educational profession, was accepted.

The study, moreover, examined teacher mobility from the standpoint of the number of years taught in the present building and in the present system (Table 4.12). The findings revealed that the mean number of years the respondents had taught in the present building ranged from six to ten years, while the mean number of years taught in the present system ranged from eleven to fifteen years.

Table 4.12 - Teacher Mobility Within Present System

Years Taught In Present Building	Teachers N=68 (Percent)
0-1 year	2 ( 2.9)
2-3 years	5 ( 7.4)
4-5 years	11 (16.2)
6-10 years	12 (17.6)
11-15 years	24 (35.3)
16-20 years	12 (17.6)
21-25 years	- -
26 years or more	1 ( 1.5)
No response	1 ( 1.5)

Years Taught In Present System	Teachers N=68 (Percent)
0-1 year	- -
2-3 years	3 ( 4.4)
4-5 years	4 ( 5.9)
6-10 years	11 (16.2)
11-15 years	26 (38.2)
16-20 years	17 (25.0)
21-25 years	2 ( 2.9)
26 years or more	4 ( 5.9)
No response	1 ( 1.5)

In addition to teacher satisfaction and mobility, the study considered initial teacher commitment to the educational profession, attained level of formal education, and future plans for formal education (Table 4.13).

Of the 68 teachers who participated in the study, 28 percent first considered entering the educational profession prior to attending high school and 29 percent during high school. Hence, 57 percent of the respondents first considered entering the educational profession at a rather young age.

Table 4.13 - Educational Commitment

Variable	Teachers N=68 (Percent)
First Considered Entering Educational Profession	
Prior to attending high school	19 (27.9)
During high school	20 (29.4)
During college	26 (38.2)
After graduating from college	2 ( 2.9)
No response	1 ( 1.5)
Finally Decided to Enter Educational Profession	
Prior to attending high school	10 (14.7)
During high school	18 (26.5)
During college	32 (47.1)
After graduating from college	5 ( 7.4)
No response	3 ( 4.4)
After Making Final Decision, Preferred Education Over All Other Professions	
Yes	62 (91.2)
No	6 ( 8.8)
Highest Degree Earned	
Bachelor's	42 (61.8)
Master's	25 (36.8)
Educational Specialist	1 ( 1.5)
Future Plans for Formal Education	
No plans	25 (36.8)
Take courses occasionally	26 (38.2)
Study for master's degree	13 (19.1)
Study for doctorate	3 ( 4.4)
No response	1 ( 1.5)

Furthermore, 91 percent of the teachers preferred education over all other professions after making a final decision to enter the field.

In consideration of the importance of formal education, 62 percent of the respondents indicated that a bachelor's degree was the highest degree they had earned. Additionally, 37 percent of the teacher's indicated that they had no future plans for formal education and 38 percent planned to only take courses occasionally.

#### Hypothesis Four

Teacher SES background is not associated with his/her perception of teacher-student SES background match or race as criteria for assisting in the determination of teacher placement according to survey checklist question on teacher placement.

#### Sub-hypothesis IVa

Teacher SES background is not associated with his/her perception of teacher-student SES background match as criteria for assisting in the determination of teacher placement according to survey checklist question on teacher placement.

#### Sub-hypothesis IVb

Teacher SES background is not associated with his/her perception of teacher-student racial match as criteria for assisting in the determination of teacher placement according to survey checklist question on teacher placement.

3

2

5

0

1

4

7

1

0

3

2

5

0

1

4

7

1

0

3

2

5

0

1

4

7

1

0

3

2

Chi-square was utilized to test each sub-hypothesis considered under Hypothesis IV on a 2 x 2 table. The chi-square had to be equal to or greater than 2.71 in order to reject a sub-hypothesis at the .10 level of confidence. Both of the sub-hypotheses were required to be rejected in order to reject Hypothesis IV. The results are presented in Tables 4.14 and 4.15.

The results for the sub-hypotheses delimited under Hypothesis IV indicated the following:

- (1.) Sub-hypothesis IVa on teacher perception of the use of teacher-student SES background match as criteria in teacher placement - accepted;
- (2.) Sub-hypothesis IVb on teacher perception of the use of teacher-student racial match as criteria in teacher placement - accepted.

Since both of the sub-hypotheses were accepted, Hypothesis IV, which states that teacher SES background is not associated with his/her perception of teacher-student SES background match or race as criteria for assisting in the determination of teacher placement according to survey checklist question on teacher placement, was accepted.

#### Hypothesis Five

The teacher-student SES background match is not associated with the teacher classroom orientation according to the Deci et al., "Problems in Schools Questionnaire."



Table 4.14 - Chi-square Breakdown of Association of Teacher Perception of the Importance of Teacher-Student SES Background Match In Teacher Placement to Teacher Childhood SES

Teacher-Student SES Background Match In Teacher Placement	Teacher SES Background		Totals
	Low	High	
Not Important	29	32	61
Important	4	2	6
Totals	33	34	67

$\chi^2 = .217$       1 d.f.      significance = .70

sub-hypothesis IVa

Study of Table 4.14 revealed no significant difference at the .10 level between low and high SES teachers with regard to perceived importance of teacher-student SES background match in teacher placement. Thus, the sub-hypothesis that teacher SES background is not associated with his/her perception of teacher-student SES background match as criteria for assisting in the determination of teacher placement was accepted.

Table

Teache  
Recor  
In  
Pla

Not im

Import

For

$K^2 = 0$

Sub-  
study

study

This v

quenci

model

ground

associ

criteria

accept

• Table 4.15 - Chi-square Breakdown of Association of Teacher Perception of the Importance of Teacher-Student Racial Match in Teacher Placement to Teacher Childhood SES

Teacher-Student Racial Match in Teacher Placement	Teacher SES Background		Totals
	Low	High	
Not Important	29	30	59
Important	4	4	8
Totals	33	34	67

$\chi^2 = 0$                       1 d.f.                      no significance

Sub-hypothesis I/b

Study of Table 4.15 revealed that the chi-square value was equal to zero. This value indicated agreement between the observed and expected frequencies on the question of perceived importance of teacher-student racial match in teacher placement by teachers from low and high SES backgrounds. Thus, the sub-hypothesis that teacher SES background is not associated with his/her perception of teacher-student racial match as criteria for assisting in the determination of teacher placement was accepted.

Tab

Res  
39

Lo  
Lo

FF  
FF

Lo  
FF

FF  
Lo

FF

FF

3

13

0

12

11

11

3

1

Table 4.16 - Chi-square Breakdown of Association of "Problems In Schools Questionnaire" to Teacher-Student SES Background Match

Teacher-Student SES Background Match	"Problems In Schools Questionnaire"		Totals
	Control-Oriented	Autonomy-Oriented	
Low Teacher- Low Student	13	7	20
High Teacher- High Student	14	8	22
Low Teacher- High Student	6	7	13
High Teacher- Low Student	6	6	12
Totals	39	28	67

$\chi^2 = 1.75$

3 d.f.

significance = .70

#### Hypothesis V

Chi-square was utilized to test Hypothesis V on a 2 x 4 table. Therefore, the chi-square value had to be equal to or greater than 6.25 in order to reject Hypothesis V at the .10 level of confidence. The findings are presented in Table 4.16.

Evaluation of Table 4.16 indicated no significant difference at the .10 level on the "Problems in Schools Questionnaire" with regard to teacher-student SES background match. Hence, Hypothesis V, which states that the teacher-student SES background match is not associated with the teacher

classroom orientation according to the Deci et al., "Problems in Schools Questionnaire," was accepted.

Hypothesis Six

The teacher-student SES background match is not associated with teacher grading practices according to survey questions on grading student assignments.

Sub-hypothesis VIa

The teacher-student SES background match is not associated with teacher grading practice on form according to survey question on grading student assignments.

Sub-hypothesis VIb

The teacher-student SES background match is not associated with teacher grading practice on neatness according to survey question on grading student assignments.

Sub-hypothesis VIc

The teacher-student SES background match is not associated with teacher grading practice on grammatical aspects according to survey question on grading student assignments.

Sub-hypothesis VIId

The teacher-student SES background match is not associated with teacher grading practice on originality of ideas according to survey question on grading student assignments.

Sub-hypothesis VIe

The teacher-student SES background match is not associated with teacher grading practice on follows directions according to survey question on grading student assignments.

Sub-hypothesis VIIf

The teacher-student SES background match is not associated with teacher grading practice on completion on time according to survey question on grading student assignments.

Chi-square was utilized to test each sub-hypothesis considered under Hypothesis VI. The chi-square had to be equal to or greater than the expression listed under .10 on a Chi-square Table for the required degrees of freedom in order to reject a sub-hypothesis. All sub-hypotheses were required to be rejected in order to reject Hypothesis VI. The findings are presented in Tables 4.17-4.22.

Sub-hypothesis VIa

Chi-square was utilized to test the sub-hypothesis on form in teacher grading practices on a 4 x 3 table. The chi-square value had to be equal to or greater than 10.66 in order to reject the sub-hypothesis at the .10 level of confidence.

Examination of Table 4.17 indicated no significant difference at the .10 level by teacher-student SES background match with regard to the use of form in teacher grading practices. Therefore, the sub-hypothesis that the teacher-student SES background match is not associated with form in teacher grading practices was accepted.

Sub-hypothesis VIb

Chi-square was utilized to test the sub-hypothesis on neatness in teacher grading practices on a 4 x 3 table. The chi-square value had to be equal to or greater than 10.66 in order to reject the sub-hypothesis at the .10 level of confidence.

Examination of Table 4.18 indicated no significant difference at the .10 level by teacher-student SES background match with regard to the use of neatness in teacher grading practices. Therefore, the sub-hypothesis that the teacher-student SES background match is not associated with neatness in teacher grading practices was accepted.



Table 4.17 - Chi-square Breakdown of Association of Form in Teacher Grading Practices to Teacher-Student SES Background Match

Form	Teacher-Student SES Background Match					Totals
	Low Teacher- Low Student	High Teacher- High Student	Low Teacher- High Student	High Teacher- Low Student		
Very Important	7	2	2	5		16
Somewhat Important	10	13	8	6		37
Not Important	3	7	3	1		14
Totals	20	22	13	12		67

$\chi^2 = 7.87$  6 d.f. significance = .30

Table 4.18 - Chi-square breakdown of association of neatness in teacher grading practices to teacher-student background match

Neatness	Teacher-Student Background Match					Totals
	Low Teacher- Low Student	High Teacher- High Student	Low Teacher- High Student	High Teacher- Low Student		
Very Important	11	12	6	8		37
Somewhat important	8	10	6	4		28
Not important	1	0	1	0		2
Totals	20	22	13	12		67

$\chi^2 = 3.08$  6 d.f. significance = .80

Sub-hypothesis VIc

Chi-square was utilized to test the sub-hypothesis on grammatical aspects in teacher grading practices on a 4 x 2 table. The chi-square value had to be equal to or greater than 6.25 in order to reject the sub-hypothesis at the .10 level of confidence.

Examination of Table 4.19 indicated no significant difference at the .10 level by teacher-student SES background match with regard to the use of grammatical aspects in teacher grading practices. Therefore, the sub-hypothesis that the teacher-student SES background is not associated with grammatical aspects in teacher grading practices was accepted.

Sub-hypothesis VIId

Chi-square was utilized to test the sub-hypothesis on originality of ideas in teacher grading practices on a 4 x 2 table. The chi-square value had to be equal to or greater than 6.25 in order to reject the sub-hypothesis at the .10 level of confidence.

Examination of Table 4.20 indicated no significant difference at the .10 level by teacher-student SES background match with regard to the use of originality of ideas in teacher grading practices. Therefore, the sub-hypothesis that the teacher-student SES background match is not associated with originality of ideas in teacher grading practices was accepted.

Table 4.19 - Chi-square breakdown of Association of Grammatical aspects in Teacher Grading Practices to Teacher-Student and Background Match

Grammatical Aspects	Teacher-Student and Background Match				Totals
	Low Teacher- Low Student	High Teacher- High Student	Low Teacher- High Student	High Teacher- Low Student	
Very Important	13	15	7	9	44
Somewhat Important	7	7	6	3	23
Totals	20	22	13	12	67

$\chi^2 = 1.34$       3 d.f.      significance = .80

Table 4.20 - Chi-square Breakdown of Association of Originality of Ideas in Teacher Grading Practices to Teacher-Student SES Background Match

Originality of Ideas	Teacher-Student SES Background Match				Totals
	Low Teacher- Low Student	High Teacher- High Student	Low Teacher- High Student	High Teacher- Low Student	
Very Important	16	18	10	7	51
Somewhat Important	4	4	3	5	16
Totals	20	22	13	12	67

$\chi^2 = 2.65$       3 d.f.      significance = .50

Sub-hypothesis VIe

Chi-square was utilized to test the sub-hypothesis on follows directions in teacher grading practices on a 4 x 2 table. The chi-square value had to be equal to or greater than 6.25 in order to reject the sub-hypothesis at the .10 level of confidence.

Examination of Table 4.21 indicated no significant difference at the .10 level by teacher-student SES background match with regard to the use of follows directions in teacher grading practices. Therefore, the sub-hypothesis that the teacher-student SES background match is not associated with follows directions in teacher grading practices was accepted.

Sub-hypothesis VI f

Chi-square was utilized to test the sub-hypothesis on completion on time in teacher grading practices on a 4 x 3 table. The chi-square value had to be equal to or greater than 10.66 in order to reject the sub-hypothesis at the .10 level of confidence.

Examination of Table 4.22 indicated a significant difference at the .10 level by teacher-student SES background match with regard to the use of completion on time in teacher grading practices. Therefore, the sub-hypothesis that the teacher-student SES background match is not associated with completion on time in teacher grading practices was rejected.

Table 4.41 - Chi-square Breakdown of Association of Follows Directions in Teacher Grading Practices to Teacher-Student and Background Match

Follows Directions	Teacher-Student and Background Match				Totals
	Low Teacher- Low Student	High Teacher- High Student	Low Teacher- High Student	High Teacher- Low Student	
Very important	17	22	11	12	62
Somewhat important	3	0	2	0	5
Totals	20	22	13	12	67

$\chi^2 = 5.57$  3 d.f. significance = .20

Table 4.22 - Chi-square Breakdown of Association of Completion on Time in Teacher Grading Practices to Teacher-Student SES Background Match

Completion on Time	Teacher-Student SES Background Match				Totals
	Low Teacher- Low Student	High Teacher- High Student	Low Teacher- High Student	High Teacher- Low Student	
Very Important	10	17	8	11	46
Somewhat Important	10	5	4	1	20
Not Important	0	0	1	0	1
Totals	20	22	13	12	67

$\chi^2 = 11.39$  6 d.f. significance = .10



The following results were established for the sub-hypotheses delimited under Hypothesis VI:

- (1.) Sub-hypothesis VIa on form - accepted;
- (2.) Sub-hypothesis VIb on neatness - accepted;
- (3.) Sub-hypothesis VIc on grammatical aspects - accepted;
- (4.) Sub-hypothesis VId on originality of ideas - accepted;
- (5.) Sub-hypothesis VIe on follows directions - accepted;
- (6.) Sub-hypothesis VIf on completion on time - rejected.

Thus, since only one of the six sub-hypotheses was rejected, Hypothesis VI, which states that the teacher-student SES background match is not associated with teacher grading practices according to survey questions on grading student assignments, was accepted.

#### Hypothesis Seven

The teacher-student SES background match is not associated with teacher job satisfaction and mobility according to survey questions on self-reported teacher determination to:

- (1.) remain in the present school system;
- (2.) transfer to another school system;
- (3.) leave the educational profession.

#### Sub-hypothesis VIIa

The teacher-student SES background match is not associated with teacher job satisfaction and mobility according to survey question on teacher determination to remain in the present school.

Sub-hypothesis VIIb

The teacher-student SES background match is not associated with teacher job satisfaction and mobility according to survey question on teacher determination to remain in the present school system, but transfer to another school.

Sub-hypothesis VIIc

The teacher-student SES background match is not associated with teacher job satisfaction and mobility according to survey question on teacher determination to transfer to another school system.

Sub-hypothesis VIId

The teacher-student SES background match is not associated with teacher job satisfaction and mobility according to survey question on teacher determination to leave the educational profession.

Chi-square was utilized to test each sub-hypothesis considered under Hypothesis VII on a 4 x 3 table. The chi-square had to be equal to or greater than 10.66 in order to reject a sub-hypothesis at the .10 level of confidence. All sub-hypotheses were required to be rejected in order to reject Hypothesis VII. The results are presented in Tables 4.23-4.26.

Sub-hypothesis VIIa

Consideration of Table 4.23 demonstrated no significant difference at the .10 level by teacher-student SES background match with regard to teacher determination to remain in the present school. Thus, the sub-hypothesis

that the teacher-student SES background match is not associated with teacher determination to remain in the present school was accepted.

Sub-hypothesis VIIb

Consideration of Table 4.24 demonstrated no significant difference at the .10 level by teacher-student SES background match with regard to teacher determination to remain in the present system, but transfer to another school. Thus, the sub-hypothesis that the teacher-student SES background match is not associated with teacher determination to remain in the present school system, but transfer to another school was accepted.

Sub-hypothesis VIIc

Consideration of Table 4.25 demonstrated no significant difference at the .10 level by teacher-student SES background match with regard to teacher determination to transfer to another school system. Thus, the sub-hypothesis that the teacher-student SES background match is not associated with teacher determination to transfer to another school system was accepted.

Sub-hypothesis VIId

Consideration of Table 4.26 demonstrated no significant difference at the .10 level by teacher-student SES background match with regard to teacher determination to leave the educational profession. Thus, the sub-hypothesis that the teacher-student SES background match is not associated with teacher determination to leave the educational profession was accepted.

Table 4.23 - Chi-square Breakdown of Association of Teacher Determination to Remain in Present School to Teacher-Student SES Background Match\*

Remain in Present School	Teacher-Student SES Background Match				Totals
	Low Teacher- Low Student	High Teacher- High Student	Low Teacher- High Student	High Teacher- Low Student	
Yes	10	10	7	7	34
No	2	3	1	2	8
Uncertain	7	9	5	3	24
Totals	19	22	13	12	66

$\chi^2 = 1.55$  6 d.f. significance = .98

\* 1 Missing Observation

Table 4.24 - Chi-square Breakdown of Association of Teacher Determination to Remain in Present System, but Transfer to Another School to Teacher-Student SES Background Match\*

Remain in Present System, but Transfer to Another School	Teacher-Student SES Background Match				Totals
	Low Teacher-Low Student	High Teacher-High Student	Low Teacher-High Student	High Teacher-Low Student	
Yes	4	6	2	3	15
No	8	9	6	7	30
Uncertain	7	7	5	2	21
Totals	19	22	13	12	66

$\chi^2 = 2.34$  6 d.f. significance = .90

\* 1 Missing Observation

Table 4.25 - Chi-square Breakdown of Association of Teacher Determination to Transfer to another School System to Teacher-Student SES Background Match

Transfer to Another School System	Teacher-Student SES Background Match				Totals
	Low Teacher- Low Student	High Teacher- High Student	Low Teacher- High Student	High Teacher- Low Student	
Yes	1	2	0	1	4
No	12	17	11	9	49
Uncertain	7	3	2	2	14
Totals	20	22	13	12	67

$\chi^2 = 4.79$  6 d.f. significance = .70

Table 4.26 - Chi-square Breakdown of Association of Teacher Determination to Leave the Educational Profession to Teacher-Student SES Background Match

Leave the Educational Profession	Teacher-Student SES Background Match				Totals
	Low Teacher- Low Student	High Teacher- High Student	Low Teacher- High Student	High Teacher- Low Student	
Yes	3	3	2	4	12
No	14	12	7	6	39
Uncertain	3	7	4	2	16
Totals	20	22	13	12	67

$\chi^2 = 4.43$       6 d.f.      significance = .70

Hence, the following results were established for the sub-hypotheses delimited under Hypothesis VII:

- (1.) Sub-hypothesis VIIa on determination to remain in the present school - accepted;
- (2.) Sub-hypothesis VIIb on determination to remain in the present system, but transfer to another school - accepted;
- (3.) Sub-hypothesis VIIc on determination to transfer to another school system - accepted;
- (4.) Sub-hypothesis VIId on determination to leave the educational profession - accepted.

Therefore, since all four of the sub-hypotheses were accepted, Hypothesis VII, which states that the teacher-student SES background match is not associated with teacher job satisfaction and mobility according to survey questions on teacher determination to: (1.) remain in the present system; (2.) transfer to another school system; and (3.) leave the educational profession, was accepted.

#### Hypothesis Eight

The teacher-student SES background match is not associated with teacher perception of teacher-student SES background match or race as criteria for assisting in the determination of teacher placement according to survey checklist question on teacher placement.

#### Sub-hypothesis VIIIA

The teacher-student SES background match is not associated with teacher perception of teacher-student SES background match as criteria for



assisting in the determination of teacher placement according to survey checklist question on teacher placement.

Sub-hypothesis VIIIB

The teacher-student SES background match is not associated with teacher perception of teacher-student racial match as criteria for assisting in the determination of teacher placement according to survey checklist question on teacher placement.

Chi-square was utilized to test each sub-hypothesis under Hypothesis VIII on a 4 x 2 table. The chi-square had to be equal to or greater than 6.25 in order to reject a sub-hypothesis at the .10 level of confidence. Both of the sub-hypotheses were required to be rejected in order to reject Hypothesis VIII. The results are presented in Tables 4.27 and 4.28.

Sub-hypothesis VIIIA

Evaluation of Table 4.27 indicated no significant difference at the .10 level by teacher-student SES background match with regard to perceived importance of teacher-student SES background match in teacher placement. Therefore, the sub-hypothesis that the teacher-student SES background match is not associated with teacher perception of teacher-student SES background match as criteria for assisting in the determination of teacher placement was accepted.

Sub-hypothesis VIIIB

Evaluation of Table 4.28 indicated no significant difference at the .10 level by teacher-student SES background match with regard to perceived

importance of teacher-student racial match in teacher placement.

Therefore, the sub-hypothesis that the teacher-student SES background match is not associated with teacher perception of teacher-student racial match as criteria for assisting in the determination of teacher placement was accepted.

The results for the sub-hypotheses delimited under Hypothesis VIII indicated the following:

- (1.) Sub-hypothesis VIIIA on teacher perception of the use of teacher-student SES background match as criteria in teacher placement - accepted;
- (2.) Sub-hypothesis VIIIB on teacher perception of the use of teacher-student racial match as criteria in teacher placement - accepted.

Since both of the sub-hypotheses were accepted, Hypothesis VIII, which states that the teacher-student SES background match is not associated with teacher perception of teacher-student SES background match or race as criteria for assisting in the determination of teacher placement according to survey checklist question on teacher placement, was accepted.

Table 4.27 - Chi-square Breakdown of association of Teacher Perception of the Importance of Teacher-Student  
 SES Background Match in Teacher Placement to Teacher-Student SES Background Match

Teacher-Student SES Background Match in Teacher Placement	Teacher-Student SES Background Match				Totals
	Low Teacher- Low Student	High Teacher- High Student	Low Teacher- High Student	High Teacher- Low Student	
Not Important	17	20	12	12	61
Important	3	2	1	0	6
Totals	20	22	13	12	67

$\chi^2 = 2.10$       3 d.f.      significance = .70

Table 4.26 - Chi-square Breakdown of Association of Teacher Perception of the Importance of Teacher-Student Racial Match in Teacher Placement to Teacher-Student SES Background Match

Teacher-Student Racial Match In Teacher Placement	Teacher-Student SES Background Match				Totals
	Low Teacher- Low Student	High Teacher- High Student	Low Teacher- High Student	High Teacher- Low Student	
Not Important	17	19	12	11	59
Important	3	3	1	1	8
Totals	20	22	13	12	67

$\chi^2 = .610$  3 d.f. significance = .90

Summary

Eight null hypotheses were considered in the study. Those hypotheses which encompassed multiple relationships were reduced to sub-hypotheses to permit inspection of single relationships. The chi-square test was utilized to examine the degree of association between the independent and dependent variables. A .10 level of confidence was established. Therefore, in order to reject a hypothesis/sub-hypothesis, the chi-square value had to be equal to or greater than the expression listed under .10 on a Chi-square Table for the required degrees of freedom. Moreover, all of the sub-hypotheses delineated under a major hypothesis were required to be rejected in order to reject a major hypothesis.

Thus, the findings revealed no association between teacher childhood SES and:

- (1.) teacher classroom orientation;
- (2.) teacher grading practices;
- (3.) teacher satisfaction and mobility;
- (4.) teacher perception of the importance of consideration of teacher-student SES background match or race in teacher placement;

as reported on the survey questionnaires.

Furthermore, no association was disclosed between teacher-student SES background match and:

- (1.) teacher classroom orientation;
- (2.) teacher grading practices;

- (3.) teacher satisfaction and mobility;
- (4.) teacher perception of the importance of consideration of teacher-student SES background match or race in teacher placement;

as indicated by the survey questionnaires.

All eight of the null hypotheses examined by the study were therefore accepted.

## Chapter V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Summary

- (1.) Does teacher SES background relate to his/her work values, authority roles, and teaching practices?
- (2.) Does teacher-student SES background match indicate satisfaction?

It was the intent of this study to examine the preceding questions through consideration of two independent variables:

- (1.) teacher childhood SES;
- (2.) teacher-student SES background match;

in relation to four dependent variables:

- (1.) teacher classroom orientation;
- (2.) teacher grading practices;
- (3.) teacher satisfaction and mobility;
- (4.) teacher perception of the importance of consideration of teacher-student SES background match or race in teacher placement.

### Instrumentation

The study was conducted in three Michigan public school districts at the close of the 1982-83 school year. Teacher questionnaires addressing the variables were distributed to 132 third, fourth, and fifth grade teachers in selected schools which represented distinctly high or low SES students. The questionnaires were color coded to identify either the high or low status of the schools to which they were distributed.

School status was based upon school level percentage data for hot lunch participation:

- (1.) low status was correlated with a high percentage of students who paid a reduced amount for hot lunch or received hot lunch at no charge;
- (2.) high status was correlated with a high percentage of students who paid the full amount for hot lunch.

Teacher SES background was determined on the basis of self-reported information concerning the occupational status of his or her major source of childhood support. The status of an occupation was determined by utilization of a modified version of the Hollingshead Scale, as described by Stricker (1972).

### Sample Population

Sixty-eight of the 132 teachers, to whom questionnaires were distributed, participated in the study. Of the 68 respondents: 33 were classified



as being from low SES backgrounds; 34 were classified as being from high SES backgrounds; and 1 did not provide the information necessary for SES background classification. Additionally, 32 of the participants taught in low status schools and 36 taught in high status schools.

The sample population was not informed that the questionnaire responses would be considered in relation to teacher childhood SES or teacher-student SES background similarity/dissimilarity. The teachers were simply advised that the questionnaires had been color coded for data gathering purposes.

#### Data Analysis

In order to examine the degree of association of (1.) teacher childhood SES and (2.) teacher-student SES background match in relation to the items on the teacher questionnaire, the chi-square test was utilized. A .10 level of confidence was established.

Six of the eight null hypotheses examined in the study considered multiple relationships. Therefore, those hypotheses which considered multiple relationships were reduced to sub-hypotheses to allow for the inspection of individual relationships. All of the sub-hypotheses presented under a major hypothesis were required to be rejected in order to reject the major hypothesis.

## Results

The following information provides a summarization of the results established for each of the eight hypotheses considered in the study.

### Hypothesis One

There was no association between teacher SES background and his/her classroom orientation according to the Deci et al., "Problems in Schools Questionnaire." The findings revealed a chi-square of zero. A chi-square of 2.71 was required to demonstrate an association at the .10 level of confidence.

### Hypothesis Two

Since four of the six grading practices which were examined demonstrated no association at the .10 level, it was determined that there was no association between teacher SES background and his/her grading practices according to survey questions on grading student assignments. This is further exemplified by the results listed below in which the chi-square obtained for a given area is followed by the chi-square needed for an association at the .10 level:

- Form	.548/4.61;
- Neatness	2.23 /4.61;
- Grammatical Aspects	.364/2.71;
- Originality of Ideas	.048/2.71;
- Follows Directions <sup>a</sup>	3.59 /2.71;
- Completion on Time <sup>b</sup>	6.36 /4.61.

a There was an association at the .10 level.

b There was an association at the .05 level.

### Hypothesis Three

There was no association between teacher SES background and his/her job satisfaction and mobility according to survey questions on self-reported teacher determination to:

- (1.) remain in the present school system;
- (2.) transfer to another school system;
- (3.) leave the educational profession.

This is further exemplified by the results listed below in which the chi-square obtained for a given area is followed by the chi-square needed for an association at the .10 level:

- Remain Present School	.440/4.61;
- Remain Present System, but Transfer to Another School	1.10 /4.61;
- Transfer to Another School System	2.31 /4.61;
- Leave the Educational Profession	.799/4.61.

### Hypothesis Four

There was no association between teacher SES background and his/her perception of teacher-student SES background match or race as criteria for assisting in the determination of teacher placement according to survey checklist question on teacher placement.

This is further exemplified by the results listed below in which the chi-square obtained for a given area is followed by the chi-square needed for an association at the .10 level:

- Teacher-Student SES Background Match	.217/2.71;
- Teacher-Student Racial Match	0.0 /2.71.

#### Hypothesis Five

There was no association between the teacher-student SES background match and the teacher classroom orientation according to the Deci et al., "Problems in Schools Questionnaire." The findings revealed a chi-square of 1.75. A chi-square of 6.25 was required to demonstrate an association at the .10 level of confidence.

#### Hypothesis Six

Since five of the six grading practices which were examined demonstrated no association at the .10 level, it was determined that there was no association between the teacher-student SES background match and teacher grading practices according to survey questions on grading student assignments. This is further exemplified by the results listed below in which the chi-square obtained for a given area is followed by the chi-square needed for an association at the .10 level:

- Form	7.87/10.66;
- Neatness	3.08/10.66;
- Grammatical Aspects	1.34/ 6.25;
- Originality of Ideas	2.65/ 6.25;
- Follows Directions	5.57/ 6.25;
- Completion on Time <sup>a</sup>	11.39/10.66.

a There was an association at the .10 level.

### Hypothesis Seven

There was no association between the teacher-student SES background match and teacher job satisfaction and mobility according to survey questions on self-reported teacher determination to:

- (1.) remain in the present school system;
- (2.) transfer to another school system;
- (3.) leave the educational profession.

This is further exemplified by the results listed below in which the chi-square obtained for a given area is followed by the chi-square needed for an association at the .10 level:

- Remain Present School	1.35/10.66;
- Remain Present System, but Transfer to Another School	2.34/10.66;
- Transfer to Another School System	4.79/10.66;
- Leave the Educational Profession	4.43/10.66.

### Hypothesis Eight

There was no association between the teacher-student SES background match and teacher perception of teacher-student SES background match or race as criteria for assisting in the determination of teacher placement according to survey checklist question on teacher placement.

This is further exemplified by the results listed below in which the chi-square obtained for a given area is followed by the chi-square needed for an association at the .10 level:

- Teacher-Student SES Background Match	2.10 /6.25;
- Teacher-Student Racial Match	.610/6.25.

### Conclusions

The findings revealed by this study indicate teacher SES background is not associated with his/her work values, authority roles, and teaching practices. They further indicate that teacher-student SES background match is not associated with teacher satisfaction with teaching.

Thus, the findings seem to indicate that other factors are operating in this study. The study originally focused upon Kalleberg's (1977) set of work values concerning the importance of socialization factors and life experiences prior to entering the work force. Upon evaluation of the data, however, it appears that another set of his work values which are affected by worker maturation and experience might instead be in operation. In order to provide the framework for such consideration, the conclusions will be subsumed under the following headings: work values; authority roles; teaching practices; and teaching satisfaction.

### Work Values

It was theorized in Chapter II that an individual's work values might be affected by maturation and experience. Such criteria may apply to the teachers represented in this study since 62 of the 68 respondents reported being 31 years of age or older and 61 of them have garnered 6

or more years of teaching experience. These teachers appear to view being an educator as more than a job to be tolerated for a few years. It is a career. In this event, the respondents may have developed professional expertise beyond specific SES-related behavior.

#### Authority Roles

Growth beyond specific SES-related behavior is exemplified in the total scale scores obtained on the Deci et al., "Problems in Schools Questionnaire." While it is felt that the sample was representative, with 33 teachers from low status backgrounds and 34 teachers from high status backgrounds, the wide range of scores for both low and high SES background teachers do not indicate particular "control-oriented" or "autonomy-oriented" behavior on the part of either group.

It might be concluded, therefore, that the teachers have re-examined their own values and attitudes along with the possible meaning of previous experiences and adapted them to meet the needs of their present teaching assignments.

#### Teaching Practices

Such an adequate perception and openness to new experiences may be additionally reflected in teacher grading practices. Perhaps the respondents subscribe to the notion that in order to teach children, they must first understand them and attempt to view the world as the children view it.

Furthermore, given the age and experience of the study participants, it seems reasonable to conclude that a majority of them received teacher training at a time when emphasis was placed upon the inequality of public education - e.g., after the 1965 "Elementary and Secondary Education Act" was passed to provide special assistance for disadvantaged students.

### Teaching Satisfaction

Perhaps the participants of this study were then, among other factors, the benefactors of well-founded elementary teacher training programs. The respondents reported satisfaction with the educational profession at the outset of their careers. Ninety-one percent of the respondents indicated that they preferred education over all other professions after making a final decision to enter the field.

The data indicated, however, a change in this initial preference level after accruing teaching experience. At the time of the study, 18 percent of the respondents reported an interest in finding a position outside the field of education. Another 25 percent expressed uncertainty as to whether or not they would like to leave the educational profession. Fifty-seven percent of the study participants indicated a desire to continue working within the field of education. It is important to note that these responses were obtained at the close of the school year - a time when respondents were probably weary and more likely to be candid.

Moreover, the timing of the study may have influenced teacher



participation. The teachers who participated in the study accepted the responsibility for an additional task during a demanding period of time. Thus, it seems plausible that the respondents may have been more professionally concerned with the field of education than the non-respondents.

### Recommendations

The following recommendations for additional research are extended as a consequence of considering the information presented in the review of related literature in relation to the findings and conclusions put forth in this study:

- (1.) With certain alterations in design, the study should be conducted utilizing student teachers. The teacher experience/mobility questions should be deleted since they would not be applicable. It is further recommended that the design be changed to provide for open-ended interviews with the study participants after they have anonymously completed the teacher questionnaires. The open-ended interviews might provide insight into SES-related behavioral orientation which may or may not have been influenced by the teacher training program.
- (2.) According to the literature, both teacher and student may develop expectations of one another based upon previous experiences. It seems that such expectations might be confounded by SES-related differences on the part of both teacher and student. Therefore, field research considering teacher-student SES background in relation to the attribution theory is recommended.

Afterword

In closing, schools socialize children to expectations which are, in many cases, more profound and enduring than the intended curriculum. Therefore, teachers need to be aware of their own SES-related values and attitudes in order to be better prepared to understand student SES-related behavior. Teacher understanding of these possible perceptual differences may then pave the way toward a more positive teacher-student relationship.

Deeper insight into the attainment of such a goal might be derived by considering this study in relation to other studies concerning teacher satisfaction with teaching. Other recent studies indicate that younger teachers are often dissatisfied with teaching after spending a brief time in the classroom. Such dissatisfaction with teaching was not, however, revealed in this study of older and more experienced teachers. Perhaps this suggests that teachers who remain in the educational profession longer than five years are better able to accommodate for SES-related differences between themselves and their students. Thus, it seems reasonable that teachers who have been "sensitized" to SES-related differences may be in a better position to ward off dissatisfaction.

Hence, teacher training programs should make a pointed effort toward helping potential teachers examine their own SES-related value systems and to anticipate how they might blend with those of students at various SES levels. Such measures may then spark the creation of more satisfactory learning environments which benefit both teachers and students.

## APPENDICES

.

## APPENDIX A

## APPENDIX A

### 1982-83 Income Guidelines for Federally Subsidized School Meals

Attachment #4  
(Schools)

#### SAMPLE PUBLIC RELEASE

\_\_\_\_\_, (Local School Food Authority) today announced its policy for Free Meals and Free Milk or Reduced-Price Meals, for children unable to pay the full price of meals and milk served under the National School Lunch, School Breakfast, Special Milk Program, and U.S.D.A. Donated Foods Programs.

Local school officials have adopted the following family size and income criteria for determining eligibility.

TOTAL FAMILY SIZE	A.	B.
	SCALE FOR FREE MEALS AND FREE MILK	SCALE FOR REDUCED-PRICE MEALS
1	6,080	8,660
2	8,090	11,510
3	10,090	14,360
4	12,090	17,210
5	14,090	20,050
6	16,090	22,900
7	18,100	25,750
8	20,100	28,600
Each additional family member	2,000	2,850

Children from families whose income is at or below the levels shown are eligible for (free meals or reduced-price meals).

Application forms are being sent to all homes in a letter to parents. Additional copies are available at the principal's office in each school. The information provided on the application is confidential and will be used only for the purpose of determining eligibility. Applications may be submitted at any time during the year.

To discourage the possibility of misrepresentation, the application forms contain a statement above the space of signature certifying that all information furnished in the application is true and correct. An additional statement is added to warn that the application is being made in connection with the receipt of Federal funds, that school officials may, for cause, verify the information in the application, and that deliberate misrepresentation of information may subject the applicant to prosecution under applicable State and criminal statutes.

In certain cases, foster children are also eligible for these benefits. If a family has foster children living with them and wishes to apply for such meals for them, it should contact the school.

Children of unemployed parents may qualify for free or reduced price meals if total family income include welfare payments, unemployment compensation and sub-pay benefits fall within the prescribed family income guidelines.

In the operation of child feeding programs, no child will be discriminated against because of race, sex, creed, color, national origin, or handicap.

NOTE: \* Delete reference to free milk if it is not available.

## APPENDIX B

## APPENDIX B

### Teacher Letter of Explanation and Teacher Questionnaire

Dear Third, Fourth, or Fifth Grade Teacher,

Having been a teacher for twelve years in grades one through eight, I realize that you are very busy at this time of year. I am, therefore, also aware of the practical concerns teachers face in the classroom. Currently, as a doctoral student at Michigan State University, I have developed a study which considers how some of those concerns might be decreased by looking at teacher classroom orientation and teacher satisfaction with teaching. With that in mind, the questionnaire is being sent to you as close to the end of the school year as possible.

I am requesting approximately twenty minutes of your time to complete the enclosed questionnaire. Please return it to me in the enclosed stamped envelope. Also, please be advised that your participation in this project is on a strictly voluntary basis.

While the questionnaires have been color coded for data collection purposes, no attempt will be made to identify either individuals or buildings within a district. All participants will remain anonymous. Individual districts will not be provided with district level data from the study. Data from all districts participating in the study will be tabulated together. Therefore, your responses will be treated with complete confidentiality.

Thank you for your cooperation!

Sincerely,

Carol VandenBoogert

### Teacher Questionnaire

Please answer the following questions by indicating the one answer which best represents your response.

What is your sex?

☐ (1.) Female

☐ (2.) Male

What is your age?

☐ (1.) 21-30 ☐ (4.) 51-60

☐ (2.) 31-40 ☐ (5.) 61-70

☐ (3.) 41-50 ☐ (6.) 71+

What is your marital status?

☐ (1.) Single

☐ (2.) Married

☐ (3.) Separated

☐ (4.) Divorced

☐ (5.) Widow or Widower

What is your race?

☐ (1.) Asian

☐ (2.) Black

☐ (3.) Hispanic

☐ (4.) Native American

☐ (5.) White

☐ (6.) Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

How many years have you been a teacher?

☐ (1.) 0-1 year

☐ (2.) 2-3 years

☐ (3.) 4-5 years

☐ (4.) 6-10 years

☐ (5.) 11-15 years

☐ (6.) 16-20 years

☐ (7.) 21-25 years

☐ (8.) 26 years or more



How many years have you taught in this building?

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> (1.) 0-1 year   | <input type="checkbox"/> (5.) 11-15 years      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (2.) 2-3 years  | <input type="checkbox"/> (6.) 16-20 years      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (3.) 4-5 years  | <input type="checkbox"/> (7.) 21-25 years      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (4.) 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> (8.) 26 years or more |

How many years have you taught in this system?

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> (1.) 0-1 year   | <input type="checkbox"/> (5.) 11-15 years      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (2.) 2-3 years  | <input type="checkbox"/> (6.) 16-20 years      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (3.) 4-5 years  | <input type="checkbox"/> (7.) 21-25 years      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (4.) 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> (8.) 26 years or more |

What was the marital status of your parents during the major portion of your childhood?

- |   |
|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> (1.) Married   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (2.) Separated |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (3.) Divorced  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (4.) Widowed   |

Who provided your major source of support during childhood?

- |  |
|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> (1.) Father                                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (2.) Mother                                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (3.) Other (specify - relative, etc.) _____ |

What was your father's major lifetime occupation? \_\_\_\_\_

What was your mother's major lifetime occupation? \_\_\_\_\_

If someone other than your father or mother provided your major source of childhood support, indicate his or her major lifetime occupation.

---

What future plans do you have for formal education?

- ☐ (1.) I have no plans
- ☐ (2.) I plan to take courses occasionally
- ☐ (3.) I plan to study for a master's degree
- ☐ (4.) I plan to study for a doctorate

What is the highest degree you have earned?

- ☐ (1.) Bachelor's
- ☐ (2.) Master's
- ☐ (3.) Educational Specialist
- ☐ (4.) Doctorate

When did you first consider entering the educational profession?

- ☐ (1.) Prior to attending high school
- ☐ (2.) During high school
- ☐ (3.) During college
- ☐ (4.) After graduating from college

When did you finally decide to enter the educational profession?

- ☐ (1.) Prior to attending high school
- ☐ (2.) During high school
- ☐ (3.) During college
- ☐ (4.) After graduating from college

When you made your final decision, did you prefer education over all other professions?

- ☐ (1.) Yes
- ☐ (2.) No

Indicate the grade level you teach.

- ☐ (1.) Grade 3
- ☐ (2.) Grade 4
- ☐ (3.) Grade 5

Would you like to continue teaching in this school for the remainder of your educational career?

- ☐ (1.) Yes
- ☐ (2.) No
- ☐ (3.) Uncertain

Would you like to continue teaching in this school system for the remainder of your educational career, but transfer to another school?

- ☐ (1.) Yes
- ☐ (2.) No
- ☐ (3.) Uncertain

Would you like to obtain a teaching position in another school system?

- ☐ (1.) Yes
- ☐ (2.) No
- ☐ (3.) Uncertain

Would you like to obtain a position outside the field of education?

- ☐ (1.) Yes
- ☐ (2.) No
- ☐ (3.) Uncertain

Check any of the following measures which you perceive to be important in determining teacher placement.

- ☐ (1.) Age
- ☐ (2.) Attitudes toward children
- ☐ (3.) Professional preparation
- ☐ (4.) Professional experience
- ☐ (5.) Race of teacher relative to that  
of student
- ☐ (6.) Sex
- ☐ (7.) Teacher childhood socioeconomic  
status relative to that of student

The following areas might be taken into consideration in grading a student's written language arts assignment. For each item, choose the one response which most nearly describes your view as to the level of importance in grading this type of assignment.

Form (student name in a specific place, etc.)

- ☐ (1.) Very important
- ☐ (2.) Somewhat important
- ☐ (3.) Not important

Neatness (careful handwriting, no words crossed out, no "doodle-marks," etc.)

- ☐ (1.) Very important
- ☐ (2.) Somewhat important
- ☐ (3.) Not important

Follows Directions (aware of and follows defined rules)

- ☐ (1.) Very important
- ☐ (2.) Somewhat important
- ☐ (3.) Not important

Grammatical Aspects (proper word usage, sentence structure, spelling, etc.)

- ☐ (1.) Very important
- ☐ (2.) Somewhat important
- ☐ (3.) Not important

Originality Of Ideas (relies on own divergent thought processes to develop new ideas)

- ☐ (1.) Very important
- ☐ (2.) Somewhat important
- ☐ (3.) Not important

Completion On Time (finishes assignment within a specified time-limit)

- \_\_\_ (1.) Very important
- \_\_\_ (2.) Somewhat important
- \_\_\_ (3.) Not important

"The Problems In Schools Questionnaire"\*

On the following pages you will find a series of vignettes. Each one describes an incident and then lists four ways of responding to the situation. Please read each vignette and then consider each response in turn. Think about each response option in terms of how appropriate you consider it to be as a means of dealing with the problem described in the vignette. You may find the option to be "perfect," in other words, "extremely appropriate" in which case you would circle number 7. You may consider the response highly inappropriate in which case you might circle the 1. If you find the option reasonable you would circle some number between 1 and 7. So think about each option and rate it on the accompanying scale. Please rate each of the four options for each vignette. There are eight vignettes with four options for each.

There are no right or wrong ratings on these items. People's styles differ, and I am simply interested in what you consider appropriate given your own style.

Some of the stories ask what you would do as a teacher. Others ask you to respond as if you were giving advice to another teacher or to a parent. If you are not a parent simply imagine what it would be like for you in that situation.

Please respond to each response option by circling one number on its rating scale.

\* "The Problems In Schools Questionnaire" is being used with the permission of Edward L. Deci.

Key\*\* 1. Jim is an average student who has been working at grade level. During the past two weeks he has appeared listless and has not been participating during reading group. The work he does is accurate but he has not been completing assignments. A phone conversation with his mother revealed no useful information. The most appropriate thing for Jim's teacher to do is:

- M.C. a. She should impress upon him the importance of finishing his assignments since he needs to learn this material for his own good.
- 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7  
very moderately very  
inappropriate appropriate appropriate
- H.A. b. Let him know that he doesn't have to finish all of his work now and see if she can help him work out the cause of the listlessness.
- 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7  
very moderately very  
inappropriate appropriate appropriate
- H.C. c. Make him stay after school until the day's assignments are done.
- 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7  
very moderately very  
inappropriate appropriate appropriate
- M.A. d. Let him see how he compares with the other children in terms of his assignments and encourage him to catch up with the others.
- 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7  
very moderately very  
inappropriate appropriate appropriate



Key 2. At a parent conference last night, Mr. and Mrs. Greene were told that their daughter, Sarah, has made more progress than expected since the time of the last conference. All agree that they hope she continues to improve so that she does not have to repeat the grade (which the Greene's have been kind of expecting since the last report card). As a result of the conference, the Greene's decide to:

H.C. a. Increase her allowance and promise her a ten-speed if she continues to improve.

1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7  
very                      moderately                      very  
inappropriate                      appropriate                      appropriate

M.A. b. Tell her that she's doing as well as many of the other children in her class.

1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7  
very                      moderately                      very  
inappropriate                      appropriate                      appropriate

H.A. c. Tell her about the report, letting her know that they're aware of her increased independence in school and at home.

1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7  
very                      moderately                      very  
inappropriate                      appropriate                      appropriate

M.C. d. Continue to emphasize that she has to work hard to get better grades.

1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7  
very                      moderately                      very  
inappropriate                      appropriate                      appropriate

- Key 3. Donny loses his temper a lot and has a way of agitating other children. He doesn't respond well to what you tell him to do and you're concerned that he won't learn the social skills he needs. The best thing for you to do with him is:
- M.C. a. Emphasize how important it is for him to "control himself" in order to succeed in school and in other situations.  
1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7  
very moderately very  
inappropriate appropriate appropriate
- H.C. b. Put him in a special class which has the structure and reward contingencies which he needs.  
1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7  
very moderately very  
inappropriate appropriate appropriate
- M.A. c. Help him see how other children behave in these various situations and praise him for doing the same.  
1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7  
very moderately very  
inappropriate appropriate appropriate
- H.A. d. Realize that Donny is probably not getting the attention he needs and start being more responsive to him.  
1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7  
very moderately very  
inappropriate appropriate appropriate

Key 4. Your son is one of the better players on his junior soccer team which has been winning most of its games. However, you are concerned because he just told you he failed his unit spelling test and will have to retake it the day after tomorrow. You decide that the best thing to do is:

H.A. a. Ask him to talk about how he plans to handle the situation.  
 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7  
                   very                                  moderately                                  very  
                   inappropriate                                  appropriate                                  appropriate

M.C. b. Tell him he probably ought to decide to forego tomorrow's game so he can catch up in spelling.  
 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7  
                   very                                  moderately                                  very  
                   inappropriate                                  appropriate                                  appropriate

M.A. c. See if others are in the same predicament and suggest he do as much preparation as the others.  
 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7  
                   very                                  moderately                                  very  
                   inappropriate                                  appropriate                                  appropriate

H.C. d. Make him miss tomorrow's game to study; soccer has been interfering too much with his school work.  
 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7  
                   very                                  moderately                                  very  
                   inappropriate                                  appropriate                                  appropriate

Key 5. The Rangers spelling group has been having trouble all year.  
How could Miss Wilson best help the Rangers?

M.A. a. Have regular spelling bees so the Rangers will be motivated  
to do as well as the other groups.

1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7  
very moderately very  
inappropriate appropriate appropriate

H.C. b. Make them drill and give them special privileges for  
improvements.

1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7  
very moderately very  
inappropriate appropriate appropriate

M.C. c. Have each child keep a spelling chart and emphasize how  
important it is to have a good chart.

1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7  
very moderately very  
inappropriate appropriate appropriate

H.A. d. Help the group devise ways of learning the words together  
(skits, games, and so on).

1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7  
very moderately very  
inappropriate appropriate appropriate

Key 6. In your class is a girl named Margy who has been the butt of jokes for years. She is quiet and usually alone. In spite of the efforts of previous teachers, Margy has not been accepted by the other children. Your wisdom would guide you to:

H.C. a. Prod her into interactions and provide her with much praise for her social initiative.  
1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7  
very moderately very  
inappropriate appropriate appropriate

M.C. b. Talk to her and emphasize that she should make friends so she'll be happier.  
1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7  
very moderately very  
inappropriate appropriate appropriate

H.A. c. Invite her to talk about her relations with the other kids, and encourage her to take small steps when she's ready.  
1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7  
very moderately very  
inappropriate appropriate appropriate

M.A. d. Encourage her to observe how other children relate and to join in with them.  
1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7  
very moderately very  
inappropriate appropriate appropriate

Key 7. For the past few weeks things have been disappearing from the teacher's desk and lunch money has been taken from some of the children's desks. Today, Marvin was seen by the teacher taking a silver dollar paperweight from her desk. The teacher phoned Marvin's mother and spoke to her about this incident. Although the teacher suspects that Marvin has been responsible for the other thefts, she mentioned only the one and assured the mother that she'll keep a close eye on Marvin. The best thing for the mother to do is:

M.A. a. Talk to him about the consequences of stealing and what it would mean in relation to the other kids.  
1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7  
very moderately very  
inappropriate appropriate appropriate

H.A. b. Talk to him about it, expressing her confidence in him and attempting to understand why he did it.  
1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7  
very moderately very  
inappropriate appropriate appropriate

H.C. c. Give him a good scolding; stealing is something which cannot be tolerated and he has to learn that.  
1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7  
very moderately very  
inappropriate appropriate appropriate

M.C. d. Emphasize that it was wrong and have him apologize to the teacher and promise not to do it again.  
1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7  
very moderately very  
inappropriate appropriate appropriate

Key 8. Your child has been getting average grades, and you'd like to see her improve. A useful approach might be to:

H.A. a. Encourage her to talk about her report card and what it means for her.  
1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7  
very moderately very  
inappropriate appropriate appropriate

M.A. b. Go over the report card with her; point out where she stands in the class.  
1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7  
very moderately very  
inappropriate appropriate appropriate

M.C. c. Stress that she should do better, she'll never get into college with grades like these.  
1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7  
very moderately very  
inappropriate appropriate appropriate

H.C. d. Offer her a dollar for every A and 50 cents for every B on future report cards.  
1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7  
very moderately very  
inappropriate appropriate appropriate

\*\* Key

H.C. = Highly Controlling  
M.C. = Moderately Controlling  
M.A. = Moderately Autonomous  
H.A. = Highly Autonomous

## BIBLIOGRAPHY



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anastasiow, Nicholas J. and Michael L. Hanes. Language Patterns of Poverty Children. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas - Publisher, 1976.
- Anyon, Jean. "Social Class and School Knowledge." Curriculum Inquiry 11(1), Spring 1981, 3-42.
- Bar-Tal, Daniel. "Attributional Analysis of Achievement-Related Behavior." Review of Educational Research 48(2), Spring 1978, 259-271.
- Bernstein, Basil. Class, Codes and Control: Volume I. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1971.
- Boocock, Sarane Spence. Sociology of Education: An Introduction. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1980.
- Brooks, Douglas M., Steven B. Silven, and Melissa Wooten. "The Ecology of Teacher-Pupil Verbal Interaction." The Journal of Classroom Interaction 14(1), 1978, 39-45.
- Brophy, Jere E. and Carolyn M. Evertson et al. Student Characteristics and Teaching. New York: Longman, Inc., 1981.
- Brophy, Jere E. and Thomas L. Good. Teacher-Student Relationships: Causes and Consequences. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1974.
- Burling, Robbins. Man's Many Voices: Language In Its Cultural Context. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1970.
- Coleman, Richard P., Lee Rainwater, and Kent A. McClelland. Social Standing In America: New Dimensions of Class. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1978.
- Cooper, Harris M. "Pygmalion Grows Up: A Model for Teacher Expectation Communication and Performance Influence." Review of Educational Research 49(3), Summer 1979, 389-410.

- Cooper, Harris M., Gail M. Hinkel, and Thomas L. Good. "Teachers' Beliefs About Interaction Control and Their Observed Behavioral Correlates." Journal of Educational Psychology 72(3), June 1980, 345-354.
- Crawford, John, Jere E. Brophy, Carolyn M. Evertson, and Cynthia L. Coulter. "Classroom Dyadic Interaction: Factor Structure of Process Variables and Achievement Correlates." Journal of Educational Psychology 69(6), December 1977, 761-772.
- Deci, Edward L., Allan J. Schwartz, Louise Sheinman, and Richard M. Ryan. "An Instrument to Assess Adults' Orientations Toward Control Versus Autonomy With Children: Reflections on Intrinsic Motivation and Perceived Competence." Journal of Educational Psychology 73(5), October 1981, 642-650.
- Domhoff, G. William. The Higher Circles: The Governing Class In America. New York: Vintage Books, 1970.
- Dworkin, Anthony Gary. "The Changing Demography of Public School Teachers: Some Implications for Faculty Turnover in Urban Areas." Sociology of Education 53(2), April 1980, 65-73.
- Education, Michigan Department of. 1982-83 Income Guidelines for Federally Subsidized School Meals. April 1982.
- Feldman, Robert S. and Andrew J. Theiss. "The Teacher and Student as Pygmaliions: Joint Effects of Teacher and Student Expectations." Journal of Educational Psychology 74(2), April 1982, 217-223.
- Hess, Robert D. and Virginia C. Shipman. "Early Experience And The Socialization of Cognitive Modes In Children." Child Development 36(4), December 1965, 869-886.
- Horton, Kathryn B. "Early Language Programming for Preschool Culturally Disadvantaged Children in Day Care Settings: Evaluation and Impact." In William G. Hardy, ed., Communication and the Disadvantaged Child. Baltimore: The Williams and Wilkins Company, 1970, 85-98.
- Huber, Joan and William H. Form. Income and Ideology: An Analysis of the American Political Formula. New York: The Free Press, 1973.
- Kalleberg, Arne L. "Work Values and Job Rewards: A Theory of Job Satisfaction." American Sociological Review 42(1), February 1977, 124-143.
- Kohn, Melvin L. "Social Class and Parent-Child Relationships; An Interpretation." In Robert Lejeune, ed., Class and Conflict in American Society. Chicago: Markham Publishing Co., 1972, 110-122.
- Mare, Robert D. "Change and Stability in Educational Stratification." American Sociological Review 46(1), February 1981, 72-87.

- Meyer, John W. "The Effects of Education as an Institution." American Journal of Sociology 83(1), July 1977, 55-77.
- Meyer, John W. and Brian Rowan. "The Structure of Educational Organizations." Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, June 1975.
- Mills, C. Wright. "The New Middle Class." In Philip Ehrensaft and Amitai Etzioni, eds., Anatomies of America: Sociological Perspectives. Toronto, Ontario: The Macmillan Company, 1969, 158-166.
- Patterson, James T. America's Struggle Against Poverty 1900-1980. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1981.
- Rist, Ray C. "Student Social Class and Teacher Expectations: The Self-fulfilling Prophecy in Ghetto Education." Harvard Educational Review 40(3), August 1970, 411-451.
- Ryans, David G. "Characteristics of Teachers in Relation to Financial and Cultural Conditions of Their Childhood Homes." Washington D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1972.
- Stricker, Lawrence J. "Measuring Social Status with Occupational Information: Some Useful Procedures." Research Memorandum Draft. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, August 1972.
- Vernberg, Eric M. and Frederic J. Medway. "Teacher and Parent Causal Perceptions of School Problems." American Educational Research Journal 18(1), Spring 1981, 29-37.
- Weick, Karl E. "Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems." Administrative Science Quarterly 21(1), March 1976, 1-19.
- Weiner, Bernard. "A Theory of Motivation for Some Classroom Experiences." Journal of Educational Psychology 71(1), February 1979, 3-25.
- Williams, Frederick. "Some Research Notes On Dialect Attitudes and Stereotypes." In Roger W. Shuy and Ralph W. Fasold, eds., Language Attitudes: Current Trends and Prospects. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1973, 113-128.

#### General References

- Alexander, Karl L., James Fennessey, Edward L. McDill, and Ronald J. D'Amico. "School SES Influences - Composition or Context?" Sociology of Education 52(4), October 1979, 222-237.

- Amato, Josephine. "Effect of Pupil's Social Class Upon Teachers' Expectations and Behavior." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, Chicago, Illinois, August 1975.
- Borg, Walter R. and Meredith D. Gall. Educational Research: An Introduction. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1971.
- Bowles, Samuel and Herbert Gintis. Schooling in Capitalist America. New York: Basic Books, 1976.
- Brophy, Jere E. "Teacher Behaviors Related to Learning by Low vs. High Socioeconomic Status Early Elementary Students." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C., 1975.
- Brophy, Jere E. and Carolyn M. Evertson. Learning from Teaching: A Developmental Perspective. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1976.
- Brown, Lorraine Hayes. "Student Socio-economic Status and Teacher Pupil Control Behavior." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1973.
- Chapman, David W. and Sigrid M. Hutcheson. "Attrition From Teaching Careers: A Discriminant Analysis." American Educational Research Journal 19(1), Spring 1982, 93-105.
- Clothier, Grant M. and Bryce B. Hudgins. "Unique Challenges of Preparing Teachers for Inner-City Schools: Progress and Prospects." Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, August 1971.
- Corwin, Ronald G. and Theodore C. Wagenaar. "Boundary Interaction Between Service Organizations and Their Publics: A Study of Teacher-Parent Relationships." Social Forces 55(2), December 1976, 471-492.
- Davis, Sharon A. "Students' SES as Related to Teachers' Perceptions and Ability Grouping Decisions." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois, April 1974.
- Davis, Sharon A. and Emil J. Haller. "Socioeconomic Segregation with Elementary School Classrooms and Teachers' Own Socioeconomic Background: Some Contrary Evidence." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C., April 1975.
- Della Fave, L. Richard. "The Meek Shall Not Inherit the Earth: Self-evaluation and the Legitimacy of Stratification." American Sociological Review 45(6), December 1980, 955-971.

- Feldman, Robert S. and Thomas Prohaska. "The Student as Pygmalion: Effect of Student Expectations on the Teacher." Journal of Educational Psychology 71(4), August 1979, 485-493.
- Frank, Bernard. "The Effect of Classroom Activities on Locus-of-Control Orientation." The Journal of Classroom Interaction 16(1), Winter 1980, 4-10.
- Friedman, Philip and Harvey Friedman. "Frequency and Types of Teacher Reinforcement Given to Lower and Middle Class Students." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, February 1973.
- Gabbert, Burt Boyd. "The Influence of Pupil Socio-Economic Status on Teacher Behavior." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, 1973.
- Goodwin, David. Delivering Educational Service. New York: Teachers College Press, 1977.
- Griffin, Larry J. and Karl L. Alexander. "Schooling and Socioeconomic Attainments: High School and College Influences." American Journal of Sociology 84(2), September 1978, 319-347.
- Herriott, Robert E. and Nancy Hoyt St. John. Social Class and the Urban School - The Impact of Pupil Background on Teachers and Principals. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.
- Howell, Frank M. and Lynn W. McBroom. "Social Relations At Home And At School: An Analysis Of The Correspondence Principle." Sociology of Education 55(1), January 1982, 40-52.
- Hummel-Rossi, Barbara and Philip Merrifield. "Student Personality Factors Related to Teacher Reports of Their Interactions With Students." Journal of Educational Psychology 69(4), August 1977, 375-380.
- Jablonsky, Adelaide. "The Exemplary Teacher of the Disadvantaged: Two Views." ERIC - IRCD Urban Disadvantaged Series 30, July 1972.
- Jackson, Mary Lynn and Frances F. Fuller. "Influence of Social Class of Students' Evaluations of Their Teachers - Appendix D." Austin, Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas, 1966.
- Kerckhoff, Alan C. and Richard T. Campbell. "Race and Social Status Differences in the Explanation of Educational Ambition." Social Forces 55(3), March 1977, 701-714.
- Kuhlen, Raymond G. "Career Development In Public School Teaching Profession with Special Reference to Changing Motivations, Pressures, Satisfactions, and Dissatisfactions." New York: Research Institute, Syracuse University, 1959.

- Lamberts, Martha Bullock et al. "Family Structure and Rejection of Teacher Authority." Paper presented at the Ohio Valley Sociological Meetings, Cleveland, Ohio, April 1971.
- Luce, Sally R. and Robert D. Hoge. "Relations Among Teacher Rankings, Pupil-Teacher Interactions, and Academic Achievement: A Test of the Teacher Expectancy Hypothesis." American Educational Research Journal 15(4), Fall 1978, 489-500.
- Mark, Jonathan H. and Barry D. Anderson. "Teacher Survival Rates - A Current Look." American Educational Research Journal 15(3), Summer 1978, 379-383.
- May, Robert E. and Everett G. Doerge. "An Analysis of the Informational Items and Procedures Used in the Selection of Teachers in the Public School Systems of Louisiana." Baton Rouge, Louisiana: School of Vocational Education, Louisiana State University and A. and M. Coll. System, November 1972.
- Mitchell, Marlene. Teacher Attitudes vs. Teacher Behavior. Final Report. Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova University, May 1972.
- Oakes, Jeannie. "Classroom Social Relationships: Exploring The Bowles and Gintis Hypothesis." Sociology of Education 55(4), October 1982, 197-212.
- Oliver, Bernard and John L. Taylor. "Teacher Characteristics and Classroom Behavior." The Journal of Classroom Interaction 16(1), Winter 1980, 11-18.
- Patsloff, Patricia Kathryn. "Attitude Change of Teachers and Students." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1967.
- Peck, Robert F. "How Do Teachers and Students Interact to Create the Outcomes of Education?" Paper presented at the National Invitational Conference on Research on Teacher Effects: An Examination by Policy Makers and Researchers, Austin, Texas, November 1975.
- Pederson, K. George. "Economic and Sociological Correlates of Teacher Turnover." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Minneapolis, Minnesota, March 1970.
- Rosenberg, Morris and Leonard I. Pearlin. "Social Class and Self-Esteem among Children and Adults." American Journal of Sociology 84(1), July 1978, 53-77.
- Rosenfeld, Lawrence B. "An Investigation of Teachers' Stereotyping Behavior: The Influence of Mode of Presentation, Ethnicity, and Social Class on Teachers Evaluations of Students." Albuquerque, New Mexico: Department of Speech Communication, New Mexico University, October 1973.

- Rosenthal, Robert and Lenore Jacobson. Pygmalion in the Classroom: Teacher Expectations and Pupil's Intellectual Development. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968.
- Schultz, Raymond A. "Student Importance Ratings as an Indicator of the Structure of Actual and Ideal Sociopsychological Climates." Journal of Educational Psychology 71(6), December 1979, 827-839.
- Solomon, Daniel and Arthur J. Kendall. "Dimensions of Children's Classroom Behavior as Perceived by Teachers." American Educational Research Journal 14(4), Fall 1977, 411-421.
- Strasberg Weinstein, Rhona and Susan E. Middlestadt. "Student Perceptions of Teacher Interactions With Male High and Low Achievers." Journal of Educational Psychology 71(4), August 1979, 421-431.
- Tenenbaum, Samuel. "The Teacher, The Middle Class, The Lower Class." Phi Delta Kappan 45(2), November 1963, 82-86.
- Turner, Richard L. Differential Association of Elementary School Teacher Characteristics with School System Types. Final Report. Bloomington, Indiana: University of Indiana, September 1968.
- Villemez, Wayne J. "Race, Class, and Neighborhood: Differences in the Residential Return on Individual Resources." Social Forces 59(2), December 1980, 414-430.
- Weiss, Melford S. and Paula H. Weiss. "Taking Another Look at Teaching: How Lower-Class Children Influence Middle-Class Teachers." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, San Francisco, California, 1975.
- Zigler, Edward. "Social Class and the Socialization Process: A Review of Research." New York: Columbia University, October 1968.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



3 1293 01732 6848