



3 1293 10370 0922

L



This is to certify that the

dissertation entitled

THE OPINIONS OF SELECTED SUPERINTENDENTS AND
BOARD OF EDUCATION PRESIDENTS AS TO WHAT
CHARACTERISTICS CONSTITUTE A MIDDLE SCHOOL

presented by

JEAN MARIE MARLOWE

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in Administration & Higher Ed.

Louis Romano

Major professor

Date 12-5-80



OVERDUE FINES:

25¢ per day per item

RETURNING LIBRARY MATERIALS:

Place in book return to remove
charge from circulation record

~~MAR 05 '83~~ 0671
~~MAY 02 '83~~ 257
~~MAY 27 '83~~

~~FEB 26 '84~~

AUG 7 '83
27

SEP 9 '89 2002

~~SEP 08 1992~~

~~8878662~~

287 nk

~~MAR 12 '88~~

06074 D

R

~~APR 16 '88~~

79. K103

~~APR 27 '88~~

05122

~~SEP 8 '88~~

THE OPINIONS OF SELECTED SUPERINTENDENTS AND BOARD OF
EDUCATION PRESIDENTS AS TO WHAT CHARACTERISTICS
CONSTITUTE A MIDDLE SCHOOL

By

Jean Marie Marlowe

A DISSERTATION

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration and Higher Education

1980

© Copyright by

JEAN MARIE MARLOWE

1980

THE OPINIONS OF SELECTED SUPERINTENDENTS AND BOARD OF
EDUCATION PRESIDENTS AS TO WHAT CHARACTERISTICS
CONSTITUTE A MIDDLE SCHOOL

By

Jean Marie Marlowe

AN ABSTRACT OF
A DISSERTATION

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration and Higher Education

1980

ABSTRACT

THE OPINIONS OF SELECTED SUPERINTENDENTS AND BOARD OF EDUCATION PRESIDENTS AS TO WHAT CHARACTERISTICS CONSTITUTE A MIDDLE SCHOOL

By

Jean Marie Marlowe

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to collect the opinions of superintendents and board of education presidents as to what characteristics they believed constituted the ideal middle school. These district personnel, planners of programs for these pre-adolescents, are responsible for directing the education of this age youngster. Their opinions along with fiscal support have an effect on the programs that would be implemented in a school district.

Methodology

An examination of the literature enabled the researcher to identify the characteristics of a middle school and a junior high school. Two teams of authorities critiqued these lists. A revised questionnaire, Characteristics Which Constitute a Middle School Program and a Junior High Program, was mailed to a random sampling of Michigan middle schools and junior high schools. Of the 100 recipients, who included superintendents and board of education presidents of middle school districts and junior high school districts, 85 questionnaires

were returned. Scores from the questionnaires were subjected to the two-way ANOVA, and the alpha level was established at .05 for rejecting the hypotheses.

Conclusions

1. There is no significant difference in the opinions concerning curriculum between superintendents and board of education presidents in middle school districts and those in junior high school districts.

2. There is no significant difference in the opinions concerning co-curriculum between superintendents and board of education presidents in middle school districts and those in junior high school districts.

3. There is no significant difference in the opinions concerning staffing between superintendents and board of education presidents in middle school districts and those in junior high school districts.

4. There is no significant difference in the opinions concerning guidance between superintendents and board of education presidents in middle school districts and those in junior high school districts.

5. There is no significant difference in the opinions concerning scheduling between superintendents and board of education presidents in middle school districts and those in junior high school districts.

6. There is no significant difference in the opinions concerning methodology between superintendents and board of education presidents in middle school districts and those in junior high school districts.

7. There is no significant difference in the opinions concerning media between superintendents and board of education presidents in middle school districts and those in junior high school districts.

8. There is no significant difference in the opinions concerning resources between superintendents and board of education presidents in middle school districts and those in junior high school districts.

9. There is no significant difference in the opinions concerning evaluation between superintendents and board of education presidents in middle school districts and those in junior high school districts.

Implications

According to the data, there seems to be no clear understanding on the part of superintendents and board of education presidents as to the characteristics of a middle school and those of a junior high school. To remedy this situation, there should be in-depth discussions on how middle schools differ from junior high schools. Furthermore, presentations of the differences between a middle school program and a junior high school program such as the filmstrip-cassette entitled "The Middle School--A Humanizing Effort"¹ could be reviewed.

Superintendents and board of education presidents should plan field trips to middle schools within the state and include all members of the educational family in all in-service efforts. Superintendents and board of education presidents should plan to attend meaningful

conferences such as the annual Michigan and National Associations of Middle School Educators.

¹A. Kinsinger and L. Romano, "The Middle School--A Humanizing Effort (Michigan State University: Michigan Association of Middle School Educators, 1979).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To Dr. Louis Romano, committee chairman and provider of direction, leadership, and guidance, goes my deepest respect. His demands for high standards of excellence are appreciated.

To the members of the committee, Dr. Sam Moore, Dr. C. Keith Groty, and Dr. James Snoddy, goes my sincere acknowledgment for their assistance, encouragement, and support.

To my mother, Mildred Chapman, an educator of high courage who always believed in me and supported that belief with love and encouragement.

And, foremost, to the Marlowes, Harvey, my husband, and Michael and Patrick, our sons, who each gave so unselfishly and provided constant and unfailing love and encouragement, this thesis is dedicated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	v
LIST OF APPENDICES	vii
 Chapter	
I. THE PROBLEM	1
Purpose of the Study	3
Significance of the Problem	3
Definition of Terms	5
Limitations of the Study	7
Review of the Related Literature	7
Objectives	7
Procedures for Analysis of Data	9
Selection of the Sample	9
Treatment of the Data	10
Overview	10
II. REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE	12
A History of the Junior High School in America	12
A History of the Middle School Movement in America	15
The Need for the Middle School in Today's World	17
Future of Middle School Education	20
Review of Related Studies	22
Eighteen Characteristics of the Middle School	24
Summary	33
III. DESIGN OF THE STUDY	35
Introduction	35
Measurement Instrument	35
Rationale	35
Selection and Validity	36
Reliability	37
Format	37
Sample	38
Data Collection	39
Procedure of the Analysis	39
Hypotheses	41

	Page
Design of the Statistical Analysis	42
Significance Level	42
Summary	43
IV. PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS	44
Introduction	44
Descriptive Information	44
Findings	46
Summary	56
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	58
Introduction	58
Summary	58
Conclusions	59
Curriculum	59
Co-Curriculum	60
Staffing	60
Guidance	60
Scheduling	60
Methodology	61
Media	61
Resources	61
Evaluation	61
Discussion of the Findings	63
Implications	65
Recommendations for Further Study	66
Reflections	67
APPENDICES	69
BIBLIOGRAPHY	103

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Means and Standard Deviations of the Perceptions of Superintendents and Presidents of Middle Schools and Junior High Schools on Nine Scales	45
2. Interaction Between Superintendents and Board Presidents of Middle School Districts and Superintendents and Board Presidents of Junior High School Districts on the Characteristic, Curriculum	47
3. Interaction Between Superintendents and Board Presidents of Middle School Districts and Superintendents and Board Presidents of Junior High School Districts on the Characteristic, Co-curriculum	48
4. Interaction Between Superintendents and Board Presidents of Middle School Districts and Superintendents and Board Presidents of Junior High School Districts on the Characteristic, Staffing	49
5. Interaction Between Superintendents and Board Presidents of Middle School Districts and Superintendents and Board Presidents of Junior High School Districts on the Characteristic, Guidance	50
6. Interaction Between Superintendents and Board Presidents of Middle School Districts and Superintendents and Board Presidents of Junior High School Districts on the Characteristic, Scheduling	51
7. Interaction Between Superintendents and Board Presidents of Middle School Districts and Superintendents and Board Presidents of Junior High School Districts on the Characteristic, Methodology	53
8. Interaction Between Superintendents and Board Presidents of Middle School Districts and Superintendents and Board Presidents of Junior High School Districts on the Characteristic, Media	54

	Page
9. Interaction Between Superintendents and Board Presidents of Middle School Districts and Superintendents and Board Presidents of Junior High School Districts on the Characteristic, Resources	55
10. Interaction Between Superintendents and Board Presidents of Middle School Districts and Superintendents and Board Presidents of Junior High School Districts on the Characteristic, Evaluation	56

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix	Page
A. EIGHTEEN MIDDLE SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS	70
B. LIST OF EXPERTS	72
C. COVER LETTER TO FIRST EIGHT AUTHORITIES	74
D. CHECKLIST DESIGN OF THE INSTRUMENT	78
E. CHARACTERISTICS WHICH CONSTITUTE A MIDDLE SCHOOL PROGRAM AND A JUNIOR HIGH PROGRAM	82
F. SECOND LIST OF AUTHORITIES AND LETTERS	88
G. SCHOOL DISTRICTS SENT QUESTIONNAIRES	93
H. COVER LETTER TO SUPERINTENDENTS AND PRESIDENTS	96
I. CHARACTERISTICS WHICH CONSTITUTE A MIDDLE SCHOOL . . .	99

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

The middle school is an emerging school organization that has grown significantly in numbers throughout the United States. This national proliferation is supported by a number of studies. One of the most recent studies, by Hawkins, included more than 3,000 middle schools; in the state of Michigan, there were approximately 270 middle schools.¹

With this growth of interest in the middle school organization, there is a need to know what teaching-learning strategies are needed in the middle school. An understanding of these teaching-learning strategies and an implementation of them would hopefully bring about schools designed to meet the unique needs of children between 10 and 14 years of age.

Unfortunately, Alexander, Romano, and others have shown that the junior high program at one time met the needs of the pre-adolescent, but that this is no longer true.² The criticism of the

¹James Hawkins, "A Study to Ascertain Actual Middle School Practices as Compared to Reported Middle School Practices in Selected Michigan Schools and Nationally Prominent Schools as Perceived by Principals" (Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1972).

²William M. Alexander, "Alternative Futures for the Middle School," in The Middle School--A Look Ahead, ed. Paul S. George (Florida University: NMSA, 1977), p. 39; Louis G. Romano, Nicholas P. Georgiady, and James E. Heald, The Middle School: Selected Readings on an Emerging School Program (Chicago: Nelson-Hall Co., 1973), p. 73.

junior high program and the earlier onset of puberty were factors that established a strong theoretical foundation for the development of an in-between school for students age 11 through 14.¹

The middle school is an attempt to develop a new organization with certain teaching-learning strategies that are consistent with the emotional, social, physical, and intellectual growth needs of these students. But despite this concern for the middle school child, the emerging school organization unfortunately may not be meeting the needs of these children. Romano asked the question, "Is the present middle school an 'emerging cesspool'?" He continued:

I have serious concerns about the "new" middle school. Far too often, I observed middle schools within the state and throughout the country being merely a case of name changing. Yesterday, the school was a junior high school; today, it is a middle school. Far too many practices in the middle school are typical of the former junior high school which in turn was little more than a carbon copy of the senior high school.²

With the problems facing a new school organization, this study was an attempt to ascertain the opinions of superintendents and board of education presidents as to what a middle school is. These two groups of educational personnel are in positions of authority and should be able to provide the necessary financial and human resources to bring about educational programs consistent with the growth needs of the student aged 10 through 14. More important, it would seem imperative to learn if superintendents and board of education

¹William M. Alexander, "The Middle School: In Retrospect and Prospect," Texas Technical Journal of Education 3(3) (1976): 157.

²Louis Romano, "The Middle School--An Emerging Cesspool," Indiana Middle School Association Yearbook (1978), p. 91.

presidents understand middle school concepts. An understanding of what constitutes a middle school can either promote or hinder the growth of middle school programs.

Purpose of the Study

The researcher's purpose in this study was to determine the opinions as related to the characteristics of middle and junior high schools between superintendents and board of education presidents of middle school programs in both middle school districts and junior high school districts. Since opinions were being collected, there were no correct or incorrect answers.

Significance of the Problem

The number of middle schools will continue to increase while the number of junior high schools will decrease; this statement has been substantiated in the professional literature.¹ With this growth, school personnel may view the middle school as an opportunity to improve and enhance the educational progress for early adolescents.² Improved guidance, team teaching independent study, and nongradedness are a few of 18 characteristics that can be implemented in the middle school.³

¹Thomas A. Sinks, Max Bough, John McLute, Robert Malinka, and Dorothy J. T. Terman, "The Middle School Trend: Another Look at the Upper Midwest," The Clearing House 49 (October 1975): 52-104.

²William M. Alexander, Emmett L. Williams, Mary Compton, Vynce A. Hines, and Dan Prescott, The Emergent Middle School (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968), p. 64.

³Jack Riegler, "A Study of Middle School Programs to Determine the Current Level of Implementation of Eighteen Basic Middle School Principles" (Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1971), p. 60.

The importance of the middle school was best stated by Alexander et al.:

Educating the 10-14 year old is one of America's most challenging and rewarding opportunities today. To meet this challenge, the middle school's major objective should be the development of a curriculum designed specifically to meet their needs and interests, to provide an opportunity to achieve a degree of responsibility, productivity, creativity and self-respect.¹

Superintendents and board of education presidents can assist to meet the challenge by providing the resources for programs that best meet the needs of these youngsters. Besides resources, there is a need for these personnel to know the significant differences between a junior high school program and a middle school program. To suggest the implementation of a middle school program without a knowledge of what a middle school is can be futile.

The board of education is the legal policy maker of a school district, and it is the board policies that can put the schools in motion to develop a meaningful and unique program for students in the "in-between" stage.

Alexander et al. stated that the middle school program is an improvement over the junior high school program in meeting the educational needs of the 11- to 14-year-old child.²

Dettre stated,

Based on all kinds of physiological, psychological, sociological, curricular and instructional research, the junior high concept had the weight of evidence in its corner, yet it never really emerged as a separate and distinct entity within

¹Alexander et al., The Emergent Middle School, p. 64.

²Ibid.

the public school milieu. It failed to achieve its announced goals not because it lacked right on its side; rather, it failed in part because the overall mentality of those in education was such that they were not capable of intellectually and psychologically capitalizing on the emergence of a "third force" and moving to create for themselves a separate and equal status with elementary and secondary.¹

If the junior high school has failed to meet its goals and the middle school is an attempt to improve the situation, this knowledge in the hands of the superintendents and board of education presidents can facilitate programs to meet the present unmet needs of the transescent.²

Without a sound understanding of the middle school, superintendents and board of education presidents may desire planning a middle school organization and curriculum that is significantly different from the junior high school. This study was an attempt to determine if superintendents and board of education presidents have opinions that promote the middle school concept or opinions that reinforce the traditional junior high concept.

Definition of Terms

Characteristics--Distinguishing features basic to the middle school philosophy.³

Middle school--An educational unit with a philosophy, structure, and program that will realistically and appropriately deal with

¹John R. Dettre, "The Middle School, A Separate and Equal Entity," The Clearing House, September 1973, p. 20.

²Romano et al., The Middle School: Selected Readings, p. 13.

³Riegle, "A Study of Middle School Programs."

11 to 14 year olds as they indeed are and behave. Its commitment is primarily to the youths it seeks to serve.¹

Transescence: The period in an individual's development beginning before the onset of puberty and continuing through early adolescence. It is characterized by changes in physical development, social interaction, and intellectual functions.²

Superintendent: The chief executive who directs the work of a school district and is appointed by the local board of education members. He or she provides leadership and general supervision over public education. The term of office is determined by the laws governing the board of education membership.

Board of education: An official body (from five to seven members) of elected persons who direct and supervise the work of a school district. This body provides general planning and coordinating for public education and gives advice on financial requirements. This is the board of the governing body of local school districts.

Junior high school: Usually a school that enrolls pupils in grades 7, 8, and 9--less commonly grades 7 and 8 or grades 8 and 9; may be a separate school or the lower part of junior-senior high school.³

¹Louis Romano, guest editor, Michigan Journal of Secondary Education (Ann Arbor: Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals, Summer 1971).

²Donald Eichhorn, The Middle School (New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1966), p. 3.

³Carter V. Good, ed., Dictionary of Education, 3rd ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973).

Limitations of the Study

The validity of the study was affected by the following factors:

1. A lack of consistent responses may develop as a result of the variety of experiences and backgrounds of the respondents.
2. Only public school districts in Michigan and superintendents and board of education presidents of districts that included middle school and/or junior high school programs were included.
3. The instrument, Factors Which Constitute a Middle School and a Junior High School, was limited to the measurement of the opinions of superintendents and board of education presidents.
4. The use of a paper-and-pencil survey instrument and/or the fact that it was mailed may not have been the most effective means of collecting data pertinent to the study.

Review of the Related Literature

A review of the literature included a history of the junior high school in America. It also included a history of the middle school movement, along with growth characteristics and a base for defining educational needs for the transescent.

The need for the middle school is discussed in the review of the literature. Alexander and other writers have shown that the junior high school no longer meets the needs of the 11-14 year old.

Objectives

The hypotheses dealt with in this study were as follows:

Hypothesis I: There is no significant difference in the opinions concerning curriculum between superintendents and board of education presidents in middle school districts and those in junior high school districts.

Hypothesis II: There is no significant difference in the opinions concerning co-curriculum between superintendents and board of education presidents in middle school districts and those in junior high school districts.

Hypothesis III: There is no significant difference in the opinions concerning staffing between superintendents and board of education presidents in middle school districts and those in junior high school districts.

Hypothesis IV: There is no significant difference in the opinions concerning guidance between superintendents and board of education presidents in middle school districts and those in junior high school districts.

Hypothesis V: There is no significant difference in the opinions concerning scheduling between superintendents and board of education presidents in middle school districts and those in junior high school districts.

Hypothesis VI: There is no significant difference in the opinions concerning methodology between superintendents and board of education presidents in middle school districts and those in junior high school districts.

Hypothesis VII: There is no significant difference in the opinions concerning media between superintendents and board of education presidents in middle school districts and those in junior high school districts.

Hypothesis VIII: There is no significant difference in the opinions concerning resources between superintendents and board of education presidents in middle school districts and those in junior high school districts.

Hypothesis IX: There is no significant difference in the opinions concerning evaluation between superintendents and board of education presidents in middle school districts and those in junior high school districts.

Procedures for Analysis of Data

Selection of the Sample

The sample of superintendents in this study was randomly selected from the population of the public school districts in Michigan as listed in the Michigan Education Directory and Buyer's Guide. The districts included housed both middle schools and/or junior high schools. Besides superintendents, board of education presidents participated in this study.

A questionnaire entitled Characteristics Which Constitute a Middle School and a Junior High School consisted of 37 matched characteristics derived from a perusal of the literature. There was a total of 74 items. Some examples of these matched characteristics of junior high school and middle school programs are as follows:

<u>Junior High</u>	<u>Middle School</u>
1. Primary thrust is toward learning a body of information.	1. Primary thrust is toward learning how to learn.
2. Departmentalized.	2. Team teaching.
3. Interscholastic sports.	3. Intramural sports.

Each participating superintendent and board of education president received a copy of the instrument. Each participant was asked to mark his opinion regarding the middle school program. A cover letter accompanied each questionnaire. A stamped, self-addressed return envelope was provided for each participant.

The validity of the instrument was established when practitioners in the field reviewed and checked the instrument.

Treatment of the Data

The data were processed using the Control Data Computer at Michigan State University. A test for distinctiveness was administered--that is, which items on the questionnaire were most frequently evaluated the same by the respondents.

The data were treated using the two-way ANOVA statistical test. The alpha level was .05. The scoring process included use of points marked on the Likert scale by the respondents and the number of times each point was marked. Treatment of the data tested responses for differences in the opinions of superintendents and board of education presidents in the areas of the nine hypotheses.

Overview

The need for opinions of superintendents and board of education presidents about what they believed constituted the middle school program was discussed in Chapter I. The purpose of the study was defined, and the significance of the problem was presented. Definitions of terms pertinent to this study were included, and limitations of the study were presented.

In Chapter II, a review of the literature related to the middle school and the junior high school education is presented. A history of the middle school movement in America is also included. The need for middle school education in today's world and research on the opinions of authorities in the field in regard to middle school education and the value of that research to the education of youngsters aged 11 through 14 are further included.

In Chapter III, the design of the study, including the development of the instrument, the selection of the sample, the procedure for collection of data, and the statistical tools applied to the data, are presented.

The data are discussed in Chapter IV. An outline of the significant findings, implications of the findings, along with conclusions and suggestions for further studies are included in Chapter V.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

The review of the literature begins with a historical presentation of the development of schools for students between childhood and adolescence, namely, the junior high school. This early development was led by educators who wanted to define a school organization that would provide the best teaching-learning situation for the pre-adolescent student. The educational thinking of these people regarding the junior high movement is reviewed.

The emergent middle school is discussed, including the need for a middle school and its program. This discussion is followed by a look into the future of middle school education.

A History of the Junior High School in America

Schools in different localities were unequal in their curriculum offerings for students in the 11-14 age group.¹ As a result, many of these students did not see the relevancy of a formal education and dropped out of school. Indeed, the original initiators of the junior high school conceived it as a terminal education for some of the students enrolled and as an academic introduction for those capable

¹Alvin W. Howard and George C. Stoumbis, The Junior High and Middle School: Issues and Practices (London: Intext Educational Publishers, 1970), p. 11.

and financially able to continue their education. The high drop-out rate attributed to student lack of interest and a "dull, dry, impractical curriculum" along with a lack of practical courses, irregular attendance, late entrance, child labor laws and illnesses, all became arguments used in support of the emergence of the junior high school.¹

"The birthplace of the junior high school was probably Berkeley, California, in 1910 and was followed by similar provisions in other cities including Columbus, Ohio, and Grand Rapids, Michigan."² Among the earliest to advocate a separate school unit for the education of early adolescents was W. A. Greeson, who served as the Grand Rapids, Michigan, superintendent of schools in the early 1900s.³ Greeson pointed out the inadequacy of the six-year high school before the 1909 Annual Meeting of the North Central Association. It was he who proposed a structural blueprint for what was to become in Berkeley the first modern-day junior high school.

With the advent of the junior high school, consideration was given to the reorganization of the schools themselves and the curriculum. The child study movement had been a major factor in causing school administrations to look more closely at this age student. "This junior high school of fifty years ago operated more along the

¹Ibid.

²Tony Egnatuck, Nicholas Georgiady, and Louis G. Romano, The Middle School: A Position Paper (East Lansing: Michigan Association of Middle School Educators, 1975), p. 1.

³Samuel Popper, The American Middle School: An Organizational Analysis (Waltham, Mass.: Blaisdell Publishing Co., 1967), p. 213.

concept that we now refer to as the 'middle school' concept today."¹ Leonard V. Koos, Professor of Education at the University of Minnesota, said in 1920 that "among the most popular descriptors of the Junior High School at that time were the 'recognition of individual differences' and 'exploration for guidance.'"² The NEA, Department of Superintendent, published a listing of descriptors of the junior high school in the late 1920s. Again, the most frequently mentioned descriptor was "meeting individual differences in pupils."³

In 1893, the emphasis focused on a school for the child and not the child for the school. Hall stated that "adolescence emphasized psychological age. Adolescence was virtually a new birth and a time of changes in the adolescent's life in all areas of physical, emotional, mental, social and moral."⁴ Because of these changes, a new approach was needed. A new school, new methods, and new curriculum were required in order to work properly with the individual differences found in the age group of youngsters in transition.

Although the primary focus in 1920 was

to meet individual differences, in the next thirty years, the country travelled through depression, world war, cold war, economic boom, and a revolution in scientific technology and college was viewed as the "saving pathway" for almost all youth. The pressure of society, particularly in the late fifties, for

¹James H. Fox, Jr., "Middle School: Surviving, Refining and Growing in the Future," in The Middle School--A Look Ahead, ed. Paul S. George (Florida University: NMSA, inc., 1977), p. 22.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

⁴Howard and Stoumbis, p. 11.

quantity matriculations into college pushed school districts toward a more subject-orientated curriculum at the junior high level.¹

The heavily academic curriculum resembled that of the high school. Was this approach appropriate for the children in the middle? Was mass production or a child-centered environment stressing individual differences more appropriate?

The junior high school seemed a good idea, but today the junior high school is no longer an innovation. In fact, the junior high school is no longer a departure from the traditional; it is the traditional.²

"The nation's junior high schools, plagued by academic and disciplinary problems, are giving way in growing numbers to an alternative type of institution--the 'middle school.'"³ "The late 50's and the 60's saw mounting criticism of the junior high school; it housed the wrong students, had lost sight of its transitional nature and purpose and was too subject-matter orientated."⁴

A History of the Middle School Movement in America

From 1910 to 1960, the junior high school became so standardized and inflexible that reformers sought to replace that model

¹Fox, p. 22.

²Romano et al., The Middle School, p. 13.

³"Middle Schools Spread Fast and Stir Controversy," U.S. News and World Report, February 2, 1976, pp. 41-43.

⁴Maurice McGlasson, "The Middle School: Whence? What? Whither?" Phi Delta Kappan, 1973, p. 12.

with the emergent middle school.¹ Mead pointed out that the educational system had become too impersonal and too standardized.² Because of these criticisms there was a need for a reformation of the American junior high school.

"The middle school movement was born in the 1960's as a product of this dissatisfaction with the junior high school."³ Today's burgeoning middle school began "in the 8-4 and 6-3-3 organizations, but inappropriate to all American communities and inadequate to meet the challenge of equal educational opportunity for all children."⁴

This inadequacy hastened the emergence of a middle unit in the public schools between elementary and high school. This middle unit required a status, curriculum, and staff unique to the needs of the students it served. "The middle school was justified socially as it embraced the period during which the majority of pupils reached adolescence. The sixth, seventh and eighth unit was valid in that many children in sixth grade were pubescent."⁵ The movement of this "school in the middle" spread rapidly. By 1965, it was so observable

¹Alexander, "Alternative Futures for the Middle School," p. 3.

²Margaret Mead, "Are We Squeezing Out Adolescents?" National Parent Teacher 55 (September 1960): 4-6.

³Howard and Stoumbis, pp. 17, 20.

⁴Alexander, "The Middle School: In Retrospect and Prospect," p. 157.

⁵Richard Conover, "The Junior High School Principalship," in Schools for the Middle Years: Readings, ed. Alvin W. Howard and George C. Stoumbis (Scranton, Pa.: International Textbook Co., 1979), pp. 81-86.

that Woodring acclaimed that "it now appears that the 6-3-3 plan with its junior high school is on the way out."¹

The Need for the Middle School in
Today's World

"This emergent school in the middle became the program of education for the students age 11-14."² DeVita continued that the middle school, a philosophy and belief about children, their unique needs, who they are, and how they grow and learn, is an organization that structures education to meet the needs of pre-adolescents and considers the nature of these children and their potential.

This program of education was concerned with all aspects of the child: cultural, social, recreational, and avocational. Designed to separate these children from the younger elementary as well as the older high school student, "middle school became a place where pupils could be exposed to a wide range of educational experiences instead of specialized training."³ This program did not have the negative connotation of the junior high school with all of the semantic problems inherent in the word "junior." Middle school "became a place where compatibility of students in grades six, seven and eight seemed rational because of similar social, emotional and physical problems

¹Alexander, "The Middle School: In Retrospect and Prospect," p. 158.

²Joseph C. DeVita, Philip Pumerantz, and Leighton B. Wilklow, The Effective Middle School (West Nyack, N.Y.: Parker Publishing Co., Inc., 1970), pp. 25-26.

³Ron L. Billings, "Musts for a Middle School," Clearing House, April 1976, p. 377.

of these children."¹ Moss's description of this school organization included "flexible grouping, adaptable curriculum, great range of materials and instructional approaches."²

Disque related that "evidence now shows that with each succeeding generation, girls tend to experience menstruation up to one year earlier. This earlier growth in girls presents a certain problem in schools and other social groups during the pre-adolescent years."³ "Social change," Mead reminded us, "has occurred so rapidly in the past two decades that parents are not only confused by the experiences their children are undergoing, but they are experiencing many of these changes themselves for the first time in their own lives."⁴ Since notice of earlier onset of puberty has occurred in recent years and as middle school was intended for early adolescents, onset of puberty should be one of the determining factors for grade organization. The earlier arrival of puberty is a factor that establishes a strong theoretical foundation for grade organization in which students age 11-14 do acquire greater amounts of general information and social sophistication earlier, substantiating the need for the in-between school. Stradley and Aspinall summed this up as they

¹Thomas E. Curtis, "Administrators View the Middle School," in Schools for the Middle Years: Readings, ed. George C. Stoumbis and Alvin W. Howard (Scranton, Pa.: International Textbook Co., 1969), pp. 147-48.

²Theodore C. Moss, Middle School (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1969), p. 154.

³Jerry Disque, "In-Between: The Adolescents' Struggle for Independence," Phi Delta Kappan, 1973, p. 8.

⁴Ibid., p. 9.

stated, "It is only common sense for the teacher to accept the changes in each student and vary the functioning demands."¹

Mead perceived this age group as emphasizing social rather than intellectual preparation. "Neither acquisition of basic skills as in elementary school nor specialization of the high school should be stressed."²

"The middle school's major objectives are the development of a curriculum designed specifically to meet pupil needs and interests and to provide an opportunity to achieve a degree of responsibility, productivity, creativity, and self-respect."³ These objectives call for provisions in a setting that encourages experimentation. These provisions include varied instruction along with independent study where teachers can focus on the individual student, encouraging communications among teachers and students. This environment provides for effective use of instructional media and technology and encourages students to relax from a competitive environment. Staff talents, interests, and expertise can better be used in this setting as teaching teams are a large part of the program. Because of teaching teams, staff can be released to prepare and research and work with small groups of students or individuals.

¹William E. Stradley and Richard D. Aspinall, Discipline in the Junior High/Middle School: A Handbook for Teachers (New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1975), p. 24.

²Ann M. Grooms, Perspectives on the Middle Schools (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, 1967), p. 4.

³Alexander et al., The Emergent Middle School, p. 64.

Co-curricular activities are an important part of the modern middle school, with all students encouraged to participate. "The diverse needs of transescent youth dictate a diverse program, including communication skills and mathematics, along with programs designed to help youngsters understand the social and emotional changes they are experiencing. These changes must be considered in a program of education for the 10-14 year old students."¹

Future of Middle School Education

"It is predicted that the number of middle schools will continue to increase while the number of junior high schools will continue to decrease."² This growth is evidenced by Alexander's 1968 statistics, which indicated that approximately 1,100 middle schools were operational. Kealy located nearly 2,300 middle schools. A 1974 report on the growth of middle schools showed that more than 3,700 middle schools could be found in operation across the nation.³ Undoubtedly, the current number of middle schools is more than 4,000.⁴ Alexander stated that "clearly the new organization and name has

¹Joseph Bondi, "Addressing the Issues: The Middle School--A Positive Change in American Education," in The Middle School--A Look Ahead, ed. Paul S. George (Florida University: NMSA, 1977), pp. 28-29.

²Thomas A. Sinks, Max Bough, John McLute, Robert Malinka, and Dorothy J. T. Terman, "The Middle School Trend: Another Look at the Upper Midwest," The Clearing House 49 (October 1975): 52-104.

³Robert Malinka, "The Middle School: Trends and Trouble Spots," in The Middle School--A Look Ahead, ed. Paul S. George (Florida University: NMSA, 1977), p. 50.

⁴Ibid., p. 52.

caught on; from fewer than 100 to some 4000 middle school grade organizations in fifteen years."¹ This kind of growth would indicate that the middle school movement is healthy, with every indication of continued growth for a viable future.

Additional indicators of robustness include the rapid increase in the number of publications on the middle school.² State and national organizations were created to support the ideals and concepts of the middle school. Members at the national level now number more than 2,000, with state membership for Michigan alone totaling 1,200. Some institutions of higher education now include programs of certification and education specifically aimed at the teacher in the middle school. A recent survey by George identified eight states as having a teacher's certification specifically for middle school.³ In addition, 14 states were planning such a certification or had the issue under study. Middle school teacher-education programs of some type were identified in 19 states, with an additional five states planning them. Dr. John Porter, Superintendent of Michigan State Public Education, stated at a Michigan Association of Middle School Educators Conference in 1977 that consideration would be underway for the inclusion of a department for middle school education within the state department of education.

¹Alexander, "The Middle School: In Retrospect and Prospect," p. 158.

²Ibid., p. 159.

³Paul S. George, ed., The Middle School--A Look Ahead (Florida University: NMSA, 1977).

All of these indicators point to the necessity for superintendents and school board members to look openly at students' needs and determine which programs best meet these necessities. In some instances, the boards of education have mandated organizational changes to meet such essentials in a school district. Superintendents and boards of education, through other administrators, teachers, and parents, are asked to design a middle school organization and curriculum so as not to duplicate the junior high school. This calls for a careful study of the middle school literature, including visitations to promising middle school programs and other meaningful activities. A truly "new" program should provide a program consistent with the needs of these children and also give middle school teachers status positions in the school organization.¹

Review of Related Studies

In 1970, Riegel conducted a study designed to identify the basic middle school characteristics.² These characteristics were gleaned from the middle school literature in existence at that time. From the literature, those characteristics frequently mentioned were gathered. These were then sent to five noted authorities in the field of middle school education for validation. From the number of characteristics collected, 18 basic middle school characteristics were compiled. They included: (1) continuous progress, (2) multi-media use, (3) flexible schedules, (4) social experiences, (5) physical

¹Egnatuck et al., The Middle School, A Position Paper, p. 7.

²Riegle, "A Study of Middle School Programs," pp. 60-68.

experiences, (6) intramural activity, (7) team teaching, (8) planned gradualism, (9) exploratory-enrichment programs, (10) guidance services, (11) independent study, (12) basic learning skills, (13) creative learning experiences, (14) student security factors, (15) evaluation practices, (16) community relations, (17) student services, and (18) auxiliary staffing.

A survey instrument was designed to measure data related to the implementation of these characteristics by selected middle schools. The survey instrument was mailed to all schools in Michigan housing grades 5-8 and 6-8. It was also mailed to four middle schools arbitrarily selected on a national basis because of their well-known middle school programs.

The findings and conclusions of the Riegle study were as follows:

1. The rapid increase in the number of schools labeled as middle schools has not been accompanied by a high degree of application of those characteristics considered by authorities in the field to be basic to middle school education.

2. There was an overall 49.64 percent application by middle schools in Michigan as measured by the survey instrument used in this study and a 64.9 percent application by the national sample when measured on the same basis.

3. The number of grades housed in a middle school was not a significant factor in determining application of the basic middle school characteristics. It should be noted that generally both

three-grade and four-grade middle schools in Michigan applied the middle school characteristics to a limited degree.

4. While a high degree of agreement exists among authorities in the field regarding what constitutes basic middle school characteristics, the degree of application of these characteristics and the wide variation in levels of application provide evidence of a failure by the leadership of the Michigan middle schools to implement the validated characteristics.

5. A limited number of Michigan middle schools demonstrated application of the basic middle school characteristics to a degree equal to that level achieved by the four selected exemplary middle schools included in this study.

A complete listing of these 18 basic middle school characteristics is presented. Although the original development of these 18 characteristics was by Riegler, a more complete description was prepared by Georgiady, Riegler, and Romano.¹

Eighteen Characteristics of the Middle School

<u>Characteristic</u>	<u>What and Why</u>
1. Continuous Progress	The middle school program should feature a nongraded organization that allows students to progress at their own individual rate regardless of chronological age. Individual differences are at the most pronounced stage during the transescent years of human development. Chronological groups tend to ignore the span of individual differences.

¹Romano et al., The Middle School: Selected Readings, pp. 73-84.

<u>Characteristic</u>	<u>Explanation</u>
	The curriculum built on continuous progress is typically composed of sequenced achievement levels or units of work. As a student completes a unit of work in a subject, he moves on to the next unit. This plan utilizes programmed and semi-programmed instructional materials, along with teacher-made units.
2. Multi-material Approach	<p><u>What and Why</u></p> <p>The middle school program should offer to students a wide range of easy, accessible instructional materials, a number of explanations and a choice of approaches to the topic. Classroom activities should be planned around a multi-material approach rather than a basic textbook organization.</p> <p><u>Explanation</u></p> <p>Maturity levels, interest areas, and student backgrounds vary greatly at this age, and these variables need to be considered when materials are selected. The middle-school-age youngster has a range biologically and physiologically anywhere from 7 years old to 19 years old. Their cognitive development, according to Piaget, progresses through different levels, too. (Limiting factors include environment, physical development, experiences, and emotions.) The middle school youngster is at one of two stages: preparation for an organization of concrete operations and the period of formal operations. These students have short attention spans. Variation in approach and variable materials should be available in the school program to meet the various needs and abilities of the youngsters and to help the teachers retain the interest of the youngsters.</p>
3. Flexible Schedules	<p><u>What and Why</u></p> <p>The middle school should provide a schedule that encourages the investment of time based on educational needs rather than standardized time periods. The schedule should be employed as a teaching aid rather than a control device. The rigid block schedule</p>

CharacteristicWhat and Why

provides little opportunity to develop a program to a special situation or to a particular student.

Explanation

Movement should be permissive and free rather than dominated by the teacher. Variation of classes and the length of class time as well as variety of group size will help a student become capable of assuming responsibility for his own learning.

4. Social Experiences

What and Why

The program should provide experiences appropriate for the transescent youth and should not emulate the social experiences of the senior high school. Social activities that emulate high school programs are inappropriate for middle school students. The stages of their social development are diverse, and the question of immaturity is pertinent in the planning of activities for this age level.

Explanation

The preadolescent and early adolescent undergo changes which affect the self-concept. The youngster is in an in-between world, separate from the family and the rest of the adult world. This is a time of sensitivity and acute perception, a crucial time in preparation for adulthood. This is the age of sex-role identification. The youngsters model themselves after a same-sex adult and seek support from the same-sex peer group. The attitudes of the group affect the judgment of the individual child. There is the necessity for developing many social skills, especially those regarding the opposite sex. There are dramatic changes in activity: dancing, slang, kidding, practical joke give and take, etc. Common areas should be provided in the building for social interaction among small groups.

Characteristic

5. Physical Experiences
and Intramural
Activities

What and Why

The middle school curricular and co-curricular programs should provide physical activities based solely on the needs of the students. Involvement in the program as a participant rather than as a spectator is critical for the students. A broad range of intramural experiences that provide physical activity for all students should be provided to supplement the physical education classes, which should center their activity upon helping students understand and use their bodies. The middle school should feature intramural activities rather than interscholastic activities.

Explanation

Activities that emulate the high school program are inappropriate for the middle school. The stages of their physical development are diverse, and the question of immaturity is pertinent in planning activities for this age level. The wide range of physical, emotional, social development found in youngsters of middle-school age strongly suggests a diverse program. The child's body is rapidly developing. The relationship of attitude and physical skill must be considered in planning physical activities consistent with the concern for growth toward independence in learning. The emphasis should be upon the development of fundamental skills as well as using these skills in a variety of activities. Intramural activity involves maximum participation, whereas interscholastic activity provides minimum involvement. There is no sound educational reason for interscholastic athletics. Too often they serve merely as public entertainment and encourage an overemphasis on specialization at the expense of the majority of the student body.

6. Team Teaching

What and Why

The middle school program should be organized in part around team-teaching patterns that allow students to work with a variety

CharacteristicWhat and Why

teachers in a wide range of subject areas. Team teaching is intended to bring to students a variety of resource persons.

Explanation

Team teaching provides an opportunity for teacher talents to reach greater numbers of students and for teacher weaknesses to be minimized. This organizational pattern requires teacher planning time and an individualized student program if it is to function most effectively.

7. Planned Gradualism

What and Why

The middle school should provide experiences that assist early adolescents in making the transition from childhood dependence to adult independence, thereby helping them to bridge the gap between elementary school and high school.

Explanation

The transition period is marked by new physical phenomena in boys and girls which bring about the need for learning to manage their bodies and erotic sensations without embarrassment. Awareness of new concepts of self and new problems of social behavior and the need for developing many social behaviors and the need for developing many social skills is relevant. There is a responsibility to help the rapidly developing person assert his right to make many more decisions about his own behavior, his social life, management of money, choice of friends, in general, to make adult, independent decisions. The transition involves a movement away from a dependence upon what can be perceived in the immediate environment to a level of hypothesizing and dealing with abstractions. There is an establishment of a level of adult-like thought and a desire to test ideas in school as well as social situations.

8 & 9. Exploratory and
Enrichment StudiesWhat and Why

The program should be broad enough to meet the individual interest of the students for which it was designed. It should widen the

CharacteristicWhat and Why

range of educational training a student experiences rather than specialize his training. There is a need for variety in the curriculum. Elective courses should be a part of the program of every student during his years in the middle school.

Explanation

Levels of retention are increased when students learn by "doing" and understanding is more complete when viewed from a wide range of experiences. Time should be spent enriching the student's concept of himself and the world around him, rather than learning subject matter in the traditional form. A student should be allowed to investigate his interests on school time and to progress on his own as he is ready.

10. Guidance Services

What and Why

The middle school program should include both group and individual guidance services for all students. Highly individualized help that is of a personal nature is needed.

Explanation

The middle-school child needs and should receive counseling on many matters. Each teacher should "counsel" the child regarding his learning opportunities and progress in respective areas. Each child should perhaps be a member of a home-base group led by a teacher-counselor, someone who watches out for his welfare. Puberty and its many problems require expert guidance for the youngster, so a professional counselor should be available to the individual youngster.

11. Independent Study

What and Why

The program should provide an opportunity for students to spend time studying individual interests or needs that do not appear in the organized curricular offerings.

<u>Characteristic</u>	<u>Explanation</u>
	A child's own intellectual curiosity motivates him to carry on independently of the group, with the teacher serving as a resource person. Independent study may be used in connection with organized knowledge, or with some special interest or hobby. The student pursues his work, after it has been defined, and uses his teachers, various materials available in the school, and perhaps even other students, as his sources. He grows in self-direction through various activities and use of materials.
12. Basic Skill Repair and Extension	<p><u>What and Why</u></p> <p>The middle school program should provide opportunities for students to receive clinical help in learning basic skills. The basic education program fostered in the elementary school should be extended in the middle school.</p> <p><u>Explanation</u></p> <p>Because of individual differences, some youngsters have not entirely mastered the basic skills. These students should be provided organized opportunities to improve their skills. Learning must be made attractive and many opportunities to practice reading, listening, asking questions, etc., must be planned in every classroom. Formal specialized instruction in the basic skills may be necessary and should be available.</p>
13. Creative Experiences	<p><u>What and Why</u></p> <p>The middle school program should include opportunities for students to express themselves in creative ways. Student newspapers, dramatic creations, musical programs, and other student-centered, student-directed, student-developed activities should be encouraged.</p> <p><u>Explanation</u></p> <p>Students should be free to do some divergent thinking and explore various avenues to possible answers. There should be time allowed for thinking without pressure, and a place for unusual ideas and unusual questions to</p>

<u>Characteristic</u>	<u>Explanation</u>
	be considered with respect. Media for expressing the inner feelings should be provided. Art, music, and drama provide opportunities for expression of personal feelings.
14. Security Factor	<p><u>What and Why</u></p> <p>The program should provide every student with a security group: a teacher who knows him well and whom he relates to in a positive manner and a peer group that meets regularly and represents more than administrative convenience in its use of time.</p> <p><u>Explanation</u></p> <p>Teachers need time to give the individual student the attention he needs, to help in counseling and curriculum situations. The student needs someone in school with whom he can be comfortable.</p>
15. Evaluation	<p><u>What and Why</u></p> <p>The middle school program should provide an evaluation of a student's work that is personal, positive in nature, non-threatening, and strictly individualized. The student should be allowed to assess his own progress and plan for future progress.</p> <p><u>Explanation</u></p> <p>A student needs more information than a letter grade provides, and he needs more security than the traditional evaluation system offers. Traditional systems seem to be punitive. The middle-school youngster needs a supportive atmosphere that helps to generate confidence and a willingness to explore new areas of learning. Student-teacher planning helps to encourage the students to seek new areas. Student-teacher evaluation sessions can help to create a mutual understanding of problems and also to provide a more meaningful report for parents. Parent-teacher-student conferences on a scheduled and unscheduled basis should be the basic reporting method. Competitive letter-grade evaluation should be replaced with open pupil-teacher-parent communications.</p>

Characteristic

16. Community Relations

What and Why

The middle school should develop and maintain a varied program of community relations. Programs to inform, to entertain, to educate, and to understand the community, as well as other activities, should be a part of the basic operation of the school.

Explanation

The middle school houses students at a time when they are eager to be involved in activities with their parents. The school should encourage this natural attitude. The middle school has facilities that can be used to good advantage by community groups.

17. Student Services

What and Why

The middle school should provide a broad spectrum of specialized services for students. Community, county, and state agencies should be utilized to expand the range of specialists to its broadest possible extent.

Explanation

Health services, counseling services, testing, opportunities for individual development (curricular and co-curricular) meeting the interests and needs of each child should be provided.

18. Auxiliary Staffing

What and Why

The middle school should utilize highly diversified personnel such as volunteer parents, teacher aides, clerical aides, student volunteers, and other similar types of support staffing that help to facilitate the teaching staff.

Explanation

Auxiliary staffing is needed to provide the individual help students require. A variety of teacher aides or paraprofessionals may be used to extend the talents of the professional staff.

In 1972, Hawkins investigated the relationship between principals and teachers in selected Michigan middle schools and four nationally prominent middle schools regarding their perceptions of their school practices. Survey questionnaires seeking data related to the current practices of middle schools were mailed to these schools. After an analysis of the data, it was apparent that the exemplary middle schools in the national sample were applying the 18 basic middle school characteristics to a greater degree than were the middle schools in Michigan.¹

No studies were available that attempted to determine the opinions of superintendents and board of education presidents as to the implementation of the 18 middle school characteristics. This study is an attempt to gain these opinions from two important leaders in the educational hierarchy.

Summary

The origin of the junior high school was a product of dissatisfaction of the times caused by many children dropping out of school at an early age. The intent of the junior high school was to meet the unique needs of the 11-14 year olds.

For 50 years, the junior high schools served this function. Due to societal pressures, the basic ideals of the junior high school were radically changed, causing more and more junior high schools to resemble the high school. In the 1960s, reformers brought about the

¹Hawkins, "A Study to Ascertain Actual Middle School Practices."

emergence of a school in the middle--neither an elementary school nor a high school--for this age youth.

This school in the middle has continued to survive and has grown at a healthy rate. Besides numbers, there have emerged associations of middle schools at state and national levels, publications, and teacher certification for this school "in the middle."

Studies by Riegle and Hawkins attempted to determine the degree of implementation of 18 characteristics of a middle school that were developed by a panel of experts. None of the studies related to the middle school attempted to gain the opinions of superintendents and board of education presidents. The present study attempted to obtain the opinions of these school leaders as they relate to the middle school or the junior high school.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Introduction

The design of the study involved the 18 characteristics of middle school programs and of junior high educational programs plus superintendents' and board of education presidents' opinions of these characteristics. The objective of this study was to collect these opinions of these leaders as to middle school and junior high school characteristics.

The literature was searched for characteristics of middle school and junior high educational programs. These characteristics were incorporated into an instrument entitled Characteristics Which Constitute a Middle School Program and a Junior High Program. The derivation and evolution of that instrument are discussed in this chapter along with the rationale, reliability, and validity for the instrument. The discussion includes features of the sample, process for data collection and analysis, treatment of the data, hypotheses, and the significance level.

Measurement Instrument

Rationale

The instrument was developed from a search of the literature on junior high and middle school programs. The instrument consisted

of 37 characteristics comprising the middle school and junior high school philosophy. These 37 characteristics were grouped into nine scales for ease of measuring the collected data.

The data collected by this instrument measured the attitudes that school leaders held as to characteristics relevant to educational programs for the transescent. The nine scales comprising the 37 variables included:¹

1. Curriculum
2. Co-curriculum
3. Staffing
4. Guidance
5. Scheduling
6. Methodology
7. Media
8. Resources
9. Evaluation²

These nine scales constituted the nine dependent variables investigated in this study.

Selection and Validity

The selection and validity indices of the instrument were based on Riegler's study, which yielded characteristics relevant to middle school education.³ (See Appendix A.)

¹The 37 items that comprise the nine scales are listed in Appendix E.

²Riegler, "A Study of Middle School Programs," p. 43.

³Ibid.

Reliability

To determine reliability, 28 graduate students in the course entitled 852E Middle School Administration were given a list of the middle school characteristics and the junior high school characteristics, but in a random order. An attempt was made to determine if the middle school characteristics were truly middle school items, and if the junior high characteristics were truly junior high school items. The split-half reliability correlation coefficient was .95 using the Spearman Brown method and .91 using the Pearson product-moment method.

Format

The format of the instrument was as follows:

<u>Junior High School</u>	<u>Middle School</u>
1. Primary thrust is toward learning a body of information.	1. Primary thrust is toward learning how to learn (study skills).
2. Departmentalized.	2. Team teaching.

This checklist was left in the comparison form for ease of scrutiny. However, the finalized questionnaire items were scrambled. A number of authorities (see Appendix B) were asked if these characteristics identified middle school and junior high practices. Adjustments were made in the instrument from the suggestions that these experts returned in their responses (Appendix C). A revised questionnaire (Appendix D) was mailed to a second list of authorities in the field of middle school education, seeking their review of this improved instrument. Changes in the second instrument included use of a five-point Likert scale with the ideal middle school and ideal junior

high items appearing at either end of the scale. Questions were organized on the instrument in no discernible patterns (Appendix E).

Each expert in the second group was called personally. This allowed the researcher to request their assistance with the revised instrument and to assure the instrument's prompt return. Following each conversation, the questionnaire and cover letter were mailed (Appendix F). Suggested changes were incorporated into the finalized questionnaire (Appendix F).

One suggestion was to change the five-point scale to a nine-point scale for a more finite measurement of the collected data. The new scale now reads one through nine points, instead of the original one through five points.

Sample

A random sample was obtained of the population of all the middle and junior high schools in the state of Michigan as listed in the 1979 Michigan Education Directory. Only public school districts were included.

After compiling a total list of all of the junior high schools in the state of Michigan, 25 of those were selected to be included in the study. Each superintendent and board president of that district received a questionnaire. The same procedure was used with the middle schools.

The total schools equalled 50, with the total respondents equalling 100. This figure included superintendents and board presidents from each of the 50 schools. These two separate lists of schools and their districts are shown in Appendix G.

Data Collection

All addresses of the superintendents in the sampling were obtained from the 1979 Michigan Education Directory. The addresses of board of education presidents were obtained from the Michigan School Board Association. The board presidents were selected for the study because they usually had a longer tenure on the board of education than did superintendents.

A cover letter (Appendix H), the finalized instrument, and a return-addressed stamped envelope were mailed to 50 school superintendents and to 50 board of education presidents. After a return of 57 questionnaires, a decision was made to send out a second mailing. A second cover letter (Appendix H) was mailed along with the same questionnaire to those superintendents and board of education presidents who had not previously responded.

A great deal of care and attention was given to the collection of the data as a system was developed to log in each questionnaire as it was returned. In addition, the questionnaires and envelopes of the original mailings had been color-coded for the purpose of recording the junior high and middle school respondents.

Eighty-five of the 100 questionnaires mailed were returned. Only one was unusable, as one of the school districts had replicated the questionnaire and two people from that superintendent's office had responded. Only the originally mailed response was used in this case.

Procedure of the Analysis

The 2 x 2 factorial design was used to test the interaction hypothesis. If the interaction was retained, it implied that the

hypothesis was also retained. If, for a given dependent variable, an interaction was not retained, the hypothesis was further examined as a post-hoc comparison of the interaction, between groups, within groups, and with alpha equal to .05 and over all F tests. Further, though the schools' main effect and the respondents' main effect were not the main concern in this study, the F tests associated with the two main effects were also reported in the ANOVA tables.

The 85 replies were organized in a notebook. The notebook was divided into four parts representing the source of the replies; that is:

Part I --- Board Presidents ---- Middle Schools
 Part II -- Superintendents ---- Middle Schools
 Part III - Board Presidents ---- Junior High Schools
 Part IV -- Superintendents ---- Junior High Schools

Returns were tallied for each point on each scale for each of the 37 questions. Examples follow:

Question 1:

Primary thrust is toward learning a body of information						Primary thrust is toward learning how to learn			
Scale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Total replies for each point:	3	7	15	19	27	5	6	1	1

Twenty-seven people marked point five on the scale for their reply; 19 people marked point four, and so on. The means and standard deviations were analyzed and subjected to the two-way ANOVA.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were derived to help test the general theory that there were no significant differences between the opinions of the superintendents and board of education presidents in middle school districts and those of superintendents and board of education presidents in junior high school districts in the nine areas that comprise the 37 characteristics of junior high schools and middle schools.

The hypotheses to be tested between the two groups were:

Hypothesis I: There is no significant difference in the opinions concerning curriculum between superintendents and board of education presidents in middle school districts and those in junior high school districts.

Hypothesis II: There is no significant difference in the opinions concerning co-curriculum between superintendents and board of education presidents in middle school districts and those in junior high school districts.

Hypothesis III: There is no significant difference in the opinions concerning staffing between superintendents and board of education presidents in middle school districts and those in junior high school districts.

Hypothesis IV: There is no significant difference in the opinions concerning guidance between superintendents and board of education presidents in middle school districts and those in junior high school districts.

Hypothesis V: There is no significant difference in the opinions concerning scheduling between superintendents and board of education presidents in middle school districts and those in junior high school districts.

Hypothesis VI: There is no significant difference in the opinions concerning methodology between superintendents and board of education presidents in middle school districts and those in junior high school districts.

Hypothesis VII: There is no significant difference in the opinions concerning media between superintendents and board of education presidents in middle school districts and those in junior high school districts.

Hypothesis VIII: There is no significant difference in the opinions concerning resources between superintendents and board of education presidents in middle school districts and those in junior high school districts.

Hypothesis IX: There is no significant difference in the opinions concerning evaluation between superintendents and board of education presidents in middle school districts and those in junior high school districts.

Design of the Statistical Analysis

There were two main factors in this design. The first one was type of school, with two levels, middle school and junior high school. The second factor was type of respondent, with two levels, presidents of boards of education and superintendents. The nine hypotheses stated in the objectives were the interaction between the respondents and the two types of schools on each of the nine scales. To analyze this general premise about the interaction, the two-way ANOVA was used to test the nine scales separately. The 2 x 2 factorial design of the analysis of variance was used to test the nine hypotheses. Each of the nine dependent variables involved in this study was analyzed by this 2 x 2 factorial design separately. These nine dependent variables were mentioned in each hypothesis.

Significance Level

The alpha level was set at $\alpha = .05$ for not retaining the null hypotheses.

Summary

The evolution of the measuring instrument, selection, validity, reliability, and format of the instrument, along with features of the sample, data collection, hypotheses, design of statistical analysis, and significance level were discussed in this chapter.

After validation by two groups of authorities, 100 copies of the instrument, Characteristics Which Constitute a Middle School Program and a Junior High Program, were mailed to a random sample of 25 middle school district superintendents, 25 middle school board of education presidents, 25 junior high district superintendents, and 25 junior high board of education presidents. All public schools were located in the state of Michigan. Eighty-five questionnaires were returned.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS

Introduction

Descriptive information about the means and standard deviations of the nine dependent variables in the four groups of respondents is discussed in Chapter IV. These four groups are:

1. Board of education presidents from middle school districts.
2. Board of education presidents from junior high school districts.
3. Superintendents from middle school districts.
4. Superintendents from junior high school districts.

The results of testing the nine hypotheses on each of the nine dependent variables are presented.

Descriptive Information

In Table 1, the means and standard deviations of the nine scales for superintendents and board of education presidents in middle school districts and superintendents and board of education presidents in junior high school districts are reflected, along with these respondents' opinions of the middle school characteristics.

Table 1.--Means and standard deviations of the perceptions of superintendents and presidents of middle schools and junior high schools on nine scales.

Scale #	Characteristics	Superintendents of Middle School Districts		Presidents of Middle School Districts		Superintendents of Jr. High Districts		Presidents of Jr. High Districts	
		\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD
1	Curriculum	5.05	.74	4.75	.81	4.83	.27	4.40	.99
2	Co-curriculum	4.31	.85	4.55	.87	4.63	.38	4.84	.87
3	Staffing	5.11	.84	4.75	.94	5.00	.69	4.29	1.07
4	Guidance	4.73	.80	4.47	.79	4.85	.84	4.90	.87
5	Scheduling	5.76	1.82	5.55	1.61	5.00	1.77	5.06	2.02
6	Methodology	5.08	.36	4.79	.58	4.70	.47	4.87	.68
7	Media	5.35	.83	5.30	1.13	5.56	1.08	5.03	.98
8	Resources	6.00	1.59	5.60	1.00	6.25	1.17	6.00	1.46
9	Evaluation	5.15	.94	4.59	.94	4.68	1.23	4.41	.97

Findings

Hypothesis I: There is no significant difference in the opinions concerning curriculum between superintendents and board of education presidents in middle school districts and those in junior high school districts.

Superintendents of middle school districts had a mean of 5.05, while the presidents of middle school districts had a mean of 4.75 (Table 1, Scale 1). The superintendents of junior high school districts had a mean of 4.83, while the presidents of junior high school districts showed a mean of 4.40. The opinions of superintendents in middle school districts concerning curriculum centered at the mean, while the other three groups' opinions reflected more toward the junior high ideal.

An r level was determined between the schools and respondees, and it was found not to be significant (.74) (Table 2). Therefore, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the opinions concerning curriculum between middle school superintendents and board presidents of middle school districts and those of the superintendents and board of education presidents of junior high school districts was retained.

Hypothesis II: There is no significant difference in the opinions concerning co-curriculum between the superintendents and board of education presidents of middle school districts and those of junior high school districts.

Superintendents of middle school districts had a mean of 4.31, while the presidents of middle school districts had a mean of 4.55 (Table 1, Scale 2). The superintendents of junior high school districts had a mean of 4.63, while the presidents of junior high school

districts showed a mean of 4.84. All four groups had opinions concerning co-curriculum more closely toward the junior high school ideal.

Table 2.--Interaction between superintendents and board presidents of middle school districts and superintendents and board presidents of junior high school districts on the characteristic, curriculum.

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sign. Level
Main effect: school	1.372	1	1.372	2.239	.139
Main effect: respondee	2.187	1	2.187	3.567	.063
School-respndee interaction	.068	1	.068	.110	.740
Residual	49.042	80	.613	--	--

An r level was determined between the schools and respondees, and it was found not to be significant (.96) (Table 3). Therefore, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the opinions concerning co-curriculum between superintendents of middle school districts and board presidents of middle school districts and those of the superintendents of junior high districts and board presidents of junior high school districts was retained.

Table 3.--Interaction between superintendents and board presidents of middle school districts and superintendents and board presidents of junior high school districts on the characteristic, co-curriculum.

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sign. Level
Main effect: school	1.417	1	1.471	2.074	.154
Main effect: respondee	1.006	1	1.006	1.472	.229
School-respndee interaction	.001	1	.001	.002	.965
Residual	54.653	80	.683	--	--

Hypothesis III: There is no significant difference in the opinions concerning staffing between superintendents and board of education presidents of middle school districts and those in junior high school districts.

Superintendents of middle school districts had a mean of 5.11, while the presidents of middle school districts had a mean of 4.75 (Table 1, Scale 3). The superintendents of junior high school districts had a mean of 5.00, while the presidents of junior high school districts showed a mean of 4.29. The opinions of superintendents of middle school districts and the superintendents of junior high school districts concerning the characteristic, staffing, were at the median point. The opinions of the other two groups were toward the junior high school ideal (4.75 and 4.29, respectively, for middle school and junior high school board presidents).

An r level was determined between the schools and respondees, and it was not found to be significant (.45) (Table 4). Therefore,

the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the opinions concerning staffing between middle school superintendents and board presidents of middle school districts and those of the superintendents and board presidents of junior high school districts was retained.

Table 4.--Interaction between superintendents and board presidents of middle school districts and superintendents and board presidents of junior high school districts on the characteristic, staffing.

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sign. Level
Main effect: school	1.479	1	1.479	1.822	.181
Main effect: respondee	3.921	1	3.921	4.832	.031
School-respndee interaction	.467	1	.467	.575	.450
Residual	64.919	80	.811	--	--

Hypothesis IV: There is no significant difference in the opinions concerning guidance between superintendents and board of education presidents of middle school districts and those of junior high school districts.

Superintendents of middle school districts had a mean of 4.73, while the presidents of junior high school districts had a mean of 4.47 (Table 1, Scale 4). The superintendents of junior high school districts had a mean of 4.85, while the presidents of junior high school districts showed a mean of 4.90. On the characteristic,

guidance, the opinions of all four groups were closer to the junior high ideal.

An r level was determined between the schools and respondees, and it was not found to be significant (.45) (Table 5). Therefore, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the opinions concerning guidance between superintendents of middle school districts and board presidents of middle school districts and those of the superintendents and board presidents of junior high school districts was retained.

Table 5.--Interaction between superintendents and board presidents of middle school districts and superintendents and board presidents of junior high school districts on the characteristic, guidance.

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sign. Level
Main effect: school	1.393	1	1.393	2.188	.143
Main effect: respondee	.526	1	.526	.826	.366
School-respondee interaction	.354	1	.354	.557	.458
Residual	50.937	80	.637	--	--

Hypothesis V: There is no significant difference in the opinions concerning scheduling between superintendents and board of education presidents of middle school districts and those of the junior high school districts.

Opinions of superintendents of middle school districts on the characteristic, scheduling, had a mean of 5.76, while the presidents

of middle school districts had a mean of 5.55 (Table 1, Scale 5). The superintendents of junior high districts had a mean of 5.00, while the presidents of boards of education of junior high districts showed a mean of 5.06. Opinions of superintendents and presidents of middle school districts on the characteristic, scheduling, were more toward the middle school ideal, while superintendents and board of education presidents of junior high districts had scores at the median.

An r level was determined between the schools and respondees, and it was found not be significant (.77) (Table 6). Therefore, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the opinions of the characteristic, scheduling, between superintendents of middle school districts and board presidents of middle school districts and those of the superintendents and board presidents of junior high school districts was retained.

Table 6.--Interaction between superintendents and board presidents of middle school districts and superintendents and board presidents of junior high school districts on the characteristic, scheduling.

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sign. Level
Main effect: school	5.600	1	5.600	1.714	.194
Main effect: respondee	.292	1	.292	.089	.766
School-respndee interaction	.263	1	.263	.080	.778
Residual	261.387	80	3.267	--	--

Hypothesis VI: There is no significant difference in the opinions concerning methodology between superintendents and board of education presidents of the middle school districts and those of junior high school districts.

Superintendents of middle school districts had a mean of 5.08, while the presidents of middle school districts had a mean of 4.79 (Table 1, Scale 6). The superintendents of junior high school districts had a mean of 4.70, while the presidents of junior high school districts showed a mean of 4.87. The opinions of middle school district superintendents on the characteristic, methodology, centered at the median. The opinions of the other three groups were toward the junior high ideal.

An r level was determined between the schools and respondees, and it was found not to be significant (.07) (Table 7). Therefore, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the opinions concerning methodology between middle school superintendents and board presidents of middle school districts and those of the superintendents and board presidents of junior high school districts was retained.

Hypothesis VII: There is no significant difference in the opinions concerning media between superintendents and board of education presidents of middle school districts and those of junior high school districts.

Superintendents of middle school districts had a mean of 5.35, while the presidents of middle school districts had a mean of 5.30 (Table 1, Scale 7). The superintendents of junior high school districts had a mean of 5.56, while the presidents of junior high districts showed a mean of 5.03. The opinions of superintendents of

Table 7.--Interaction between superintendents and board presidents of middle school districts and superintendents and board presidents of junior high school districts on the characteristic, methodology.

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sign. Level
Main effect: school	.206	1	.206	.834	.364
Main effect: respondee	.493	1	.493	1.997	.161
School-respndee interaction	.819	1	.819	3.320	.072
Residual	19.744	80	.247	--	--

middle school and junior districts and the presidents of junior high districts were scored near the median. Opinions of the junior high school district superintendents reflected a slight tendency toward the middle school ideal.

An r level was determined between the schools and respondees, and it was not found to be significant (.32) (Table 8). Therefore, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the opinions of the characteristic, media, between middle school superintendents and board presidents of middle school districts and those of the superintendents and board presidents of junior high school districts was retained.

Table 8.--Interaction between superintendents and board presidents of middle school districts and superintendents and board presidents of junior high school districts on the characteristic, media.

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sign. Level
Main effect: school	.061	1	.061	.066	.797
Main effect: respondee	.656	1	.656	.717	.400
School-respndee interaction	.882	1	.882	.964	.329
Residual	73.253	80	.916	--	--

Hypothesis VIII: There is no significant difference in the opinions concerning resources between superintendents and board of education presidents of middle school districts and those of junior high school districts.

Superintendents of middle school districts had a mean of 6.00, while the presidents of middle school districts had a mean of 5.60 (Table 1, Scale 8). The superintendents of junior high districts had a mean of 6.25, while the presidents of junior high districts showed a mean of 6.00. The opinions of all of the respondents concerning resources were closer to the middle school ideal than to the junior high school ideal.

An r level was determined between the schools and respondees, and it was not found to be significant (.84) (Table 9). Therefore, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the opinions of the characteristic, resources, between middle school superintendents and board presidents of middle school districts and

those of the superintendents and board presidents of junior high school districts was retained.

Table 9.--Interaction between superintendents and board presidents of middle school districts and superintendents and board presidents of junior high school districts on the characteristic, resources.

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sign. Level
Main effect: school	1.753	1	1.753	.745	.391
Main effect: respondee	2.381	1	3.281	1.012	.318
School-respndee interaction	.086	1	.086	.036	.849
Residual	188.300	80	2.354	--	--

Hypothesis IX: There is no significant difference in the opinions concerning evaluation between superintendents and board of education presidents of middle school districts and those of junior high school districts.

Superintendents of middle school districts had a mean of 5.15, while the presidents of middle school districts had a mean of 4.59 (Table 1, Scale 9). The superintendents of junior high school districts had a mean of 4.68, while the presidents of junior high districts showed a mean of 4.41. The opinions of middle school district superintendents concerning evaluation reflected more closely the middle school ideal than did the other three groups of respondents. The opinions of these groups were toward the junior high ideal.

An r level was determined between the schools and respondees, and it was not found to be significant (.55) (Table 10). Therefore, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between superintendents and board presidents of middle school districts as compared to superintendents and board presidents of junior high school districts regarding evaluation was retained.

Table 10.--Interaction between superintendents and board presidents of middle school districts and superintendents and board presidents of junior high school districts on the characteristic, evaluation.

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sign. Level
Main effect: school	1.447	1	1.447	1.521	.221
Main effect: resposdee	4.212	1	4.212	4.426	.039
School-resposdee interaction	.337	1	.337	.354	.553
Residual	76.130	80	.952	--	--

Summary

In summary, the opinions of superintendents of middle school districts had mean scores larger than the other three groups of respondents on the characteristics: curriculum, staffing, scheduling, methodology, and evaluation. Their opinions were toward the middle school ideal. The opinions of superintendents of junior high schools on the characteristics, curriculum, co-curriculum, guidance, methodology, and evaluation were toward the junior high school ideal.

The opinions of presidents of middle school districts had mean scores in curriculum, co-curriculum, staffing, guidance, methodology, and evaluation that were toward the junior high ideal. The opinions of board presidents in junior high districts had mean scores in curriculum, co-curriculum, staffing, guidance, methodology, and evaluation toward the junior high ideal.

Using the two-way ANOVA to analyze each of the nine characteristics, it was found that there was no significant difference in the opinions of superintendents and board of education presidents of middle school districts and those of superintendents and board of education presidents of junior high school districts on any of the nine characteristics, namely, curriculum, co-curriculum, staffing, guidance, scheduling, methodology, media, resources, and evaluation.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

Since 1910, the goals of the junior high school were very similar to those of today's middle school. But, in time, it became apparent that the junior high school had become a "junior" high school. The implementation of the original goals was no longer being realized.

The middle school emerged in the 1960s designed to meet the unique physical, emotional, intellectual, and social growth characteristics of these children, age 11-14. Middle schools steadily grew in numbers throughout the United States. An abundance of literature pertaining to this educational program for transescents became available. Teacher certification for educators of the "youth in the middle" evolved in some states.

Summary

The general purpose of this study was to determine the opinions of superintendents and board of education presidents in middle school districts and in junior high districts on nine characteristics that identify a middle school and a junior high school.

A 37-item survey was developed to elicit data necessary to answer the research questions. The items were designed to reflect

characteristics of a middle school and characteristics of a junior high school. This survey tool was mailed to authorities in the field of middle school education. After their suggestions for improvement were incorporated, a second instrument was mailed to a group of middle school practitioners. They critiqued the instrument, and suggestions were incorporated. The finalized questionnaire, Characteristics Which Constitute a Middle School Program and a Junior High Program, included 37 variables. Each respondent was asked to place an X on a nine-point Likert scale. Twenty-five superintendents from public school districts housing middle schools and 25 superintendents from public school districts housing junior high schools were randomly selected from all of the public junior high and middle schools in the state of Michigan. The board of education president from each of the 50 school districts received a questionnaire along with the superintendent. Eighty-five percent of the questionnaires were returned.

Mean scores were computed for each of the subjects for the characteristics, and the two-way ANOVA was used to analyze each of the nine characteristics.

Conclusions

Curriculum

The opinions of superintendents of middle school districts were neither toward the ideal middle school curriculum or the ideal junior high curriculum. The opinions of superintendents of junior high school districts, board of education presidents of middle school districts and junior high districts were toward the ideal junior high curriculum.

Co-Curriculum

The opinions of all four groups, superintendents of middle school districts and junior high districts and board of education presidents of middle school districts and junior high districts, were toward the ideal junior high co-curriculum characteristic.

Staffing

The opinions of superintendents of middle school and junior high districts were neither toward the ideal middle school staffing characteristic nor the ideal junior high staffing characteristic. The opinions of board of education presidents of middle school and junior high districts were toward the ideal junior high staffing characteristic.

Guidance

All four groups, superintendents of middle schools and junior high schools and board of education presidents of middle schools and junior high schools, had opinions more toward the ideal junior high guidance characteristic.

Scheduling

Opinions of superintendents and board of education presidents of middle school districts were more toward the ideal middle school schedule characteristic, whereas the opinions of superintendents and board of education presidents of junior high school districts were neither toward the ideal middle school schedule characteristic nor the ideal junior high school schedule characteristic.

Methodology

Opinions of superintendents of middle school districts were neither toward the ideal middle school methodology characteristic nor the ideal junior high school methodology characteristic. The other three groups, superintendents of junior high school districts and board of education presidents of middle school and junior high districts, were toward the ideal junior high school methodology characteristic.

Media

Opinions of superintendents of middle school and junior high school districts were neither toward the ideal junior high media characteristic nor the ideal middle school media characteristic. Opinions of the board of education presidents of middle school districts and junior high school districts were slightly toward the ideal middle school media characteristic.

Resources

Opinions of all of the respondents, superintendents and board of education presidents of middle school and junior high districts, were toward the ideal middle school resources characteristic.

Evaluation

Opinions of the superintendents of middle school districts were toward the ideal middle school evaluation characteristic, whereas superintendents of junior high school districts and board of education presidents of middle school and junior high school districts were toward the ideal junior high evaluation characteristic.

Each of the hypotheses was subjected to a significance test, and the conclusions were as follows:

1. There was no significant difference in the opinions concerning curriculum between superintendents and board of education presidents in middle school districts and those in junior high school districts.

2. There was no significant difference in the opinions concerning co-curriculum between superintendents and board of education presidents in middle school districts and those in junior high school districts.

3. There was no significant difference in the opinions concerning staffing between superintendents and board of education presidents in middle school districts and those in junior high school districts.

4. There was no significant difference in the opinions concerning guidance between superintendents and board of education presidents in middle school districts and those in junior high school districts.

5. There was no significant difference in the opinions concerning scheduling between superintendents and board of education presidents in middle school districts and those in junior high school districts.

6. There was no significant difference in the opinions concerning methodology between superintendents and board of education presidents in middle school districts and those in junior high school districts.

7. There was no significant difference in the opinions concerning media between superintendents and board of education presidents in middle school districts and those in junior high school districts.

8. There was no significant difference in the opinions concerning resources between superintendents and board of education presidents in middle school districts and those in junior high school districts.

9. There was no significant difference in the opinions concerning evaluation between superintendents and board of education presidents in middle school districts and those in junior high school districts.

Discussion of the Findings

In an overall examination of means of the nine characteristics for middle and junior high schools, almost all resources tended to congregate at the mean, which is 5.0. In other words, board of education presidents and superintendents of middle school districts and junior high districts did not have opinions that were clearly middle school or junior high school.

The researcher expected to find board of education presidents and superintendents of middle schools having opinions concerning a particular characteristic to lean toward the middle school, and the board of education presidents and superintendents of junior high school districts to be toward the junior high school. In all nine characteristics there was no clear-cut division, and any scores from the mean were only slight.

These data might indicate that superintendents and board of education presidents did not have a clear understanding of not only the characteristics of a middle school, but also the characteristics of a junior high school. Without a clearer understanding, how can these characteristics be implemented, whether a school district has a junior high school or plans to implement a middle school?

Even though these policy makers decide to implement a middle school, the question must be raised, "How do they know that the professional staff has achieved a middle school program--or that the program is a carbon copy of the typical junior high school?"

Of the nine characteristics, the data showed that superintendents of middle schools approached the ideal middle school characteristic in only three instances. On four characteristics they scored at the median point, whereas two characteristics were toward the ideal junior high characteristic.

The data were slightly different for the superintendents of junior high districts. Only five characteristics were toward the ideal junior high, three were at the median, and one was toward the ideal middle school.

The board of education presidents of middle school districts had only three characteristics toward the ideal middle school, and six were toward the ideal junior high. None was found at the median. At least, one could say that board of education presidents of middle school districts had some definite ideas despite their lack of understanding of what constituted a middle school.

The board of education presidents of junior high districts had six characteristics toward the ideal junior high, one at the median, and two toward the ideal middle school.

The data showed greater consistency between the superintendents and presidents of junior high districts, with a significant number of ideal junior high characteristics. This was not true of the superintendents and board of education presidents of middle school districts. They scored few characteristics toward the ideal middle school and a significant number toward the ideal junior high (especially the presidents).

Implications

According to the data, there seemed to be no clear understanding on the part of superintendents and board of education presidents as to the characteristics of a middle school and those of a junior high school. To remedy this situation, there should be in-depth discussions on how middle schools differ from junior high schools. Furthermore, presentations of the differences between a middle school program and a junior high school program, such as the filmstrip-cassette entitled "The Middle School--A Humanizing Effort,"¹ could be reviewed. Discussion following the showing would be most helpful in bringing out an understanding of the middle school.

Another implication of these data would call for superintendents and board of education presidents to plan field trips to

¹A. Kinsinger and L. Romano, "The Middle School--A Humanizing Effort" (Michigan State University: Michigan Association of Middle School Educators, 1978).

middle schools within the state. Care should be exercised that in observing a middle school, practices be identified that are consistent with a middle school philosophy. For example, a middle school that includes interscholastic sports should be pointed out to the visitors that this practice is part of the junior high program and is not consistent with the middle school philosophy.

Although this study was limited to superintendents and board of education presidents, it seems advisable that all members of the educational family be included in all in-service efforts devoted to knowing the significant differences between a middle school and a junior high school. This common understanding and effort would reinforce learnings for all participants. They would be able to critique each other in discussions.

Besides discussions, audio-visual presentations, and visitations, superintendents and board of education presidents should plan to attend meaningful conferences such as those planned yearly by the Michigan Association of Middle School Educators and the National Middle School Association.

Recommendations for Further Study

There is a need for a study to determine why some of the respondents marked some of the items as critically as they did. Respondents' opinions appeared to favor some junior high characteristics. It might be of interest to determine the reasons why superintendents and board of education presidents have opinions concerning particular characteristics.

Another study might focus on how superintendents' and board presidents' opinions affect programs of middle schools in their districts.

A parallel study with a sample comprised of respondents from different Michigan schools might be researched and their opinions compared to those reflected in this study, or the study could be reflected using a national sample.

Opinions of respondents from urban and those from rural districts might be compared in another study. Or a researcher could look at the size of the district to determine if size deters the implementation of a middle school program.

Pairing of respondents' opinions could be of interest to see if teams of people who work together, i.e., superintendents and board presidents, agree in their opinions on middle school characteristics. The question to be explored would be, "Do superintendents and board of education presidents in the same school districts have the same understanding as to middle school districts?"

Still another study might be a replication using teachers and principals as the respondents to assess their opinions regarding characteristics of a middle school.

Reflections

In this study it became clear to the researcher that there is much confusion among our educational policy makers as to what a middle school or a junior high school is. The data left the researcher to lose some of her idealism concerning these educational leaders.

Another startling finding was the middle-of-the-road stance indicated by so many educational leaders and a seeming reluctance to take a strong stand for one set of characteristics or the other. This concern was reinforced as the data revealed that so many of the responses fell near the median. The researcher anticipated strong opinions toward either the ideal junior high school characteristics or toward the ideal middle school characteristics. This anticipation was not realized in this study.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

EIGHTEEN MIDDLE SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

APPENDIX A

EIGHTEEN MIDDLE SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS¹

1. Continuous Progress
2. Multi-material Approach
3. Flexible Schedules
4. Social Experiences
5. Physical Experiences and Intramural Activities
6. Team Teaching
7. Planned Gradualism
8. Exploratory
9. Enrichment Studies
10. Guidance Services
11. Independent Study
12. Basic Skill Repair and Extension
13. Creative Experiences
14. Security Factor
15. Evaluation
16. Community Relations
17. Student Services
18. Auxiliary Staffing

¹Riegle, "A Study of Middle School Programs."

APPENDIX B

LIST OF EXPERTS

APPENDIX B

LIST OF EXPERTS

1. Dr. Nicholas Georgiady, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio
2. Dr. Louis Romano, Michigan State University, East Lansing,
Michigan
3. Dr. Joe Raymer, Superintendent of Schools, Rockford, Michigan
4. Dr. Alexander Kloster, Northern Michigan University, Marquette,
Michigan
5. Dr. Conrad F. Toepfer, State University of New York, Albany,
New York
6. Dr. James Heald, Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, Illinois
7. Dr. Jacqueline Caul, Michigan State University, East Lansing,
Michigan
8. Dr. Glen Gerard, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Forest
Hills, Grand Rapids, Michigan

APPENDIX C

COVER LETTER TO FIRST EIGHT AUTHORITIES

APPENDIX C

COVER LETTER TO FIRST EIGHT AUTHORITIES

August 22, 1978

Dr. Nicholas P. Georgiady
110 West Bullrun
Oxford, Ohio 45056

Dear Nick,

Lou Romano says, "Hello." He suggested that I ask if you would take a look at the enclosed comparison and critique it. I am working on a Ph.D. in the Middle School with Lou.

My thesis is that superintendents and boards of education know what a middle school is.

The format of comparisons of a junior high school to a middle school has been used. For the questionnaire, the concepts are scrambled. My plan is to ask superintendents and board of education members to check the items which they feel constitute a middle school.

The questionnaire has been left in the comparison form for ease of critiquing. Do the items truly designate middle school practice?

Enclosed is a return-addressed, stamped envelope for convenience in reply. Thank you for your help, Nick. I remember meeting you two summers ago, when you addressed Lou's middle school seminar at the M.S.U. campus.

Sincerely,

Jean Marlowe

JM

Enclosures: 2

August 17, 1978

Mrs. Jean Marlow
7764 Walnut Avenue
Jenison, Michigan 49428

Dear Jean:

Thank you for your recent letter. I am delighted that you are seriously pursuing a doctorate and especially with my very good friend, Lou Romano.

The topic you have selected for your dissertation is highly worthy of investigation. I am not sure that you will find the evidence you seek that confirms your belief regarding boards of education being able to identify middle school characteristics correctly. I will be very curious about your findings.

I have examined the listing of characteristics and offer these reactions and suggestions for your consideration.

First, I would question, as others might, whether the term Junior High School is accurate enough for your purposes. Some junior high schools have rather good programs with many of the characteristics of the middle school concept. I believe that what you are looking for is the traditional or conservative (outmoded) junior high school, at the far end of your continuum, far from the middle school, that is.

As to specific items, I would suggest the following may deserve some further attention:

4. Read "interschool." Should this be intraschool, that is within the middle school building?
7. "Many teachers by a class." This sounds like a high school. You really mean several teachers, or a team of teachers, don't you? The middle school concept advocates more than the one teacher per class in the elementary school but not the numerous teachers each student meets in the departmentalized high school --something in-between for the middle school student.
8. "Rigid 45-minute schedule." Insert the word "period" after "minute."
11. "Class use of instructor only." The real meaning is unclear to me--you ought to restate this.
21. I would suggest--"Retention in grade or failure" in place of just "retention."

Page 2
Mrs. Jean Marlow
August 17, 1978

- 24. Would you consider including "psychomotor" along with affective as these two are closely related?
- 28 & 34. These two sound very similar. Is this intentional?
- 36. Do you mean students are fully independent or that they are responsible for their own behavior?

I hope my quick reactions are of some help to you. Let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Best wishes,

N. P. Georgiady
Professor

NPG/pab

APPENDIX D

CHECKLIST DESIGN OF THE INSTRUMENT

APPENDIX D

CHECKLIST DESIGN OF THE INSTRUMENT

Matching items on a continuum from Junior High to Middle School

<u>Junior High School Program</u>	<u>Middle School Program</u>
1. Learning a body of information	Learning how to learn
2. Curriculum development for the high school student	Curriculum developed to specifically meet the needs, interests, and problems of pre- and early adolescents
3. Departmentalized	Team teaching
4. Interscholastic sports	Intramural sports
5. Marching bands	Band for intraschool performances only
6. Physical education geared to the exceptional	Physical education geared to all students
7. One teacher for a class	Team of teachers for a class
8. Rigid 45-minute period schedule	Flexible schedule
9. Single-textbook approach	Multi-textbook approach
10. Minimal media approach	Maximum media approach
11. Total class use of instructor only	Variable class size instruction
12. Teacher-directed instruction	Pupil-teacher planned instruction
13. Adherence to the teacher-made lesson plan	Student self-directed under expert guidance
14. Homogeneous grouping	Heterogeneous grouping
15. Minimum community resource use	Maximum community resource use

16. Teacher responsible for learning	Student responsible for learning
17. Use of formal ABC grading	Use of diagnostic evaluation tools plus parent-teacher conferences
18. Dances and other night activities	Rich variety of co-curricular activities during the day and after school
19. Meeting class needs	Meeting individual needs
20. Guidance designed to get student ready for high school	Guidance designed to meet the here-and-now needs of the student
21. Retention in grade or failure	Continuous progress for each student
22. Curriculum design for getting ready for high school	Curriculum design to meet specific needs and interests of the pre-adolescent
23. Textbook approach with all students on the same page at the same time	A self-pacing approach with students learning at different rates
24. Greatest concentration on cognitive skills	Concentration on both cognitive, affective, and psychomotor areas
25. Limited creative experiences	Extensive opportunities for creative experiences
26. Library materials for the specific grade levels	Library materials encompass reading levels for grades three to adult level
27. Teachers are responsible for the students' learning	Students are responsible for their own learning
28. Students' achievement compared with other students	Students' achievement compared with own goals
29. Memorization	Learning how to learn
30. Standard classroom	Variable group size
31. Honor rolls	Recognition for all students
32. Teaching is predominantly lecture	Teaching includes much discussion and small-group work

33. Competes with other students in class	Competes with his own goals
34. Subject-centered program	Child-centered program
35. Mastery of concepts and skills	Creative expression
36. Teacher control	Student independence

APPENDIX E

CHARACTERISTICS WHICH CONSTITUTE A MIDDLE SCHOOL PROGRAM AND A JUNIOR HIGH PROGRAM

APPENDIX E

CHARACTERISTICS WHICH CONSTITUTE A MIDDLE SCHOOL PROGRAM AND A JUNIOR HIGH PROGRAM

Each of the following items from the literature identifies a middle school program or a junior high school program. This list indicates the present "ideal type" junior high and the original "ideal type" middle school.

Please place an M for middle school on the lines below to indicate at which point you believe that item pertains to the middle school.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Primary thrust is toward learning a body of information | Primary thrust is toward learning how to learn (study skills) |
| _____ | _____ |
| 2. Curriculum developed for the high school student | Curriculum developed to specifically meet the needs, interests, and problems of pre- and early adolescents |
| _____ | _____ |
| 3. Team teaching | Departmentalized |
| _____ | _____ |
| 4. Bands for intraschool performances only | Marching bands |
| _____ | _____ |
| 5. Interscholastic sports | Intramural sports |
| _____ | _____ |
| 6. Physical education for all students | Physical education for the exceptional student |
| _____ | _____ |

7. One teacher for a class	Team of teachers for some classes
8. Rigid block period	Flexible schedule
9. Textbook approach	Multi-materials approach
10. Maximum media approach	Minimal media approach
11. Instructor used for small group or individuals	Instructor used for total class group
12. Pupil-teacher planned instruction	Teacher-directed instruction
13. Student self-directed under faculty guidance	Adherence to the teacher-made lesson plan
14. Heterogeneous grouping	Homogeneous grouping
15. Minimum emphasis upon community resource use	Maximum emphasis upon community resource use

16. Teacher responsible for learning	Student and teacher responsible for learning
17. Dominance of formal ABC grading	Use of diagnostic evaluation tools plus parent-teacher conferences. Varied evaluation tools
18. Rich variety of co-curricular activities during the day and after school	Dances and other night activities
19. Meeting individual needs	Meeting class needs
20. Guidance designed to get student ready for high school	Guidance designed to meet the social, emotional, and intellectual needs of the student
21. Retention in grade or failure	Continuous progress for student
22. Curriculum designed for getting ready for high school	Curriculum designed to meet specific needs and interests of the pre-adolescent
23. Textbook organization with all students on the same page at the same time	A self-pacing approach with students learning at different rates

24. Concentration on cognitive, psychomotor, and affective areas	Greatest concentration on cognitive skills
25. Extensive opportunities for creative experiences	Limited creative experiences
26. Library materials for the specific grade levels	Library materials encompass reading levels for grades three to adult level
27. Teachers are responsible for the students' learning	Students are responsible for their own learning
28. Students' achievement compared with other students	Students' achievement compared with own goals
29. Learning how to learn	Memorization
30. Teaching is predominantly lecture	Teaching includes much discussion and small-group work
31. Variable group size	Standard classroom
32. Recognition for all students	Honor rolls

33. Child-centered program

Subject-centered program

34. Competes with his own goals

Competes with other students and/or rigid scales in class

35. Creative expression

Mastery of cognitive concepts and skills

36. Teacher control

Students are responsible for their own behavior

37. Use secondary-trained teachers

Use elementary-trained teachers

APPENDIX F

SECOND LIST OF AUTHORITIES AND LETTERS

APPENDIX F

SECOND LIST OF AUTHORITIES AND LETTERS

1. Dr. Gerald Burgeois, Maine
2. Dr. Tom Maglaras, Colorado
3. Dr. Ken McEwin, North Carolina
4. Howard McIntyre, Maryland
5. Thomas E. Moeller, Missouri
6. Sheri Russell, Ohio
7. Frank Whittlesey, Texas

January 2, 1979

Lou Romano says, "Hello." He suggested that I ask you if you would take a look at the enclosed Factors Which Constitute a Middle School instrument and critique it. Currently, I am writing my doctoral dissertation on the topic and am working under Lou's direction.

My thesis is that superintendents and Board of Education members know what a middle school is.

I have used a Likert Scale with 5 points with the middle school being at either end of the scale. I have mixed them up in no set pattern. My plan is to ask superintendents and Board of Education members to place an M on the line at the point where they believe the middle school concepts to be.

Do these items truly designate the middle school? Will the marking of the M on the scale truly indicate the understanding and perceptions of the superintendents and Board of Education members for the middle school philosophy? Are there problems inherent in the scoring of this instrument?

Your help in critiquing this instrument would be sincerely appreciated. Enclosed in a return-addressed, stamped envelope for convenience in replying. Thank you for your reply.

Sincerely yours,

Jean M. Marlowe

JM: 2 enclosures

January 15, 1979

Ms. Jean M. Marlowe
Jenison Public Schools
8375 20th Avenue
Jenison, Michigan 49428

Dear Ms. Marlowe:

I have received your instrument "Factors Which Constitute a Middle School" with your request that I critique it. By the way, would you convey my greeting to Lou Romano and tell him I am anxious to see him in February at our board meeting. I have the following comments to make regarding your instrument:

1. The middle school descriptors which you use are fine. However, the middle and junior high descriptors dichotomize the two rather severely. It is like establishing two groups--"the white hats" and "the black hats." You have a priori determined the items which designate the "ideal" middle school and stated the contrast between the middle school and junior high in such a way that you may not precisely measure board member and superintendent perceptions. In other words, the construction of your instruments may predict the results. See for examples item two, four, five, nine, ten, and others. I do have some concerns with your list describing the "ideal" junior high school. What literature presents this? I would suggest that the ideal middle school and the ideal junior high, as defined in the literature, would be more convergent in philosophy than divergent.
2. I would suggest more precise instructions and directions on how to use the instrument. In other words, how are people to rate each item? For example, you need to define the scale of one to five on the form, and provide a description of what a specific response means or at least a definition of what each incremental movement in the Likert scale in either direction would indicate.
3. I would suggest that you include some instructions or directions on the types of comments you are soliciting or how respondents should use the comment section of the instrument.
4. What information will you have when you compile all of your returns; how will you score each return and the total returns; and how will you use the result on each specific question?
5. I have incorporated comments throughout your instrument so please look through there to find those. I hope they are self-explanatory.

Jean Marlowe
January 15, 1979, Page 2

Good luck in your challenging assignment. You have an excellent advisor in Lou. I would be interested in seeing the results of your study when you complete it.

Sincerely,

Tom Maglaras, Ed.D.
Director of Middle Schools

eol/129

APPENDIX G

SCHOOL DISTRICTS SENT QUESTIONNAIRES

APPENDIX G
SCHOOL DISTRICTS SENT QUESTIONNAIRES

1979 MED POPULATION

232 Junior High Schools--designated by Letter J
Random Sample--25 Schools

- | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Albion | 18. Redford |
| 2. Allegan | 19. Saginaw BV |
| 3. Bessemer | 20. Shelby |
| 4. Brooklyn | 21. Standish |
| 5. Capac | 22. Vicksburg |
| 6. Caro | 23. Waterford |
| 7. Croswell | 24. Watervliet |
| 8. Dearborn Heights NDH | 25. Ypsilanti POWRCS |
| 9. Detour Village | |
| 10. East Jordan | |
| 11. Grant | |
| 12. Grosse Ile | |
| 13. Kingsford | |
| 14. Manistee | |
| 15. Manistique | |
| 16. Northport | |
| 17. Pinconning | |

1979 MED POPULATION

163 Middle Schools--designated by Letter M
Random Sample--25 Schools

- | | |
|----------------------|----------------|
| 1. Adrian | 18. Morenci |
| 2. Bronson | 19. Oak Park |
| 3. Burton (A) | 20. Quincy |
| 4. Chelsea | 21. Roscommon |
| 5. Clare | 22. Southfield |
| 6. Goodrich | 23. Springport |
| 7. G. R. Northview | 24. Sturgis |
| 8. Gwinn | 25. Ypsilanti |
| 9. Hart | |
| 10. Hartford | |
| 11. Houghton Lake | |
| 12. Hudson | |
| 13. Jackson (Monroe) | |
| 14. Kalkaska | |
| 15. Lawton | |
| 16. Madison Heights | |
| 17. Mancelona | |

APPENDIX H

COVER LETTER TO SUPERINTENDENTS AND PRESIDENTS

APPENDIX H

COVER LETTER TO SUPERINTENDENTS AND PRESIDENTS

January 22, 1979

Dear Sir,

Let me introduce myself. I have been working as a teacher and a principal for 12 years in the Grand Rapids and Jenison Public Schools and have been involved to a large degree with the middle school concept. Currently, I am writing my doctoral dissertation on the middle schools under the direction of Dr. Louis Romano, Michigan State University.

The purpose of this study is to obtain the perceptions of selected superintendents and Board of Education Presidents as to what factors constitute middle schools. This list was derived from a comprehensive study of the literature in the field.

Would you please take five minutes to study and mark the enclosed Likert Scale with an X on the line for each item measured? The X need not be at either extreme and can be placed at any point on the scale. An example might be:

Open School Closed School

_____ X _____

(Area for Comment)

Available computer time is limited to me, so there is a need to get the questionnaire back as quickly as possible. If you could get this into the mail yet today, I would sincerely appreciate it.

To facilitate this, the enclosed stamped, addressed envelope is ready for your anticipated and awaited reply.

Thank you for your continued concern for children.

Sincerely yours

Jean Marlowe, Principal
Maplewood School

JM: 2 enclosures

February 12, 1979

Just in case you have mislaid the instrument (Factors Which Constitute a Middle School) mailed in January, I am enclosing another copy for your convenience in responding.

You are part of a personally selected group, and your perceptions in this area of education are of high importance to me and other educators.

I am very eager to hear from you and have included a stamped, addressed envelope for ease of reply.

Thank you for your help in this research on the education of children in the junior high and middle school programs of Michigan.

Please indicate on the instrument if you desire a copy of the results of this study.

Sincerely yours,

Jean M. Marlowe, Principal
Maplewood School
Jenison Public Schools

JM: 2 enclosures

APPENDIX I

CHARACTERISTICS WHICH CONSTITUTE A MIDDLE SCHOOL

APPENDIX I

CHARACTERISTICS WHICH CONSTITUTE A MIDDLE SCHOOL

Junior High and Middle School Superintendents' Perceptions of the
Thirty-Seven Survey Variables:

JUNIOR HIGH CHARACTERISTICS	MIDDLE SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS
<p><u>I. CURRICULUM AREAS:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Primary thrust is toward learning a body of information. 2. Curriculum developed for the high school student. 22. Curriculum designed for getting ready for high school. 24. Greatest concentration on cognitive skills. 25. Limited creative experience. 35. Mastery of cognitive concepts and skills. <p><u>II. CO-CURRICULUM AREAS:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Marching bands. 5. Interscholastic sports. 6. Physical education for the exceptional student. 18. Dances and other night activities. <p><u>III. STAFFING AREAS:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Departmentalized. 7. One teacher for a class. 37. Use secondary-trained teachers. 	<p><u>I. CURRICULUM AREAS:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Primary thrust is toward learning how to learn. 2. Curriculum developed to specifically meet the needs, interests and problems of pre- and early adolescents. 22. Curriculum designed to meet specific needs and interests of the pre-adolescent. 24. Concentration on cognitive, psychomotor, and affective areas. 25. Extensive opportunities for creative experiences. 35. Creative expression. <p><u>II. CO-CURRICULUM AREAS:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Bands for intraschool performances only. 5. Intramural sports. 6. Physical education for all students. 18. Rich variety of co-curricular activities during the day and after school. <p><u>III. STAFFING AREAS:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Team teaching. 7. Team of teachers for some classes. 37. Use elementary-trained teachers.

JUNIOR HIGH CHARACTERISTICSIV. GUIDANCE AREAS:

- 12. Teacher-directed instruction.
- 13. Adherence to the teacher-made lesson plan.
- 19. Meeting class needs.
- 20. Guidance designed to get student ready for high school.
- 29. Memorization.

V. SCHEDULING AREA:

- 8. Rigid block period.

VI. METHODOLOGY:

- 9. Textbook approach.
- 11. Instructor used for total class.
- 14. Heterogeneous grouping.
- 16. Teacher responsible for learning.
- 23. Textbook organization with all students on the same page at the same time.
- 27. Teachers are responsible for the students' learning.
- 30. Teaching is predominantly lecture.
- 31. Standard classroom.
- 33. Subject-centered program.
- 36. Teacher control.

VII. MEDIA AREA:

- 10. Minimal media approach.
- 26. Library materials for specific grade.

VIII. RESOURCES:

- 15. Minimum emphasis on community resources.

MIDDLE SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICSIV. GUIDANCE AREAS:

- 12. Pupil-teacher planned instruction.
- 13. Student self-directed under faculty guidance.
- 19. Meeting individual needs.
- 20. Guidance designed to meet the social, emotional and intellectual needs of students.
- 29. Learning how to learn.

V. SCHEDULING AREA:

- 8. Flexible schedule.

VI. METHODOLOGY:

- 9. Multi-materials approach.
- 11. Instructor used for small group or individuals.
- 14. Homogeneous grouping.
- 16. Student and teacher responsible for learning.
- 23. A self-pacing approach with students learning at different rates.
- 27. Students are responsible for their own learning.
- 30. Teaching includes much discussion and small-group work.
- 31. Variable group size.
- 33. Child-centered program.
- 36. Students are responsible for their own behavior.

VII. MEDIA AREA:

- 10. Maximum media approach.
- 26. Library materials for grades three to adult.

VIII. RESOURCES:

- 15. Maximum emphasis upon community resources.

<u>JUNIOR HIGH CHARACTERISTICS</u>	<u>MIDDLE SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS</u>
<u>IX. EVALUATION:</u>	<u>IX. EVALUATION:</u>
17. Dominance of formal ABC grading.	17. Use of diagnostic evaluation tools plus parent-teacher conference.
21. Retention in grade or failure.	21. Continuous progress for each student.
28. Students' achievements compared.	28. Achievement compared with own goals.
32. Honor rolls.	32. Recognition for all students.
34. Competes with other students and/or rigid scales in class.	34. Competes with own goals.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Alexander, William M.; Williams, Emmett L.; Compton, Mary; Hines, Vynce A.; and Prescott, Dan. The Emergent Middle School. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968.
- Curtis, Thomas E., and Bidwell, Wilma W. Curriculum and Instruction for Emerging Adolescents. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1977.
- DeVita, Joseph C.; Pumerantz, Philip; and Wilklow, Leghton B. The Effective Middle School. New York: Parker Publishing Company, Inc., 1970.
- Eichhorn, D. H. The Middle School. New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1966.
- George, Paul S., ed. The Middle School--A Look Ahead. Florida University: NMSA, 1977.
- Good, Carter V., ed. Dictionary of Education. 3rd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.
- Grooms, M. Ann. Perspectives on the Middle School. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1967.
- Hertling, James E., and Getz, Howard G. Education for the Middle School Years: Readings. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1971.
- Howard, Alvin W., and Stoumbis, George C. The Junior High and Middle School: Issues and Practices. London: Intext Educational Publishers, 1970.
- Moss, Theodore C. Middle School. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1969.
- Popper, Samuel H. The American Middle School: An Organizational Analysis. Waltham, Mass.: Blaisdell Publishing Company, 1967.
- Pumerantz, Philip, and Galano, Ralph W. Establishing Interdisciplinary Programs in the Middle School. West Nyack, N.Y.: Parker Publishing Company, Inc., 1972.

Romano, Louis G.; Georgiady, Nicholas P.; and Heald, James E. The Middle School: Selected Readings on an Emerging School Program. Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1973.

Stradley, William E., and Aspinall, Richard D. Discipline in the Junior High/Middle School: A Handbook for Teachers. New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1975.

Periodicals

Alexander, William M. "The Middle School: In Retrospect and Prospect." Texas Tech. Journal of Education 3 (1976): 157.

Billings, Ron L. "Musts for a Middle School." Clearing House, April 1976, p. 377.

Dettre, John R. "The Middle School, A Separate and Equal Entity." The Clearing House, September 1973, p. 20.

Disque, Jerry. "In-Between: The Adolescents' Struggle for Independence." Phi Delta Kappan, 1973, pp. 8-9.

Eichhorn, Donald H. "Youth Cultures: What Can We Learn?" Educational Leadership, April 1978, pp. 499-502.

Epstein, Herman T., and Toepfer, Conrad F., Jr. "A Neuroscience Basis for Reorganizing Middle Grades Education." Educational Leadership, May 1978, pp. 656-60.

Fenwick, James J. "Insights Into the Middle School Years." Educational Leadership 34 (April 1977): 528-35.

Garner, Arthur E. "Is Your Middle School Ready?" NASSP Bulletin 60 (November 1976): 98-102.

Groden, Austin F. "Junior High vs. Middle School vs. Adolescents." NASSP Bulletin 60 (January 1976): 109-12.

Huber, Joseph D. "Reincarnation of the One Room Schoolhouse, The American Middle School." The Clearing House 49 (November 1975): 104.

McCarthy, Robert J. "Student and Staff Advocates in the Middle School." NASSP Bulletin 60 (March 1976): 90-94.

McGlasson, Maurice. "The Middle School: Whence? What? Whither?" Phi Delta Kappan, 1973, p. 12.

Mead, Margaret. "Are We Squeezing Out Adolescents?" The Education Digest 26 (November 1960): 12.

- "Middle Schools Spread Fast--and Stir Controversy." U.S. News and World Report, February 2, 1976, pp. 41-42.
- Mitchell, Ronald. "How to Start a Middle School." The National Elementary Principal 99 (June 1979): 46-48.
- Rathban, Dorothy. "How to Cope in the Middle School Jungle." Learning, November 1977, pp. 40+.
- Romano, Louis, guest ed. Michigan Journal of Secondary Education (Ann Arbor: Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals, Summer 1971).
- Sinks, Thomas A.; Bough, Max; McLute, John; Malinka, Robert; and Terman, Dorothy J. T. "The Middle School Trend: Another Look at the Upper Midwest." The Clearing House 49 (October 1975): 56-104.
- Slate, Virginia S. "A Program to Train the Middle School Principal." NASSP Bulletin 59 (November 1975): 75-81.
- Toepfer, C. F., Jr. "Challenge to Middle School Education: Preventing Regression to the Mean." Middle School Journal 7 (September 1976): 3+.
- Woodring, Paul, and Casse, James. "The New Intermediate School." Saturday Review, October 1965, pp. 77-78.

Essays and Articles in Collections

- Alexander, William M. "Alternative Futures for the Middle School." In The Middle School--A Look Ahead. Edited by Paul S. George. Florida University: NMSA, 1977.
- Bondi, Joseph. "Addressing the Issues: The Middle School, A Positive Change in American Education." In The Middle School--A Look Ahead. Edited by Paul S. George. Florida University: NMSA, 1977.
- Conover, H. Richard. "The Junior High School Principalship." In Schools for the Middle Years: Readings. Edited by Alvin W. Howard and George C. Stoumbis. Scranton, Pa.: International Textbook Company, 1979.
- Curtis, Thomas E. "Administrators View the Middle School." In Schools for the Middle Years: Readings. Edited by Alvin W. Howard and George C. Stoumbis. Scranton, Pa.: International Textbook Company, 1979.

Fox, James H., Jr. "Middle School: Surviving, Refining and Growing in the Future." In The Middle School--A Look Ahead. Edited by Paul S. George. Florida University: NMSA, 1977.

Malinka, Robert. "The Middle School: Trends and Trouble Spots." In The Middle School--A Look Ahead. Edited by Paul S. George. Florida University: NMSA, 1977.

"Middle School in the Making: Readings." In Educational Leadership. Edited by Robert Leeper. ASCD, 1974.

Romano, Louis. "The Middle School--An Emerging Cesspool." Indiana Middle School Association Yearbook, 1978.

Publications of Professional Organizations

Egnatuck, Tony; Georgiady, Nicholas; and Romano, Louis G. "The Middle School: A Position Paper." East Lansing: Michigan Association of Middle School Educators, 1975.

Eichhorn, Donald H. "Middle School in the Making." Position Statement of the Michigan Junior High-Middle School Task Force. East Lansing: Michigan Association of Middle School Educators, 1974.

Johnson, Sharon K.; Number, Kay; Pasternak, Dennis; and Schwenter, Robert. "Michigan Middle School Survey." East Lansing: Michigan Association of Middle School Educators, 1975.

Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals and Michigan Department of Education. "The Education of Youth in the Middle Years." A Joint Position Paper. Lansing: Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals and Michigan Department of Education, January 1976.

Michigan Education Directory and Buyer's Guide. Lansing: Michigan Education Directory, 1979.

Miscellaneous

Blom, Frank S., Gerard, Glen K., and Kinsinger, Addie. "A Middle School Belief System." Okemos, Mich.: Kinawa Middle School, January 1974.

Eichhorn, Donald H. "Rationale for Emergence--A Look at the Middle School." Paper presented at the Conference on the Middle School--Rationale and Development, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, December 11, 1967.

- Gatewood, Thomas E., and Dilg, Charles A. "The Middle School We Need." Report from the ASCD Working Group on the Emerging Adolescent Learner. 1975.
- Hawkins, James. "A Study to Ascertain Actual Middle School Practices as Compared to Reported Middle School Practices in Selected Michigan Schools and Nationally Prominent Schools as Perceived by Principals." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1972.
- Kinsinger, Addie, and Romano, Louis G. "The Middle School--A Humanizing Effort." Michigan State University: Michigan Association of Middle School Educators, 1979. (Filmstrip.)
- Riegle, Jack D. "A Study of Middle School Programs to Determine the Current Level of Implementation of 18 Basic Middle School Principles." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1971.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293103700922