



RETURNING MATERIALS:

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

~~11/7/11~~ 11/7/11

~~1/1/12~~ 1/1/12

OCT 20 1997

4615247

DC

Sept 27 1993 (146)

Jul 25 1995

A STUDY OF THE EGALITARIAN IDEAL AS IT EXISTS IN
THE VALUES PATTERNS OF VARIOUS GROUPS OF EDUCATORS

By

Barbara Wenger Markle

A DISSERTATION

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration and Curriculum

1984

© Copyright by
BARBARA WENGER MARKLE
1984

ABSTRACT

A STUDY OF THE EGALITARIAN IDEAL AS IT EXISTS IN THE VALUES PATTERNS OF VARIOUS GROUPS OF EDUCATORS

By

Barbara Wenger Markle

The purpose of this research was to determine the value and belief patterns of secondary school teachers, counselors, and administrators in terms of the egalitarian ideal to provide an equally effective education for every student. It was believed that some educators, particularly teachers, would prefer a more meritocratic system of education. Secondary school programs and policies were examined in both egalitarian and meritocratic terms in relation to the goals of secondary schools, special education, discipline, curriculum, and student evaluation.

A total of 94 secondary school educators from a single large suburban school district participated in the study. Q-methodology was used to determine if differences existed in the value and belief patterns of these educators. Each respondent completed a 58-item Q-sort and prioritized belief statements on a continuum ranging from very strongly agree to very strongly disagree.

Two Q-analyses resulted in the identification of five types of value and belief patterns. The first Q-analysis of the responses of the Teachers group consisting of 57 teachers of academic and nonacademic

subjects indicated three types: meritocratic-oriented teachers (the strongest type), combination meritocratic/egalitarian-oriented teachers, and egalitarian-oriented teachers. The second Q-analysis of the responses of the Specialists group, which included 12 special education teachers, 12 counselors, and 13 building administrators, indicated two types: egalitarian-oriented (the stronger type) and meritocratic-oriented.

Teaching position was the only significant personal characteristic from which values and beliefs could be predicted. Teachers of academic subjects tended to be meritocratic, whereas teachers of non-academic subjects tended to be egalitarian.

The results of the study indicated educators held values and beliefs regarding education that were inconsistent both within and between the groups. The two strongest types held conflicting views. Meritocratic-oriented teachers valued predetermined standards and acknowledged that not all students can succeed in school. Egalitarian-oriented specialists valued the goal of schooling to develop each student socially, emotionally, and intellectually and believed that the school should find ways to meet the needs of all students.

This dissertation is dedicated to my parents, L. Edwin and Mary Louise Wenger, who taught me, among many things, the value of education, and to my husband, Jim, whose love, patience, and support made this study possible.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I appreciate the assistance provided by many people throughout the course of this study. I am indebted to the chairman of my committee, Dr. Philip A. Cusick, for his many hours of help and direction in the development of this research as well as for his patience and encouragement. My thanks are extended to Dr. Frederick Ignatovich for his time, insightful comments, and statistical expertise. I appreciate the thoughtful suggestions of the other members of my committee, Dr. Lawrence Lezotte and Dr. Sigmund Nosow.

A very special thank-you goes to the teachers, counselors, and administrators who took the time to participate in this study. I also appreciate the clerical assistance provided by Gina Krings and Lori Lamoreaux. Finally, I wish to thank my friend and colleague, Verne Lamoreaux, for his advice and support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vii
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Conceptual Framework	1
Summary	12
The Egalitarian Conflict	13
Purpose	22
Significance of the Study	23
Exploratory Questions	24
Methodology	25
Development of the Q-Sort Instrument	26
Administration of the Q-Sort	27
Coding	27
Treatment of the Data (Computerized)	28
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	32
Introduction	32
Egalitarianism	34
Equal Opportunity	35
The Brown Decision	37
The Coleman Report	41
Egalitarianism and Secondary Schools	43
The Comprehensive High School	45
Summary	59
Meritocracy	60
Summary	64
Conceptual Framework	65
Values	67
Summary	70
III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES	79
Methodology Employed	80
Selection of Participants	80
The Participants	82
Administrators	82
Counselors	83

	Page
Teachers	83
Special Education Teachers	84
Concept Identification	85
Concept Reduction	88
Selection of the Q-Sort Items	91
Pilot Test	93
Type I and Type II	98
Use of the Pilot Test	98
Summary	99
Administration of the Q-Sort	99
Treatment of the Data	101
Validity	102
Reliability	103
Summary	103
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	106
Introduction	106
Clarification of Types	112
Selected Characteristics of Participants	112
Item Typal Belief Patterns	115
Structure of the Data	116
First Analysis: Teachers Group	116
Type 1 (Meritocratic-Oriented Teacher) Belief Patterns	117
Type 2 (Combination Meritocratic/Egalitarian- Oriented Teacher) Belief Patterns	122
Type 3 (Egalitarian-Oriented Teacher) Belief Patterns	129
Second Analysis (Specialists Group)	141
Type 4 (Egalitarian-Oriented Special Education Teachers, Counselors, Administrators [Special- ists]) Belief Patterns	141
Type 5 (Meritocratic-Oriented Special Education Teachers, Counselors, Administrators [Special- ists]) Belief Patterns	149
Descending Array of Difference Between Types	157
Summary	172
Consensus Items	174
Relationship Between Selected Personal Characteris- tics of Participants and Their Value and Belief Patterns	183
Summary	185

	Page
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	187
Purpose of the Study	187
Procedure	188
Participants	190
Summary of Findings	191
Belief Patterns	191
Conclusions	192
The Meritocratic-Oriented Teachers	194
The Combination Meritocratic/Egalitarian- Oriented Teachers	197
The Egalitarian-Oriented Teachers	198
Teacher Group	201
Specialists Q-Analysis	202
Recommendations	210
Implications	213
APPENDICES	217
A. INFORMATION FORM	218
B. LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS	220
C. INTERVIEW QUESTIONS	222
D. DIRECTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE Q-SORT	224
E. VALUE AND BELIEF STATEMENTS	228
BIBLIOGRAPHY	234

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Participant Composition--First Q-Analysis	109
2. Participant Composition--Second Q-Analysis	110
3. Participant Composition by Type	112
4. Age Analysis in Years	113
5. Sex of Participants	114
6. Secondary Level	114
7. Years of Experience	115
8. Item Descriptions and Descending Array of Z-Scores for Meritocratic-Oriented Teachers (Significant Items Above +1.0)	119
9. Item Descriptions and Descending Array of Z-Scores for Meritocratic-Oriented Teachers (Significant Items Below -1.0)	123
10. Item Descriptions and Descending Array of Z-Scores for Combination Meritocratic/Egalitarian-Oriented Teachers (Significant Items Above +1.0)	126
11. Item Descriptions and Descending Array of Z-Scores for Combination Meritocratic/Egalitarian-Oriented Teachers (Significant Items Below -1.0)	130
12. Item Descriptions and Descending Array of Z-Scores for Egalitarian-Oriented Teachers (Significant Items Above +1.0)	134
13. Item Descriptions and Descending Array of Z-Scores for Egalitarian-Oriented Teachers (Significant Items Below -1.0)	138
14. Item Descriptions and Descending Array of Z-Scores for Egalitarian-Oriented Specialists (Significant Items Above +1.0)	142

	Page
15. Item Descriptions and Descending Array of Z-Scores for Egalitarian-Oriented Specialists (Significant Items Below -1.0)	146
16. Item Descriptions and Descending Array of Z-Scores for Meritocratic-Oriented Specialists (Significant Items Above +1.0)	150
17. Item Descriptions and Descending Array of Z-Scores for Meritocratic-Oriented Specialists (Significant Items Below -1.0)	154
18. Comparisons Between Types 1 and 2 (Significant Differences Above a Z-Score Value of +1.0)	158
19. Comparisons Between Types 1 and 2 (Significant Differences Below a Z-Score Value of -1.0)	161
20. Comparisons Between Types 1 and 3 (Significant Differences Above a Z-Score Value of +1.0)	163
21. Comparisons Between Types 1 and 3 (Significant Differences Below a Z-Score Value of -1.0)	166
22. Comparisons Between Types 2 and 3 (Significant Differences Above a Z-Score Value of +1.0)	167
23. Comparisons Between Types 2 and 3 (Significant Differences Below a Z-Score Value of -1.0)	169
24. Comparisons Between Types 4 and 5 (Significant Differences Above a Z-Score Value of +1.0)	171
25. Significant Differences Between Types 4 and 5 (Significant Differences Below a Z-Score of -1.0) . . .	173
26. Consensus Items: Teachers Group	175
27. Consensus Items: Specialists Group	178
28. Statistical Significance of Selected Personal Char- acteristics of Teachers Group	184
29. Statistical Significance of Selected Personal Char- acteristics of Specialist Group	184

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Conceptual Framework

The concept that education exists as a basic human right has been consistently reaffirmed in recent history. The 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights issued by the United Nations stated in Article 26, section 1, 21, stated that "Everyone has the right to education. . . . Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms."

Long before 1948, however, the framers of the American Constitution recognized the importance of an educated electorate. To protect their rights and liberties, Jefferson wrote that men must "arm themselves with the power that knowledge gives."¹ Lapati defined education not only as a human right, but as a fundamental human right, since without an education, man, as Jefferson warned, would lack the ability to understand or exercise his rights.² Thus, it was not surprising that education would become the primary vehicle for the protection of these freedoms. Furthermore, since the basic belief of this new democracy was that all men are equal in the possession of certain legal, civil, and political rights, it followed that they also had the right to an education in order to participate in the democracy and protect these freedoms. The revolutionary

ideals of the new society also held that man was not born into a social class, and unlike his European forefathers, could rise above it. Obtaining an education was considered a way to achieve social mobility.

Although the effect of education in providing greater equality has been questioned by some, the general and documented belief is that education does make a difference. Some find it significant in terms of establishing "life's chances." Gardner discussed the "principle of multiple chances" in which through an individual's educational process, he is given many successive opportunities to discover himself. Unlike the European model of education which separates children at an early age according to ability, the American system allows the "late bloomer" opportunities to complete his education to almost any level he is capable.³

In addition to the obvious rewards to the individual in developing his intellectual, physical, social, and occupational expertise, Lapati described the societal value that education has which is synergistic. That is, all members of an educated population benefit from the "fall-out" effect that results from the individuals who comprise it. In other words, increasing an individual's general ability level not only benefits the individual, but also has a positive effect as educated individuals interact with one another. The interaction of an educated population can result in better decision making, increased productivity, and ultimately a higher quality of life. In addition to the previously mentioned need for an educated populace in a democratic society, such a population offers a broader cultural base

that leads to greater social and economic affluence as well as a more sensitive appreciation of individuals and groups in the society. The opposite is also true. Denial of education to the individual can become a detriment to the society as a whole.⁴

In his analysis of Horace Mann's theories, Cremin (1957) pointed out that Mann was seeking a common value system through the establishment of common schools, which would undergird American republicanism and offset the destructive possibilities of religious, political, and class discord. This common value system would be brought about by mixing children of all "creeds, classes and backgrounds," rich and poor alike. Through the kindred-childhood spirit, Americans could achieve almost any social goal through education. Mann called universal education (among other things) the "great equalizer" of human conditions.

This theme of the schools as the "equalizer of conditions"⁵ has been the recurring theme in American education. However, not all agree that education is, as Mann described it, an "equalizer" nor, as Gardner indicated, a purveyor of "multiple chances." Critics of American education such as Katz, Bowles, Gintis, and others have said that the real but unstated purpose of education is to maintain class distinctions through the educational structure. They have described such educational practices as tracking students in different ability levels of class which appear to reflect their socioeconomic status, and having students select general, vocational, and college-preparatory curriculums which segregate them from students with differing goals. Guiding students to select particular colleges, i.e.,

community, state supported, private, and Ivy League, is still another way in which, as these critics argue, the educational system appears to offer equality of opportunity, but actually stifles it by "grouping" similar classes of people. In an even stronger tone, these educational historians have claimed that the schools are an instrument of coercive assimilation,⁶ designed to maintain racial and class structure and to meet the needs of the capitalistic system. Despite these claims, however, there has been significant governmental intervention which has sought to promote the goals of education for all school-age children.

The governmental intervention with the goal of actualizing the egalitarian ideal in American education has come in the form of Supreme Court decisions, public acts, public mandates, and reflections of specific political thinking. Although the review of literature in Chapter II describes these actions and events in greater detail, it is important to describe the forces supporting the egalitarianism in American education. The turning point in the commitment to equal opportunity in education (beyond the compulsory education movement) was the 1954 Supreme Court decision in *Brown v. The School Board of Topeka, Kansas*.⁷ It overturned the "separate but equal" facilities doctrine of the 1898 decision of *Plessy v. Ferguson*. The court held that racial segregation in schools was unconstitutional and, moreover, even if the financial inputs to segregated schools were equal, the results of segregated schooling were not. Equal educational opportunity meant more than access to education; it was now concerned with the outcome of the educational experience.

The goals of education, or more specifically the goals of the public schools, are often a reflection of current American thought and governmental action. The results of the Brown decision, along with the emerging civil rights movement of the early sixties, began the intensive focus on equality of human rights in American society. The anti-poverty policies of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, with their goals of the "Great Society," sought to effect through the schools the central policy theme of equality. Congress acted to provide direct support to the schools in order to meet the needs of deprived youngsters. The Elementary and Secondary Educational Act (ESEA) of 1965 was designed to meet "the special educational needs of children of low-income families. . . ." In 1978 Congress voted overwhelmingly a five-year, \$50 billion re-endorsement. Halperin (1979) described this action as the federal government's commitment to equity and quality in elementary and secondary education.⁸

The Emergency School Act of 1972 was passed by Congress to provide additional assistance for minority children in desegregated schools. Title VII of ESEA, passed in 1968, provided federal support money for bilingual education. In order to provide appropriate instruction for non-English-speaking students, the schools teach the student in his dominant language while simultaneously teaching a second language, usually English.

In addition to legislation to provide educational access and support for minority children, Congress enacted the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, which protects handicapped people from discrimination. Section 504 of the Act guarantees the right of handicapped

individuals to jobs and services in schools, colleges, and other social agencies.

In Public Law 94-142 these guarantees under Section 504 were spelled out. Schools are required to make every effort to locate handicapped children, evaluate them, and then develop an individualized educational plan to meet their educational needs. In addition, such identified children must be placed in the "least restrictive environment," which usually includes regular education classes, a placement known as "mainstreaming," and have their total educational plan reviewed at least annually. Parents have the right to appeal all decisions made by educators and must be assured that each placement follows due process procedures.

Other legislative mandates sought greater sex equity in American education. Title IX, passed in 1972 as part of the Educational Amendments, prohibited sex discrimination in all federally funded educational programs. In 1974, the Women's Educational Equity Act authorized federal grants for research, development, and other educational activities to increase awareness of sexual bias in education and to promote greater educational equity for females. Greater equality in training programs for nontraditional occupations for women was promoted under Title II of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1976.

In terms of academic-achievement equity, the federal government's interest in competency testing is, as Berry explained, "to be concerned with the education of all children, as well as to give special attention to children who have difficulty learning or who have

not been given equal opportunity in the past." The role at the national level, she said, is to "seek new ways to raise the intellectual level of every child."⁹

This commitment to "every child" is recognized in other areas as well. The method of financing schools has sought to equalize or reduce inequalities in funding education. State equalization aid formulas have attempted to insure that each child has an adequate and fair amount spent on his education. The federal government then supplements, through entitlements as described previously, those programs designed to promote equality and that need greater support than state or local resources can provide.

In addition to the commitment to provide equality in learning opportunities, the Supreme Court has provided due process procedures to assure students equality under discipline procedures. In *Goss v. Lopez*,¹⁰ the Court affirmed that students indeed have a property right in their education and therefore must receive due process in the protection of it as mandated in the Fourteenth Amendment. Students, therefore, had a "right" to an education, and according to *Goss v. Lopez*, this right cannot be denied even for a few days, without at least an informal hearing and an explanation of the charges against the student. One purpose of this ruling is to ensure that school discipline is administered equitably and without discrimination.

Other federal programs such as the School Lunch Act and Head Start Programs reflect the federal government's commitment to equalize other factors that may affect a student's education. As

the role of the federal government is examined, it is apparent that the area of emphasis is to provide education on equal terms and for students who need greater assistance to supplement their participation in the educational process, and to provide additional support as well.

In addition to federal acts, mandates, and court decisions, another significant influence in refining the concept of equality of opportunity was Coleman's 1966 study on the subject. Sponsored by the Office of Education, Coleman was directed to examine the effects of equality of educational opportunity as a follow-up to the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision of 1954. The original purpose of the voluminous study was to measure resources between black and white schools on the assumption that greater equality of resources would mean greater equality of opportunity for education. What Coleman used as his criterion, however, was achievement, or results. In doing so, he found that despite relatively few differences in measurable criteria between black and white schools (inputs), there remained a sizable difference in achievement (results), which increased with the number of years of schooling. Although the resulting emotion-laden questions of compulsory integration and school busing appeared to be the significant outcomes of the study, Bell (1977) and others pointed out that it was really the redefinition of equality of opportunity that was the most important aspect of the report. In essence, as Bell explained, "Coleman redefined equality of opportunity from equal access to equally well-endowed schools (inputs) to equal performance on standardized achievement tests (equality of outcome)."¹¹

Coleman (1968) described the change in the concept of equality of educational opportunity as an evolutionary step. Originally, the school and community held a passive role, and the responsibility to take advantage of available resources was that of the child and his family. In the evolutionary process, however, the roles were reversed. (The Special Education Law, PL 94-142, probably most clearly illustrates the change.) The implication of the most recent concept, as Coleman described it, "is that the responsibility to create achievement lies with the educational institution, not with the child." It is therefore the "intensity of the school's influences relative to the external divergent influences." That is, the equality of result is not so much determined by the equality of resource inputs as it is by the power of the school in bringing about achievement.¹²

However, in accepting the charge to provide equality of opportunity, the schools have a vastly different responsibility to accomplish educational goals in what Coleman described as the shift in focus from "equal schools to equal students." Providing "equal schools" is a matter of equalizing inputs. Lighting requirements, classroom square-footage requirements, class size, textbooks, curriculum, financing, teacher credentials--the list could go on in terms of policies and regulations designed to make schools as much alike as possible. Producing the resulting "equal students," however, is a different matter. Unlike light bulbs and square-footage measurements, students come not only in a variety of shapes and sizes, but with a vast variety of aptitudes, abilities, achievements,

talents, languages, social classes, cultural backgrounds, family structures, physical handicaps, personal goals, and individual motivations.

However, the egalitarian goal of American education is that this heterogeneous group of students should be able to gain greater opportunity at what Gardner called "life's chances" through Coleman's description of the "intensity of the school's influence" and the responsibility of the school to create achievement."

Coupled with the charge that schools take students, as Mann described, from all "creeds, classes and backgrounds" and then retain and provide an appropriate educational program for each of them, is the added responsibility to create equal achievement. Placed in the context of mass education, schools are called upon to meet the egalitarian goal--that is, to take, retain, and meet the individual needs of all students (as directed by law and federal mandates) and at the same time to consider the group needs of 30 to 35 students in a classroom, students in the entire school, or even the group needs of the students in a school district. In addition, the resources of the school, its administrators, and teachers are finite and therefore have a realistic limit as to what they can accomplish.

It is interesting to note, however, that not all educational systems have developed with the goal of meeting the egalitarian ideal. Other countries, such as Japan, seek to develop the intellectual potential of their young people, but do so in an entirely different way. If the American value of egalitarianism can be

defined as being placed on one end of a continuum, the Japanese value of a meritocratic system of education could be placed at the other.

Unlike the American egalitarian goal of providing equal results as a way of pursuing equal opportunity, the Japanese seek to "weed out" through a series of challenging examinations those students who fail to meet the increasingly rigorous standards as they progress through their education. In Japan, formal education and the successful completion of entrance examinations to high school and college play a key role in determining one's function and status in life. All Japanese children attend free compulsory schooling through junior high school. However, it is common for parents to enroll their children in the best private nursery schools in order to give them a head start in the meritocratic process that is to come. Following graduation from junior high school, students compete through entrance examinations for admission to distinguished high schools which will best prepare them for the difficult examinations that will determine their subsequent acceptance into a university. Students from the prestigious universities are then those recruited, again through examinations, to jobs in big business or government. Although there is little overt competition while in school, the entire secondary and public university system is centered on achievement. There is little or no chance for the "late bloomer." Rejection or acceptance by a prestigious university (usually based on the high school one attended) is seen as determining one's whole life. The student's academic as well as family life centers on the quest for academic excellence, in fact depends on

it, in determining his function and status in Japan's modern meritocracy.

Summary

The emphasis in meritocratic systems is on the excellent student and the student's successful progress through the educational system. The theme of American education, in contrast, has reflected the egalitarian ideal or a commitment to education for all students. It is a theme that has reflected the basic American tenet of equality. Jefferson viewed education as a safeguard of the new democracy. Mann described it as the great equalizer, and the United Nations Declaration stated that education was a basic human right. The Supreme Court in 1954 decided, however, that equal education meant more than equal access to an education. Students had more than a property right to an equal education; they had a right to an equally effective education. The 1966 Coleman study went a step further and used as its definition for the study the equality of education as equal results from the educational experience. Legislative mandates and social policy promoted greater equality in schools as well as programs designed to help students "catch up" in order to equalize their educational achievement. Programs created to meet the needs of the poor, the handicapped, the bilingual, females, and racially integrated students had as their goals greater equality of opportunity, as well as an emphasis on equality of result.

The Egalitarian Conflict

The purpose of the conceptual framework is to trace the evolution of the schools' responsibility to "take, retain and interest everyone" and thus hopefully to provide each student with an equal chance or opportunity in life. This is a significant charge to the public schools since, as described previously, it reflects one of the individual's most basic rights in American society.

As the designated "equalizer" of opportunity, the public schools as an institution have had to assume egalitarianism as a value in educating each student. In describing institutions as possessing values, Rokeach (1979) said that:

values are as much sociological and psychological concepts; it is just as meaningful to speak of cultural, societal, institutional, organizational, and group values as it is to speak of individual values. If individual values are socially shared cognitive representations of personal needs and the means for satisfying them, then institutional values are socially shared cognitive representations of institutional representations of institutional goals and demands.¹³

Rokeach went on to say that the consensus among sociologists is that the most distinctive property or defining characteristic of a social institution is its values. Williams defined an institution as "a set of institutional norms that cohere around a relatively distinct and socially important complex of values."¹⁴ This distinctiveness is described as "value specialization" as a result of the differentiations of functions among social institutions.

There is little question that, throughout the history of American education, the function of the public schools has been to educate the young. Social change and increasing emphasis on human

rights and equal opportunity have made the schools the place where everyone has a right to be educated: a right so basic that it has been defined as a property right that cannot be denied without due process. The public schools, as an institution, can be described as specializing in educating all young people virtually without exception.

The question becomes, then, whether the egalitarian value of educating all students, a value assigned to the public schools, reflects the personal values of those whom Lewin called the institutional gatekeepers--administrators and teachers.¹⁵ It is likely that many educators put a higher priority on a more meritocratic system of education rather than on an egalitarian system. The thesis is that tension and conflict exist in education as a result of the incongruence between teachers' personal commitments to the value of egalitarianism and, as a social institution, the public schools' value of egalitarianism. This conflict appears to reflect differences in beliefs between the administrators who represent, through policies and dictates, the values of the institution and the teacher who must implement these policies and dictates each day in the classroom. More specifically, these differences can be reflected in the areas of the teachers' and administrators' personal values and beliefs regarding student achievement, special education, curriculum organization, student discipline, and goals of public education.

The conflict between the teacher's values and the school's egalitarian values appears to be manifesting itself in three ways. First, it is manifested as an internal value conflict within the

teacher, resulting from her inability or reluctance to identify with the goals and values of the institution. Second, it is manifested as inherent contradictions within the school's goals to educate all students, which can result in problems in the teaching process. Third, it is manifested as a conflict between the imperatives of the organization, as defined by egalitarian administrators, and the expectations for student achievement and behavior, as identified by the teacher.

The egalitarian goal of public education to meet the needs of a diverse, heterogeneous group of students can result in what Cedoline (1982) defined as role conflict for the individual teacher. The teacher recognizes the discrepancy between the necessity of dealing with total classes and the ideal of individual instruction. In order to assure equality of results, an equal opportunity of life's chances, the teacher knows he must fit the program to the child and not the child to the program. Equal time should be spent to develop each student's particular talents and abilities. Realistically, however, teachers with classes of 30 students cannot provide "equal" education to fully meet the individual needs of each child.¹⁶ Thus, the teacher is caught in the conflict between the ideal and the actual. While teachers know that they should be doing something more for certain children, they are not always able to do so. Nor do students always want something done for them. Cusick (1983) noted that at some high schools, a few students carry .000 grade point averages. Although enrolled in school, these students do not attend classes or take an interest in anything in the school.¹⁷

Thus, the teacher committed to the egalitarian ideal to take, retain, and interest students in something, finds that she must first get them to class. Getting the students to class may not mean that once there the students are eager to learn. Tension may also result from the conflict between the teacher's goal and students' goal for the class. Not only must the teacher try to meet individual needs in order to equalize education results, he must do so with those students who, for whatever reason, may or may not want to learn. For the teacher who does not fully value the egalitarian ideal, this internal conflict is even greater. Although the teacher may believe that it is the schools' responsibility to "take, retain, and interest" all students, the teacher is surrounded by these students who do not value education each day. If the teacher does not come into contact with these students in the classroom, he does so in study halls, lunchrooms, hallways, and at school events. Tension and conflict can result as the teacher is forced to deal with a greater variety of students each year.

Another or second source of conflict and frustration is the teaching process. The Education for All Handicapped Children Act, PL 94-142, referred to previously, is probably one of the best examples of this frustration or tension. Corrigan (1979) indicated that the Act implies that American schools now be based on the principle of "no rejects," on the conviction that every human being has the right to an education and the right to be treated as a person.¹⁸ The Act itself states that "to the maximum extent appropriate, handicapped children, including children in public or private institutions

or other care facilities, are to be educated with children who are not handicapped." The law goes on to say that these students should be educated in the schools they would attend if not handicapped.

The perception of the "regular" education teacher's attitudes and experiences with mainstreaming is currently being researched. There is little doubt, however, that the emphasis in PL 94-142 is on the individual needs of the handicapped child and his or her right to be mainstreamed in a regular classroom. The following examples are from actual school situations that reflect specific adjustments that regular education teachers (in this case, junior high school teachers in a suburban, middle-class area) must make in the instruction, discipline, and evaluation procedures when dealing with special education students. For example, the teacher who majored in math and is teaching a ninth-grade algebra class now finds that he can no longer give the explanation to the problem while writing on the blackboard. Instead the teacher must turn to face the class and keep attention focused on the deaf student who is learning math by reading the teacher's lips. Moreover, the deaf student has an Individual Education Plan (IEP) that has been signed by the principal, parents, and teacher at a formal meeting, indicating that the student will successfully complete the algebra course.

In another classroom, a student who "cannot successfully maintain interpersonal relationships" and is labeled "emotionally impaired" is bothering and bickering with those around him. When the teacher attempts to intervene, she is met with a hostile response

from the student. It does little good to refer the student to the office, since handicapped students cannot be suspended for incidents that are a direct result of their impairment. Other methods must be used to deal with this particular child's misbehavior.

In a seventh-grade science class, the teacher attempts to teach a unit on basic electricity to his class, which includes three students who have learning disabilities and cannot read. Despite supportive help from the special education teacher during another part of the day, these students require repeated individual attention from the science teacher in order to interpret directions, understand the material, and complete tests and quizzes. As in the other cases, these students, too, have IEPs, indicating they will be able to successfully complete the class.

Grading these students can be compared to playing golf. Just as less-experienced or less-able golfers are given a "handicap" score, so are special education students given an "equalizer" in terms of their Individual Education Plans. In fact, if the deaf student appears to be trying to learn algebra, but is not successful, failure is not the student's but rather attributed to the "inaccurate goals of the IEP." In other words, handicapped students who are trying to the best of their ability cannot fail. For when it appears that the student cannot succeed under the goals as they are written, new goals are devised until the student can achieve them. The result is that normative standards in the fullest sense of the meaning no longer exist in classrooms when special education students are mainstreamed. In keeping with the law, teachers now have to grade

"normal" students under the teacher's classroom standard and special education students on their individually formulated standards. The overall result is the absence of a single standard and the responsibility of the teacher to assure that there are no failures or "rejects."

The egalitarian concept to take, retain, interest, and provide an effective education goes beyond the single classroom and individual teacher. The curricula of most urban and suburban high schools reflect, through their varied offerings, the hope that each student would be interested in something. This appeal to each student is what Cusick (1983) in his study of three high schools abstracted into the egalitarian ideal. He said:

For the overall structure, the most important element was the hope of providing some sort of instruction for everyone, even those who were not interested in acquiring positive abstract knowledge. This hope which I abstracted into the egalitarian ideal, which, as I saw it, legitimized the schools' role in society, and solved both the internal and external constraints.¹⁹

In its goal to provide something for everyone, a variety of courses to meet a variety of individual student needs, Cusick found that there were few commonly held standards as to what really was "good for kids." The imperatives of the organization, he said, were to "maintain order" and "take and provide some instruction for everyone." The question becomes, however, whether or not teachers can really agree with the directive to take every student and provide appropriate instruction for each student. Although most teachers appear to agree with the need for "order" in the classroom,

the ideal of taking and providing for everyone seems to raise some questions.

It is possible that teachers are caught between the school's egalitarian goal to provide for everyone and their own value for more definitive standards. Such standards would make it easier to separate those who wish to learn from those who do not. Yet, under the imperative to provide for everyone, those who do not wish to learn are included in these educational goals and thus in the teacher's classroom.

Each day, the teacher attempts to teach the assortment of students in her classroom under the dictates of providing an equally effective education for everyone. Yet, in reaction to this "no rejects" principle and the demand for equality of results, comes the demand for a more meritocratic system of education reflected in the call for higher standards and emphasis on excellence. A National Commission on Excellence in Education is currently proposing the "need for tougher academic standards, the elimination of social promotion, minimum competency testing of students and more emphasis on basic courses." Public opinion as reflected in the Gallup Poll (1982) is demanding higher standards in education.²⁰

In the area of the third conflict, there appears to be limited evidence that this institutional commitment to egalitarianism is also causing tensions between administrators and teachers. In describing the tensions resulting from teachers attempting to meet the educational needs of a diverse, heterogeneous group of students, Cedoline (1982) indicated that a conflict exists between teachers

taking responsibility for reaching certain levels of (student) achievement and their lack of authority and control over classroom activities and conditions.²¹ Teachers, in other words, become the implementers of a social-political philosophy to educate all students that is interpreted to them through directives from administrators who, in turn, represent the elected board of education and governmental educational mandates. This conflict can be viewed as the reluctance of the teacher to cope with and take responsibility for this heterogeneous population of students found in the public school classroom and the administrators' responsibility to assign the students to the classroom and assure the public that they will be educated.

For the teacher who places a high value on meritocracy, or absolute standards, the placement of "problem" students in the classroom with the directive that they be taught can result in a strained and conflict-ridden relationship with the principal. The conflict can manifest itself in such areas as discipline when, for example, the principal is bound to use the sometimes lengthy procedures of due process in reprimanding a student and the teacher interprets this as a lack of support for her.

Conflict between administrator and teacher can also result, for example, when the principal feels that the teacher's standards are too high and unrealistic for a particular group of students. Especially if the class is a required one, the principal may question the teacher's right to fail many students. The teacher, on the other hand, feels that her high standards should not be questioned since

her goal is to get the best effort from her students. The principal may feel he is protecting the rights of all students who must take the class, while the teacher protects her right to high standards and students who work hard to achieve them.

The teacher then appears to be caught in a three-way conflict under the egalitarian system. First, the teacher's own values may reflect his or her preference for a more meritocratic, standardized system. Second, despite the teacher's previous experience and training, the teacher must modify the instruction and evaluation in order to cope with a wider variety of students in the classroom. Third, the teacher must deal daily with the purpose of public education as reflected in its stated goals, administrative dictates, and curriculum organization in attempting to take, retain, and interest everyone.

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to demonstrate the values of belief patterns of various groups of educators and their commitment to the egalitarian ideal to provide each child with an equally effective education. The thesis is that particular groups of educators, notably teachers, may prefer a more meritocratic system of education and that the inconsistency between the values of the teachers and those of the educational institution may be a source of tension. In other words, tensions may exist between the schools' commitment to the egalitarian ideal and the individual teacher's commitment to the ideal. Also, tensions may result between

egalitarian-oriented administrators (who represent the directives and values of the organization) and teachers whose values may differ from those of the organization.

Significance of the Study

The concept that everyone is entitled to equal educational opportunity has been redefined throughout American history. At first, education was seen as a way to support the fledgling democracy by providing men the ability to read the ballot and make wise decisions to ensure self-governance. As judicial decisions and constitutional amendments expanded man's right to an education, the concept of equal educational opportunity changed from equal access to an education to equal results from that education. Moreover, almost every individual of school age becomes eligible for this commitment of equal results.

In addition, this evolution of American human rights focused on the schools as the way to promote greater equality in American society. Forces in the schools such as expanded curriculum offerings, increased special education, and due process protection intensified the schools' commitment to take, retain, and interest each student in some aspect or subject that the school could offer. However, those who define equal educational opportunity as equal results and make the commitment that schools have something to offer everyone are perhaps holding different values from those whose job it is to deliver the educational product.

It is worthy of study to determine if teachers agree with the egalitarian goals of the educational structure and its commitment

to equality of results. It may be that what appears to be a strong and most ostensible value is actually causing tensions within teachers' own value systems, within their teaching methods, as well as their relationships with the educational organization.

Exploratory Questions

The purpose of this study is to determine the value and belief patterns of various groups of educators and their commitment to the egalitarian ideal to provide each student with an equally effective education. The following exploratory questions guided this study:

1. Are teachers' value and belief patterns regarding their commitment to the egalitarian ideal consistent with the schools' commitment to provide an equally effective education for each student?
2. How do various groups of secondary educators, i.e., teachers of academic subjects, teachers of nonacademic subjects, special education teachers, counselors, and administrators, compare in their commitment to the egalitarian ideal?
3. Does conflict exist between the value and belief patterns of administrators who represent the goals of the organization and thus the goal to provide an equally effective education for all students and the value and belief patterns of teachers who must actualize the goal in the classroom?

Methodology

The Q-methodology appears to be an appropriate statistical procedure for use in this research project. The purpose of this study is to determine value and belief patterns of particular groups of educators in terms of their commitment to the egalitarian ideal and the secondary schools' commitment to provide every child with an equally effective education. The thesis is that tensions may exist between the schools' commitment to the egalitarian ideal and the individual teacher's commitment to it, that these tensions may exist due to particular teaching problems that arise from the schools' commitment to provide effective education, and that tensions may result between administrators and teachers whose values may differ from those of the organization. To test this thesis, one must examine and compare the belief patterns of various groups of educators, specifically teachers and administrators.

The Q-methodology requires the participant to sort a deck of cards containing items. In this study, belief statements reflecting egalitarian or meritocratic values of education in the areas of special education, discipline, curriculum, student achievement, and the goals of public education formed the Q-sort. Each participant sorted the cards into a given distribution (structured Q-sort or assigned number of cards in each pile) on a continuum ranging from "most agree" to "least agree." The results of the statistical analysis of these responses provided a parsimonious explanation of whether tensions arise as a result of the secondary schools' commitment to

the egalitarian ideal and the differing values of those who must actualize that commitment.

The Q-method has unique features that make it suitable to determine the belief patterns of particular "groups" or "types" of educators. First, the concepts this research tested can be built into the Q-sort through the structuring of the items. Second, the participants of the Q-sort do not have to be randomly selected and thus a specific group provides a purposeful sample. The researcher can test the conceptualization of people representing each population (i.e., teachers, administrators, particular groups of teachers) and determine if these groups differ in their belief patterns. Third, given particular job descriptions and responsibilities, the researcher can test out whether assumptions regarding belief patterns of each group are indeed accurate and consistent within the group. Fourth, through factor analysis and weighting the responses of each group, the researcher can ascertain the relative importance each "group" or "type" places on the items. Fifth, the Q-sort is an interesting and entertaining method of testing individuals.

Development of the Q-Sort Instrument

The items used in the Q-sort should come from the people being studied (Talbot, 1971). This aspect of the research was accomplished through a series of focused interviews with emphasis on the areas of discipline, student achievement, curriculum, special education, and the goals of public education. The items derived from these interviews formed a series of statements that reflected, in essence, an egalitarian or meritocratic point of view for each of

the five areas. Following the completion of the items, a pilot test was conducted with groups representative of the groups to be tested. The purpose of the pilot test was to determine if the correct number of items was being used, if the meaning of the items was clearly conveyed, and if any items were repetitive. A Q-factor analysis was then administered to determine if particular groups of educators' responses clustered together, reflecting similar belief patterns.

Administration of the Q-Sort

The participants were asked to sort separate cards into stacks of varying numbers on a bipolar continuum indicating to what degree the participant agreed or disagreed with the statement written on the card. When the Q-sort was completed, the continuum approximated a normal distribution. Kerlinger suggested that 60 to 90 cards be used for statistical stability and reliability, although he indicated as few as 40 cards have been used successfully.²² The continuum ranged from very strongly agree to very strongly disagree, with the center as the neutral pile of cards.

Coding

Each variable (participant) was coded to identify his/her group membership. Each response (card) was assigned a value based on the pile in which the card was placed. These values were used for statistical purposes.

Treatment of the Data (Computerized)

1. A correlation matrix was formed to correlate each participant's sort of the items with every other sort.
2. The matrix was submitted to factor analysis and then to Varimax rotation to produce orthogonal factors. These factors represented groups of persons with similar sorting patterns and thus represented a "type" of participant.
3. To obtain a profile of the "ideal type," item patterns for each of the factors were determined by weighting the items' responses and producing an item array of weighted responses for each type. These items arrays were converted to Z-scores.
4. The resulting "types" were described by listing the statements from greatest to least acceptance for that particular type (based on Z-scores).
5. Differences between the types were examined through differences between acceptance or rejection of each of the items. The purpose of contrasting each group was to isolate those beliefs that describe a particular type as well as those areas in which contrast or differences may be the greatest. These differences of beliefs were projected as possible areas of conflict between different types.
6. In summary, the purpose of Q-methodology was to isolate and describe groups of people who possess similar beliefs regarding their attitudes toward egalitarianism and meritocracy in education as it relates to special education, discipline, curriculum, and goals of public education. Through the application of statistical

procedures and subsequent analysis of the results, the goal of the research was to identify areas of agreement and disagreement for each type and thus describe each "type's" beliefs regarding egalitarianism and meritocracy in education. By comparing the beliefs of each type as well as the intensity of those beliefs, the researcher was able to determine areas of possible conflict between the groups--administrators and teachers, in particular.

In addition, each type was analyzed in terms of selected characteristics such as age, sex, teaching or administrative experience, teaching area, and grade level to ascertain if a relationship existed among the groups and if such information described similarity as well as variance within the group.

Footnotes--Chapter I

¹Kern Alexander, School Law (St. Paul: West Publishing Co., 1980), p. 20.

²Americo D. Lapati, "Education: Privilege, Claim, or Right?" Educational Theory 56 (Winter 1976): 1.

³John W. Gardner, Excellence (New York: Harper and Row, 1961), p. 68.

⁴Lapati, p. 27.

⁵Lawrence A. Cremin, ed., The Republic and the School (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1957), p. 8.

⁶Diane Ratvitch, The Revisionists Revised (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1977), p. 57.

⁷Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).

⁸Samuel Halperin, "ESEA Comes of Age: Some Historical Reflections," Educational Leadership 36 (February 1979): 5.

⁹Mary F. Berry, Assistant Secretary for Education, "Student Competency Testing," The High School Journal (January 1979).

¹⁰Goss v. Lopez, 419 U.S. 565.

¹¹Daniel Bell, "On Meritocracy and Equality," in Power and Ideology in Education, ed. Jerome Karabel and A. H. Halsey (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), p. 69.

¹²James A. Coleman, "The Concept of Equality of Educational Opportunity," Harvard Educational Review 38 (Winter 1968).

¹³Milton Rokeach, Understanding Human Values (New York: The Free Press, 1979), p. 68.

¹⁴Robin Williams, American Society: A Sociological Interpretation (New York: Knopf, 1951), p. 29.

¹⁵Kurt Lewin, Field Theory in Social Science (New York: Harper and Row, 1951), p. 186.

¹⁶Anthony J. Cedoline, Job Burnout in Public Education (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1982), p. 103.

¹⁷Philip Cusick, The Egalitarian Ideal and American High School (New York: Longman, 1983).

¹⁸Dean C. Corrigan, "Educational Human Rights: Legislation and Leadership," Educational Leadership 36 (February 1979): 5.

¹⁹Cusick.

²⁰George H. Gallup, "The 14th Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward Public Schools," Phi Delta Kappan 64 (September 1982): 1.

²¹Cedoline, p. 100.

²²Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964), p. 582.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to demonstrate the beliefs and value patterns of various groups of educators and their commitment to the egalitarian ideal to provide an equally effective secondary school education for everyone. The egalitarian emphasis on providing an equally effective education for everyone has primarily been developed since the sixties through political and societal goals, court decisions, and federal programs. The school has been mandated to provide policies and programs, for example, in special education, bilingual education, remediation for the economically disadvantaged, free and reduced-price lunches, and free school supplies, with the goal of increasing the educational opportunity for those to enter school with a lesser chance for success. Such mandated programs have resulted in particular groups of students being treated and/or evaluated based on their individual need or handicap and therefore differently from other students. While some educators may be able to adjust to differentiated standards based on the needs or conditions of individual students, other educators, as Cusick (1983) described, may prefer a more meritocratic system or definite, pre-determined standards against which all students, despite their background or condition, are measured.¹

It is the contrast between the egalitarian efforts to provide for an effective education for each student by finding ways to neutralize the student's educational disadvantages and the teachers' possible value of a more meritocratic system that is investigated in this study. It is possible that the contrast between the egalitarian programs and policies that influence education and the individual teacher's value of a meritocratic educational system will result in conflict for the teacher as he or she is faced with the personal dilemma of working in an egalitarian-influenced system, one in which the teacher may not believe. This can result in what Cedoline (1983) related as the stress and frustration teachers face as the schools try to teach everything to everybody.² Cusick (1983) described the coping that is necessary as teachers are faced with the egalitarian obligation to "take, retain and interest" all students.³

The extent to which teachers or other groups of educators such as counselors and administrators value the egalitarian ideal as actualized through educational programs and policies has received limited attention in educational literature. The purpose of this chapter is to describe how the egalitarian ideal has developed and affected public secondary schools and the role that personal values of educators have in accepting or rejecting the validity of the ideal. The efforts to diversify the secondary school curriculum, the due process procedures for students, the establishment of special programs and individualized standards for the handicapped, foreign-speaking, and poor, as well as the revised obligations and goals of public education are all a result of the egalitarian influence.

Egalitarianism

Wilson (1966) defined the concept of egalitarianism by making a distinction between two types of equality. One he described as "natural similarity" on the basis of physical likeness (similar in amount, magnitude, etc.), and the other he labeled as "artificial or man-made similarity" (on the same level in dignity, power, excellence, etc.; having the same rights or privileges). It is this latter definition that applies to the American concept of equality under the law and, ultimately, under education.

The egalitarian believes that equal educational opportunity is realized only when each student has an equal opportunity for achievement. If, for instance, the student has a learning disability, a physical handicap, or comes from a foreign-speaking or culturally deprived home, the egalitarian proposes that additional time and resources should be allocated to the student. Such efforts should be made so that the student can reach the same level of achievement as those students who do not have such handicaps. In other words, the egalitarian must recompense those whom fate or circumstances have given less than an even chance for scholastic achievement. Educational resources should be allocated based on student need, rather than according to merit or desert. Egalitarianism reflects the values of effort and determination to learn and is based on cooperation rather than on competition with other students.

Rawls (1971) described the egalitarian efforts to bring the level of the disadvantaged student to that of the advantaged as the "principle of redress." According to the principle, inequalities,

such as those obtained through birth and natural endowment, are undeserved and therefore should be somehow compensated for. This compensation should be given to those with fewer native assets and to those born to less favorable social positions in order to redress their inferior status and thus provide genuine equality of opportunity.⁵

Others have indicated that egalitarianism developed for different reasons. Social responsibility is the source for what Weisskopf viewed as the trend toward egalitarianism. He cited the main cause of the movement as a disintegration of the belief that wealth and other privileges are based on merit and desert. The demands for greater opportunity for those in need, not merely from those who want more, but also from those who feel guilty about having more.⁶ Gans (1972) described the decade of the sixties as beginning the shift to equality for various groups of Americans who previously had accepted their less-than-equal status in society.⁷

Equal Opportunity

It is a pervasive belief in America that education serves to equalize opportunity. At the time of the American Revolution, the importance of education was advocated as a way to protect the young democracy. Jefferson held that education was "essentially necessary" in a republic in order that people could preserve their freedom and promote their own real happiness.⁸ Two hundred years later, Hodgson (1976) described the widespread acceptance of education as a way of achieving equality. For the liberals, he said,

"education was opportunity and it appealed to the liberal mind because it meant giving a chance to the have-nots without taking anything from the haves that they would notice losing." Education as a way to increase opportunity also appealed to the conservatives because it reflected effort and hard work in the Protestant work ethic and American tradition.⁹

Coleman (1968) asked the question, "What is and has been meant in society by the idea of equality of educational opportunity?" He traced the role of education in providing learning experience in order that the individual would become self-sufficient. The family was the first educational experience. In pre-industrial times the family provided the training in order that the child would become equipped to contribute to the economic survival of the family. Whether craftsmen or farmers, the family had the responsibility to train the child so that he or she could contribute to the production and also support other members of the family as they grew older and were no longer able to work. The concept of equality of opportunity had little meaning at this time since the family's fixed station in life, along with the necessity of the child's labor in the family, meant that, as an adult, the individual would not move from the social class into which he had been born.

The Industrial Revolution changed the family's educational and training functions, however. As individuals began to work outside the family unit, it became evident that different and more general types of training would be necessary. This societal need for an educated population gave rise to the concept of public school

education. Although private school and tutors had existed as an educational system for the rich, it was the general need for educated workers as people moved from the farm to the cities to work in factories that brought the need for publicly supported education into focus.

In the United States, unlike in England, public schools developed as common schools where all classes of children mainly, with the exception of Negroes and Indians, attended school together. While the English dual system of education sought to perpetuate class distinctions, the American system, according to Coleman (1968), based its concept on the ideal of equality of opportunity. Coleman cited four elements on which this equality of opportunity was and is based:

1. The provision of a free education up to a given level which constituted the principal entry point to the labor force.
2. The provision of a common curriculum for all children, regardless of background.
3. Partly by design and partly because of low population density, providing that children from diverse backgrounds attend the same school.
4. Providing equality within a given locality, since local taxes provided the source of support for schools.¹⁰

The Brown Decision

Before the 1954 decision of *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas*, the *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1898) decision had instituted separate-but-equal facilities for black and white students. In the landmark *Brown* case, the Supreme Court ruled that segregated schools were unconstitutional, and the decision marked the turning

point in not only the Civil Rights movement, but in the definition of equal educational opportunity. In what has been described as the most socially and ideologically significant opinion in Supreme Court history, Supreme Court Justice Warren wrote:

"In these days, it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education," adding that where the state had undertaken to make education available it must be on equal terms. He went on to say that the question is then, "Does segregation of children in public schools solely on the basis of race, even though the physical facilities and other 'tangible' factors may be equal, deprive the children of the minority group of equal educational opportunities?"

The court's answer: "We believe that it does."^{11,12}

Although the results of this decision had far-reaching effects in terms of the Civil Rights movement and desegregation, it also was a turning point in educational thought. Unlike the court decision that it overturned (*Plessy v. Ferguson*), the *Brown* decision considered the results of education, rather than the inputs. The court ruled that equal inputs did not mean equal education. Rather than to adhere to a pre-determined set of resources that would mean equal education, the court (above) judged there were other than "tangible" factors that constituted an education. Although the immediate effect of this decision was the ordered desegregation of schools, the real effect was the statement that education must be on equal terms.

It was the results of education--what it could do to improve the lot of the disadvantaged individual and promote a better America--that made educational opportunity a major consideration of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations. Johnson's Great Society looked to

education to reduce poverty and racial inequality as other programs to accomplish these goals met with political opposition. Soon after his victory in the 1964 presidential election, Lyndon Johnson strongly promoted the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), which included the largest money authorization ever proposed for the nation's schools. ESEA was designed to provide support on "equal terms" for students so that they could receive their education.¹³

ESEA is a program that embodies the egalitarian ideal. Its purpose is to provide categorical funds to be used to directly assist those from financially deprived, foreign-speaking, or minority backgrounds. The emphasis is on bringing disadvantaged students up to an educational level par with students who have not experienced such disadvantages. For example, the purpose of Chapter I (formerly Title I) under ESEA is to provide funds to local school districts. These funds are used to develop and implement supplemental compensatory education programs, primarily in the basic skills, to meet the special educational needs of low-achieving children who reside in neighborhoods with high concentrations of poverty. In addition, funds are provided to state education agencies for similar programs for children of migrant workers and fishermen and for children in institutions for the neglected and delinquent. More than 11 million children are eligible for this program and for special help in reading and math.¹⁴

Title VI, also known as the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA), was developed to aid in the desegregation of schools. In addition,

funds are provided to support minority school children in overcoming the effects of minority-group isolation. Concern for minority foreign-speaking students is reflected in Title VII. The Bilingual Program under Title VII is designed to aid students with bilingual services if they are deemed to have sufficient difficulty speaking, reading, writing, or understanding English.¹⁵

Bilingual education has received increased attention since the Supreme Court mandate in *Lau v. Nichols* required school districts to provide instruction in the child's own language if that child cannot benefit from instruction conducted in English. To comply with this order, many school districts found it necessary to obtain support from the federal government.¹⁶

To equalize educational opportunity for females, ESEA includes Title IX. The major thrust of Title IX is the Women's Educational Equity program, which has as its objective the elimination of inequitable educational policies based on sex. The purpose of this legislation was to sensitize educators to unequal treatment and expectations of males and females. Title IX has had a significant effect on girls' sports and has resulted in the establishment of athletic teams for girls in almost every sport.¹⁷

These sections of ESEA include the major ways that the federal government is fostering the egalitarian ideal of providing additional resources for those students who need assistance in order to compete on an equal basis. The programs are closely monitored, and school districts that fail to comply with the policies of ESEA face the loss of federal funds. The federal government has also

demonstrated a continuing commitment to equality of opportunity when ESEA received a \$50 billion, five-year re-endorsement in 1978.

The Coleman Report

The egalitarian emphasis on equal educational results had its origins in the Coleman Report. James Coleman was ordered by Congress under section 402 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to conduct a massive survey of 4,000 schools and 600,000 students in order to determine differences in educational resources between black and white schools. Although the purpose of the study was to compare educational inputs (what was the extent of the equity of the educational resources available to black and white children), what Coleman used as his criterion was achievement or results.

. . . Inequality may be defined in terms of consequences of the individuals with equal background and abilities. In this definition, equality of educational opportunity is equality of results, given the same individual input. With such a definition, inequality might come about from differences in the school inputs and/or racial composition and/or from more intangible things as described above.¹⁸

Although Coleman had expected to find gross differences in the quality of schools that black and white children attended, the results were that there was little difference in such things as physical facilities, curriculum, and teacher preparation.¹⁹ Minority children exhibited educational deficiencies when they entered school, and these deficiencies were even more pronounced when they left school. Coleman attributed these differences in results mainly to the background of one's fellow students and in order to provide appropriate peer groups, intergration of black and white students was recommended.

However, as Bell (1977) pointed out, the far-reaching effect of Coleman's work was not its findings but its major thesis, which was the redefinition of equality.²⁰ Coleman, as stated previously, was directed to compare inputs. Instead, he looked at results, and in doing so, shifted the definition of equality of opportunity from equal access to equal programs (inputs) to equality of performance (outcomes).

Coleman's analysis of the increasing divergence of test scores between black and white students (with the exception of black students in the urban northeast) was based on the thought that if divergent out-of-school influences cannot be controlled, i.e., home, neighborhood (the only way to control out-of-school influences would be to place students in boarding schools), then the in-school influences must create greater equalized opportunity (results) through the intensity of the school's influences relative to the external divergent influences. That is, equality of output is not so much determined by equality of resource inputs, but by the power of those resources in bringing about achievement. Coleman continued that the difference in achievement between students (the average black and the average white) is actually a difference in equality of opportunity, and it is the responsibility of the school to reduce that inequality.²¹

Guthrie et al. (1971) described the point Coleman was making this way: Although students may come from differing backgrounds, the task of the school is to equalize opportunities among different social groupings by the end of the compulsory school period.²² In

Michigan, for example, where the compulsory age of schooling is until one reaches age 16, all social groups of students should be at the same point in their education and thus share equal chances of success.

However, neither the schools in general nor the specific groups of educators who comprise them had a choice in whether or not they could accept and accomplish the task of bringing students to the same educational level. While the federal government's commitment to the egalitarian ideal of working toward equal educational results is evident through such programs as described under ESEA, there is little to document that individual educators shared the egalitarian value with the same level of commitment.

Egalitarianism and Secondary Schools

The history of secondary education does, however, reflect a growing commitment to educate all students. In his study of the structure of three high schools, Cusick (1983) found that the "key element to that structure is the commitment to provide each student with an opportunity for social, political and economic equality" or the "schools' commitment to the egalitarian ideal."²³ This commitment has evolved throughout the history of education and has mirrored social and political trends in American society.

The emphasis on providing education for a wider circle of students developed through the nineteenth century. Private schools and academies of the eighteenth century gradually declined in number, giving rise to the common school. Horace Mann, as the leader of the public school movement in Massachusetts, valued universal education

as the "great equalizer" of human conditions, the "balance wheel of social machinery," and the "creator of wealth undreamed of." Mann viewed the common school as a major vehicle in establishing a common value system for the United States and thus a way that the young republic could contend with the diversity of the American population. The common school would not attract, in the European sense, only the common people. Rather, it was a school common to all people. The public schools would be available and equal to all children regardless of creeds, classes, and backgrounds. It would be equal for all, and Mann hoped that children would develop a spirit of mutual amity that would result in greater social harmony.²⁴

In 1852 Massachusetts passed the first compulsory attendance law, and by 1918 all the states had followed suit. Although the first laws were weak and barely enforceable, many people felt the schools had overstepped their authority in requiring parents to send their children to school. In a challenge to the attendance law, the court ruled on an 1891 Ohio case that while parents have "rights in respect to their children they do not have sole authority over them. It declared that 'the welfare of the minor' is of 'paramount importance' and that the state may interfere with the liberty of the parent for the good of the child."²⁵

The compulsory-attendance laws were received by a mixed reaction from the public. Some, as described above, thought that the law infringed on their liberty as parents. Others wanted their children to work and viewed compulsory schooling as a threat to the family's income. However, the effect of the law was felt in the

schools as well. Many students who would have previously dropped out of school at an earlier age were now forced to attend. As the minimum school-leaving age moved progressively upward, the schools were challenged to provide programs for a wider variety of students with disparate goals and ambitions. Cremin (1961) signalled the problems resulting from compulsory attendance as the opportunity for educators to sponsor educational innovations in the decades preceding World War I.²⁶

During the war years and after, American education witnessed the rise of vocational education and the comprehensive high school. Education grew in scope from providing basic literacy to offering opportunities in vocational skills as well as advanced academic preparation. The Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act of 1917 provided federal assistance that school districts could offer programs aimed at meeting the needs for a growing skilled labor force. Schooling was no longer a preparation for college; its purpose was to appeal to a broader group of students.²⁷

The Comprehensive High School

The development of the comprehensive high school embodied both the democratic and egalitarian ideals in education. Gardner described it as a "particularly American phenomenon."²⁸ Rather than reflecting its European counterpart as a socially and academically stratified institution, the American comprehensive high school developed in response to the needs of its students as well as societal pressures.

As early as 1890, a committee of the National Education Association, known as the Committee of Ten, redefined the purpose of the high school from a purely college-preparatory function to the goal of preparing all "adolescents for life." The comprehensive high school underwent further study in 1918 when another committee of the National Education Association expanded the secondary schools' function in a position paper titled "Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education." The committee focused its attention on the high school as a socializing institution. Included in the goals of schooling was the solution to many social ills. The report was a classic statement of the possibility of a new form of social engineering--of creating deliberate and positive change through education.²⁹ The "Cardinal Principles" described the high school as "embracing all curriculums" and as "the prototype of a democracy in which various groups must have a degree of self-consciousness as groups and yet be federated into a large whole through the recognition of common interest and ideals."³⁰

It was this idea that social change could be accomplished through education that would have a profound effect on the future of secondary schooling. Whether they agreed or not, educators would be charged with the task of accomplishing desired social change through school program and treatment of students. In the early twentieth century, the emergence of scientific management resulted in differentiation of students and specificity of training for them. The development of I.Q. tests gave educators support for "scientifically" determining who would receive special or academic training.

Secondary education continued to reflect the societal pressures of the times. During the Depression, the schools, unlike many businesses and industries, continued to operate. However, under the stress of the economy, educators re-examined and re-interpreted the function of the public schools. Two major issues of the thirties were increasing social services to students and expanding the curriculum to meet the needs of the heterogeneous high school population.

The emphasis on the student-centered curriculum changed dramatically with the Russian launching of Sputnik I in the fifties. The United States entered the "space race," and American public high schools were criticized for having watered-down curricula, incompetent teachers, and poor academic standards. Demands were on public education to increase science and math offerings, develop high cognitive expectations, a rigorous educational system, and well-disciplined students.

In 1959 James Conant completed his study, The American High School Today. In the Foreword to this report, Gardner defined the comprehensive high school in terms of its responsibilities. That is, it is responsible for educating

. . . the bright and not so bright children with different vocational and professional ambitions and with various motivations. It is responsible, in sum, for providing good and appropriate education, both academic and vocational, for all young people within a democratic environment which the American people believe serves the principles they cherish.³¹

The sixties witnessed a renewed emphasis on the cherished principle of individualism, and the educational pendulum swung from the rigorous standards of the fifties to the egalitarian ideals of

the sixties. The difference would be, however, that the egalitarian values of the sixties would be established through court decisions and legislation. As discussed in a previous section, education in the sixties responded to the call for a "Great Society" in which it would attempt to play a central role in solving the problems of the poor, minorities, handicapped, and foreign born. The Coleman Study redefined the meaning of equal opportunity to mean equal results in achievement, and the role of the federal government grew as categorical funding was provided to achieve equal results. Social unrest and a demand for relevance affected educational policy.

The late sixties and early seventies witnessed the demand for a "relevant curriculum." Adolescents were rejecting the adult culture, not only verbally but through mass protests, love-ins, and changes in grooming and manners of dress. Students were charging that the curriculum, defined by Metcalf and Hunt (1970) as "the formal course-work taken by students,"³² had little meaning in their lives.³³ Under the impetus of social change, generated mainly by the vocal youth culture, educators began to examine the secondary curriculum. Ornstein (1982) described what proponents for changing the curriculum saw as needs:

1. the individualization of instruction through such teaching methods as independent inquiry, special projects and contracts.
2. the revision of existing courses and development of new ones on such topics of student concern as environmental protection, drug addiction, urban problems, cultural pluralism, and Afro-American literature.
3. the provision of educational alternatives (e.g., electives, minicourses, open classrooms) that allow more freedom of choice.

4. the extension of the curriculum beyond the school's walls through such innovations as work-study programs, credit for life experiences, and external degree programs.³⁴

In addition, teachers were advised to familiarize themselves with the thought patterns of students--their attitudes, values, beliefs, and interests.³⁵ Students gained greater influence in curriculum planning, and courses such as "Folk Rock Lyric" as an English class were an attempt to respond to their youthful interest. One high school English program, for example, was revised from three years of literature--American, English, and world--to 36 distinct, semester-long courses from which the student could choose "according to [his] need or interest." In the same high school, in addition to the social studies requirement of one year of American history and a semester of government, students can choose from 26 elective social studies classes. More than 75 vocational education classes encompass courses in actual child care to electronics.³⁶ This curriculum changed from professionally predetermined courses that were thought to be beneficial to a student's education to an array of classes designed to appeal to student interest.

The curriculum has also developed since the late sixties in response to many outside pressures. McCritcheon (1978) described the inconsistent curricular planning that occurs in order to appease groups such as the Chamber of Commerce, which desires a work force; the legislature, which desires proven competency; or citizens concerned about ethnic and sex stereotyping.³⁷ James and Tyack (1983) attributed the growth in curriculum to the increasing numbers of adolescents who stay in high school and the response the educators

must make in order to keep this heterogeneous population orderly and occupied. In the attempt to keep courses relevant to a diverse group of students, programs and curricula have grown increasingly incoherent.³⁸

It is the response that educators must make that is the focus of this study. Do teachers, counselors, and administrators prefer a rationally organized, uniformly structured curriculum, which is consistent with a meritocratic philosophy, or do they value the curriculum organized, as Cusick (1983) described, around the "needs" of students. The secondary school staff, he said, in an effort to fulfill the educational aspirations of students, embark on an endless search for something that would be of interest to students and, when found, would then meet their "educational needs." Cusick attributed this process to the egalitarian ideal that the schools are expected to fulfill and the promise that in return for the student's obligation to come to school, the school will find something to interest each individual.³⁹

The current curriculum design to meet the needs of students has its critics. Postman (1979) described the schools as having gone too far in their mission to interest students. He viewed the expanding curriculum as the schools' imposition into domains that should be the responsibility of other institutions, such as the family and church. Postman said:

Within our own life-time, we have seen the schools go into the sex-education business, the drug-education business, the driver-education business, the brotherhood business, the psychological counseling business, the free-lunch business, the baby-sitting

business, the racial integration business, the social equality business, the motivation business and lately, the business of ethnicizing the population after having failed in de-ethnicizing it.⁴⁰

Postman's contention was that the curriculum of American schools has become progressively utopian in its goal to reform society and therefore has lost its ability to concentrate on the needs of the individual. Like those who opposed compulsory education almost a century ago, Postman feared that the school is undermining the family. By assuming a programmatic responsibility for a problem, the school automatically transforms it into a social problem and thereby gives support to the growing acceptance of individual powerlessness.

Others have criticized education on the basis that it fails to offer equal opportunity. Critics such as Katz, Bowles, and Gintis have cited the purpose of public education as facilitating the growth of a capitalist economy. They have rejected the idea of cognitive attainment as a key to social mobility and, instead, developed the concept of the school as a place to foster values and behaviors that will result in a supply of acceptable workers.

Bowles and Gintis described the reproduction of social relationships as the correspondence theory, which posits that "social relationships of education--the relationships between administrators and teachers, teachers and students, students and students, and students and their work--replicate the hierarchical division of labor." They based their theory on how different levels of education prepare students to enter corresponding levels of the work force; i.e., junior

and senior high school emphasize rule following, while elite Ivy League colleges develop the social network of top business management. Other levels of education such as state universities fall somewhere in between. Bowles and Gintis also suggested that schools differentially reward and socialize students based on the perceived future occupational role of the student.⁴¹

Katz pointed to such educational practices as guidance and ability grouping as social sorting devices that legitimize inequality. He viewed these techniques as ways of channeling "working class children into working class jobs." The bureaucratic structure of the schools, he maintained, serves to foster the myth of equal opportunity while at the same time strictly regulating social mobility. It is the affluent who profit from schooling because the educational bureaucracy diverts resources to those whose goals, values, and abilities are consistent with those of the institution.

Thus, Katz said, those children who are unable to compete successfully are taught to blame themselves for their failure. This is another way the schools legitimize inequality. Children learn that the unequal distribution of rewards reflects the unequal distribution of ability. They come to learn through grading, test scores, promotion policies, and the bureaucratic structure, in general, that they, themselves, are to blame, not the system.⁴²

The emphasis on rule following and other factors that these critics have cited changed as schools were challenged on their disciplinary procedures. In response to court decisions and other societal pressures that students, especially those from poor and

minority backgrounds, be treated equally under discipline codes, due process procedures were instituted to protect student rights. This egalitarian concern for the individual was spotlighted as previously held school codes regarding conduct, student dress, and limits to self-expression were sacrificed in the interest of personal student liberty. It has been the obligation of the public schools to "take, retain and interest" all students and the students' obligation to attend school, regardless of their own desires, that has had an effect on the rights of the students when they are in school. The increasing emphasis on student rights evolved as the courts defined students' constitutional rights in relationship to the authority of the school.

Although the courts still recognize the in loco parentis function of educators in relation to students, the courts have increasingly defined particular student rights. The underlying theme to these decisions is that students have a constitutionally protected right to attend public schools that cannot be denied or impaired without due process of law.⁴³ The property right students have in their education must be protected by due process, as defined under the Fourteenth Amendment. The Court has defined two types of due process. The first is procedural due process. If a person is to be deprived of life, liberty, or property, then he must have valid notice of such, he must be given an opportunity to be heard, and a hearing must be conducted fairly. The second type, substantive due process, means that if the state (which has been defined as its administrative agencies, including schools) is going to deprive an individual of his

life, liberty, or property, the state must have a valid objective, and the means used must be reasonably calculated to achieve the objective.⁴⁴

Thus, students must be given adequate notice in writing of the rules and regulations of the school and their due process rights must be carefully protected under any circumstances by school administrators.⁴⁵ In addition to clarifying the standards of behavior required of students, the school must hold a hearing in which the student is apprised of the charges against him and is given the right to tell his side of the story. This process must apply in all cases in which a student could be deprived of his education, even for less than ten days (*Goss v. Lopez*).⁴⁶

As a result of these types of court decisions, the schools have had to respond to each discipline problem in a manner that would be consistent with due process procedures. Students being disciplined must not only have an opportunity to bring in witnesses and evidence to support their innocence, but must be apprised of the appeal procedures available to them if their parents disagree with the administrative decision.

Probably nowhere in the school has the issue of student rights been more evident than in the change in student appearance. In disputes over length of hair and the wearing of beards, the court has held that rules against such violate substantive due process unless the schools can prove that the hair style interferes with the academic process. In *Richards v. Thurston*, the court concluded that "within the commodious concept of liberty, embracing freedoms great

and small, is the right to wear one's hair as he wishes."⁴⁷ In the cases that followed, the test for acceptability of dress and hair length appeared to be whether or not such styles had a detrimental effect on the educational process. If no infringement of the rights of others can be demonstrated, then the student is allowed his personal liberty in terms of appearance.⁴⁸ The result of these and other court decisions regarding student appearance is that the school no longer has the right to set standards regarding appearance. The only standard that remains is the rule of "good taste"--that the student's appearance may not interfere with the academic process.⁴⁹

Another area in which predetermined standards have undergone change is in the classroom. The Special Education Law, PL 94-142, which originated in Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, guarantees the right of handicapped individuals to services in school. This legislation reflects the egalitarian ideal of "redress." Those who come to school with a certified "disadvantage," whether physical, mental, or emotional, are allocated more teacher time, resources, and an individualized school program. Such a program could include modified classroom standards in order to help special education students meet the level of the "regular" student and thus "redress" the inequality of their disadvantage. Boyer (1979), former U.S. Commissioner of Education, stated that "Public Law 94-142 is intended to help schools provide equity and quality in education for children who need more care, attention and understanding than most."⁵⁰ Shapiro (1980) identified the struggle for the passage of PL 94-142 as similar to that of other minority groups who have been discriminated

against by American society. He cited the Brown v. Board of Education case of 1954 as legal justification to allow handicapped students access to a public school education.⁵¹

The federal government, in order to assure the handicapped access to a public school education, has issued specific compliance rules for school districts to follow in order to receive categorical support for their special education programs. For children aged 6 to 17, the law specifies that school districts must (1) make every reasonable effort to locate handicapped children; (2) evaluate the learning needs of each child and, in consultation with parents and special education advisors, administrators, and regular education teachers, develop an individualized education plan (IEP); (3) place the child in the least restrictive environment with regular education students and teachers if possible, the process known as mainstreaming; (4) evaluate the student's progress periodically, making adjustments in the IEP if necessary; and (5) set up an impartial hearing, appeal, and other due process procedures under which parents can challenge school decisions.

In following federal and state mandates, additional commitments must be made by building administrators and teachers. Special education students are no longer solely the responsibility of the special education teacher. The student's IEP must be designed by a team that includes at least the child's regular education teacher, a representative from special education, an administrator, the child's parents, and, when possible, the child. The written plan must include annual goals, short-term objectives, individual performance objectives,

specification of the services provided, and an evaluation schedule. The school personnel and parents must review this plan at least annually, or whenever a change is made in the student's program.⁵² Thus, through PL 94-142, regular education personnel are now a legally required aspect of a handicapped child's education. The courts have also ruled that cost cannot be a reason to deny a special education student an appropriate placement even if the placement is out of the school district or out of the state. In addition, it is the school district's responsibility to transport students to these special programs.

Regular education teachers have felt the effect of the addition of special education students in the classroom. Teachers have had to modify their teaching methods in order that deaf and blind students can learn in the regular classroom. Evaluation procedures and standards for daily work and tests have to be modified if the special education student's Individual Education Plan (IEP) has so indicated. The classroom behavior standards may have to be modified if, for example, emotionally impaired students find the standards impossible to meet.

Disciplining special education students has not yet been legally resolved. The question is a complex one and may depend on the type of handicap and degree of severity. The cases decided thus far have been based on procedural, rather than substantive, issues.⁵³ Regarding the expulsion of a handicapped student, a federal district court ruled in a Connecticut case that a handicapped child could not be expelled because of the irreparable injury that would occur as a

result of being without an educational program. As per the procedures of PL 94-142, a more suitable program would have to be found for students with behavior problems.⁵⁴ In a 1979 Indiana case, the federal court ruled that handicapped children can only be expelled for behavior that is unrelated to the handicapping condition.⁵⁵ Negative reactions to these and other decisions have been based on the belief that special treatment for handicapped students discriminates against nonhandicapped students.⁵⁶

In still another aspect of the egalitarian influence in education, schools are having to react to the inequality of family income and the student's subsequent ability to purchase school supplies. The Supreme Court has yet to rule on the constitutionality of textbook and student-supplies fees. However, states have handled the matter on an individual basis. States such as Virginia, Colorado, and Arizona have allowed fees for textbooks, while Illinois and North Dakota have determined fees cannot be levied for the use of textbooks. Other states such as West Virginia, Missouri, Illinois, New Mexico, and New York have all instituted fee differentiation between required and elective courses on the basis that charging for required courses "impairs students' rights to free public schooling."⁵⁷ It has been made clear, however, that public education must be offered to all on equal terms. The classroom teacher cannot require the student to purchase supplies or equipment on the basis that the student may not be able to afford the items.

Summary

The American dream has long held that any individual, no matter what his or her origins may be, can, with ambition and hard work, become successful. Public education has been regarded as a chief ingredient in making this dream of success come true. However, despite the rags-to-riches stories, it was realized that if each person was truly to have an equal opportunity for personal achievement, some would need more support than others. This support, based on individual need rather than what is earned through achievement, is a basic tenet of the egalitarian ideal. The egalitarian holds that one's family background, physical or mental condition, skin color, native language, ability to provide pen and paper, or even one's ability not to be hungry all have an effect on the value that one is able to attain from his or her education. If each student is to maximize the value of his or her education and therefore receive an equally effective education, then efforts must be made to remedy or adjust for the disadvantages the student may have in receiving full benefit from the learning experience. Federal legislation and court decisions regarding special education, bilingual programs, free-lunch programs, due process laws to protect student rights are a few of the ways the egalitarian ideal has been actualized in the educational process. The courts have emphasized that it is the effects of education that must be equal, and that simply providing equal inputs to education is not enough. The egalitarian rejects the idea that all can meet or even should be required to meet

a single standard. Value is placed on effort, determination, and cooperation rather than on competition to attain particular standards.

Meritocracy

It may be that some educators prefer a more meritocratic educational system and do not place a high value on the egalitarian ideal. They would prefer what Gardner (1966) referred to as the long-standing acceptance of the meritocratic ideal, the American love for competitive performance or the concept of "let the best man (student) win."⁵⁸ Bell (1977) described the logic of the meritocracy as allowing high-scoring individuals, no matter what their original status in society, the right to move to the top in order to make best use of their talents.⁵⁹ Jefferson called this process the rise of the "natural aristoi" and reflected it in his 1779 plan for public education.

Under Jefferson's educational plan for Virginia, all students would have the opportunity for three years of free education, but the brightest boys who were not able to afford to go on to secondary school would be sent by scholarship. Those who achieved the highest distinctions would then be sent to William and Mary for a free college education. Although all had an equal opportunity to compete for further schooling, only the most academically talented would achieve the privilege of further education. Of course, this procedure applied to scholarship students only. Those who could afford further schooling had access to it.

The acknowledgment and reward of achievement has remained a consistent theme in American secondary education. Although the schools took on a socializing role through the rise of the common school and later, the structure of the comprehensive high school still reflected meritocratic policies through such practices as I.Q. testing, aptitude testing, formal classification and labeling of students, homogeneous grouping and tracking, differentiated curriculum, programs and classes with different goals.⁶⁰

The practice of tracking students according to ability has received much criticism from those who value egalitarianism in education. Conant (1959) recommended tracking in his study of the American high school and then reiterated it in his work (1967) on the comprehensive high school. He advocated that students should be placed according to ability, subject by subject, and thus avoid being placed on a single track for every class. He recommended three types of classes: one for the more able, one for the large group whose ability is average, and another for the very slow reader who requires special help. In his 1967 study, Conant reported that 96.5 percent of the principals surveyed indicated that their schools offered grouping in one or more academic classes.⁶¹

As described previously, Bowles and Gintis viewed tracking as a method of reinforcing and reproducing social classes. They maintained that intelligence testing and tracking are ways of "streamlining the meritocracy" and are incompatible with the egalitarian functions of education.⁶² Oakes (1982) supported this position in her study of social relationships in the classroom. Based on the

Bowles and Gintis assertion that the schools reinforce class differences through the cognitive and noncognitive treatment in tracked-levels classrooms, the study encompassed 139 various tracked secondary (junior and senior high school) classrooms. The findings indicated that students in low-tracked classes expressed more negative feelings about themselves and that relationships in the classes were characterized by more alienation, distance, and punitiveness than were those in higher-tracked classes. Moreover, this process appeared to intensify with years of schooling.⁶³

The courts have also considered the issue of tracking. In *Hobson v. Hansen*, the use of standardized intelligence test scores to place students in various ability tracks was deemed unconstitutional because the court determined that such placements resulted in de jure segregation. While the court emphasized that it was not abolishing the use of track systems, it was declaring that tracking could only be used for educational purposes if the method did not discriminate against particular groups of students.⁶⁴

Brookover and Erickson (1975) indicated that equality is not achieved by enhancing the differences in students through their assignments to differentiated programs. They described two ideal types of differentiated and equality-oriented educational systems that reflect opposite views on ability assumptions, school policies and practices, and outcomes. In terms of ability, the differentiated-oriented system operates under the belief that innate ability can be identified and remains basically unchanged. Students identified under this system would be labeled and placed in a homogeneous

program. Brookover and Erickson maintained that such placement then identifies students with particular careers and opportunities and does little to advance the students' social mobility. They indicated that most school systems operate under this system rather than under the assumption that students actually have few differences in their ability to learn and that mastery of a common curriculum is possible. Such assumptions, they said, would foster equality of opportunity.⁶⁵

Despite the views of these critics and the egalitarian emphasis on "leveling up" to meet the educational needs of students who have been neglected in the educational process, the meritocratic idea of higher standards and requirements has been receiving increased attention. The National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) reported on seven studies recently completed or currently underway that recommended increased efforts to raise student achievement and various rewards to those students and teachers who are most successful in doing so. The National Commission on Excellence in Education charged that the educational foundation of our society is being eroded by a "rising tide of mediocrity" and that other nations and overtaking the United States in educational attainments. The study stated, among other things, that students are not taking enough academic classes, especially in the areas of science and math, that less homework is being assigned, that high school graduation standards are too low, and that students spend an insufficient length of time in school. The study recommended that graduation requirements be significantly increased and that schools develop more rigorous and

measurable standards, and high expectations for academic performance and student conduct.⁶⁶ Similar sentiments were reflected in the following reports: "Action for Excellence" sponsored by the Education Commission of the States, Task Force on Education for Economic Growth; "Academic Preparation for College" sponsored by the College Entrance Examination Board; Education Equality Project, "Making the Grade," Twentieth Century Fund, Task Force on Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Policy; "Education and Economic Progress: Toward a National Education Policy" sponsored by the Carnegie Corporation; and "A Celebration of Teaching: High Schools in the 1980's" chaired by TheodoreSizer and sponsored by the National Association of Secondary School Principals and the Commission on Education Issues of the National Association of Independent Schools.⁶⁷

Summary

Egalitarianism and meritocracy are opposing ways of looking at the educational process. Egalitarianism stresses an equally effective education for every student as evidenced by equal results or achievement. To produce equal results may, however, necessitate unequal allocation of resources with greater amounts of time, energy, and financial resources allocated to those with greatest need. The need is determined by deciding who enters the educational process at a disadvantage for maximum personal academic achievement. Whether a diagnosed learning handicap or the lack of money to purchase a student lunch, the individual is unable to compete on an equal basis with those who can learn or those who have their hunger satisfied

because they can afford to eat lunch. Egalitarianism stresses effort and determination the individual makes toward achievement.

Meritocracy, in contrast, is not based on the effort made, but rather achievement as measured by a predetermined standard. Students who cannot meet the standard have their needs met by being placed in a class or curriculum that is suited to their ability, a process known as tracking. These decisions are based on how a student compares to others on standardized tests and in terms of teacher judgments. Tracking and similar practices are criticized on the basis that they reinforce class distinctions and limit social mobility.

Recently, however, education has been criticized because of the lack of high standards and the increasing mediocrity of American student achievement. Thus, educators are caught in a dilemma. While the commitment to egalitarianism has been legitimized in the educational system through federal mandates, laws, and court decisions to meet the needs of all students, there is evidence of pressure to increase educational standards and performance. It may be also that within the educational community some educators value egalitarian programs and policies while others support a meritocratic system of education, resulting in conflict between professionals within the institution.

Conceptual Framework

In a democratic society, the function of public education is shaped in large part by the principle of equality. Public schools are assigned the tasks of socializing the young in a way that will be

appropriate to their participation in a democracy. Those who enter the educational process at a disadvantage must be given, under egalitarian theory, added support in order to assure equal achievement and thus, ultimately, equal participation in the democracy. This goal of education is said to conflict with the second goal of education, that of maximizing individual potential so that achievement is based on individual merit rather than on other factors such as wealth or birthright.

The role of the federal government as well as specific interest groups over the last 20 years has been to emphasize the egalitarian function of education. Court mandates, public acts, and various funding programs have been designed to increase the opportunity of the disadvantaged. Coupled with the reality of compulsory education, schools were obligated to "take, retain and interest" all students regardless of their "ability, ambition or inclination," in the hopes of providing a "fairly even chance at social, economic and political equality."⁶⁸

Retsinas (1982) pointed out that the effect of nonlocal mandates (those mandates outside of the local school board's control) has reduced the professional autonomy of not only the administration but that of the teacher also. She said:

The nonlocal mandates are not trivial, they define the goals of the school system, the selection of clients, and the mechanics of staffing. Federal legislation and subsequent regulations touch curriculum, racial integration, the use of auxiliary personnel, remedial education, libraries, vocational programs, personnel policies, gifted students, handicapped students, and non-English-speaking students. The courts have also ruled on bussing, liability of boards and teachers, educational malpractice, and student rights.⁶⁹

Cedoline (1982) defined these issues as stress producing for both administrators and teachers. He pointed to the definition of student rights and the personal liability of those who do not provide them as a major factor that has made many educators more timid or careful in their administration of discipline. He also cited other factors such as student-population changes, including the presence of bilingual and special-needs students in the classroom, as stress producing for teachers. These stressors are exacerbated by the conflicting values the school as an institution places on these issues, and the values of the individual teacher who must operationalize the demands that society places on the schools.⁷⁰

Values

Values were chosen as the chief indicants in this study because by definition they reflect qualities that individuals judge as worthwhile.⁷¹ Blank and Grady (1983) described values as enduring beliefs and preferences about what is right or wrong, good or bad, important or relatively unimportant.⁷² Williams (1979) described values as the core conceptions of the desirable within every individual and society. Values serve as criteria or standards that guide not only action but also judgment, attitude, choice, evaluation, rationalization, and attribution of causality.⁷³ Rokeach (1979) described all values as having cognitive, affective, and directional aspects. Values, he said, serve as criteria for selection in action. However, he indicated that differences among individuals are not the presence or absence of particular values, but the ordering,

arrangement, hierarchy, or priorities that characterize particular values.⁷⁴ In this study, teachers and administrators prioritize particular values that reflect their commitment to either an egalitarian or a meritocratic view of education. The ways educators make decisions about students, about what is taught, and about how students are treated reflect what the teacher or administrator deems important in the educational process. The individual educator's values may or may not be in harmony with the school's values as an institution.

Rokeach (1979) described institutional values. He quoted Williams' (1970) sociological definition of an institution as "a set of institutional norms that cohere around a relatively distinct and socially important complex of values."⁷⁵ Rokeach suggested that institutions be regarded as

. . . social arrangements that provide frameworks for value specialization, that is, frameworks for the transmission and implementation mainly of those subsets of values that are especially implicated in their own particular spheres of activity (i.e. education of the young). This is a useful perspective, particularly because it provides for the structural articulation of individuals' values with macrosocial arrangements.⁷⁶

Katz and Kahn (1978) described the values and norms of a social system as "the common beliefs of an evaluative type which constitute a coherent interrelated system."⁷⁷ While system norms refer to the explicit forms of behavior appropriate for members of the system, system values provide a "more elaborate and generalized justification both for appropriate behavior and for the activities and functions to the system." Although system norms and values are

a group product and are not necessarily held by all individuals participating in the system, they do serve two functions: first by providing cognitive maps for members that facilitate their work in the system and their adjustment to it and second by providing the moral or social justification for system activities both for members and those outside the system.⁷⁸

Rokeach described five methods for measuring institutional values based on the assumptions "that institutional values are substantively the same as those manifested at the individual level; that institutional values are major determinants of individual values and like individual values are hierarchically arranged."⁷⁹ He cited five ways that the value patterns of institutions can be ascertained:

1. Content analysis--by content analysis--by extracting the terminal and instrumental values contained in institutional publications and documents such as the school board's philosophy of education.
2. Personal values of institutional gatekeepers. Measuring the values of institutional gatekeepers such as administrators and teachers is based on the assumption that such values will reflect the influence of socialization by a particular social institution such as the school.
3. Personal values of an institution's special clients--by measuring the personal values of specific groups of clients such as college bound students or high school cheerleaders.
4. Perceived values of an institution by gatekeepers--by measuring the value image of an institution as perceived by its institutional gatekeepers.
5. Perceived values of an institution by general clients--by measuring the perceived values of a given institution as perceived by anyone who can be regarded as a client of the institution.⁸⁰

In his study of the editorials of Science Magazine (1964-1973) using these five criteria, Rokeach found "the most sensitive single indicator of an institution's value is, first, the value image of an

institution by its gatekeepers, and second, the personal values of its gatekeepers."⁸¹ However, Rokeach went on to say that although much is known about organizational processes such as power, conflict, communication, and environment adaptation, little is known about the relationships among the various organizational properties and processes and the values of organizational actors.⁸² The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship of the schools' commitment to egalitarianism and the values of teachers and administrators, the organizational actors. In terms of values and organizational context, Hodgkinson (1971) found that value orientations differ by hierarchical levels, but he found little evidence for relationship between values and biographical data.⁸³ Although Rokeach reported that little has been researched on the relationship between values and organizational processes, he did cite the Hodgkinson study (1971) to support the suspicion that "values, as a variable, may explain even more of the variance in organizational processes, such as conflict, communication and group behavior."⁸⁴ It may be possible that conflict within the professional school staff, particularly teachers and administrators, may actually be a value conflict. These groups may have differing beliefs regarding the commitment to effectively educate all students, especially those students who previously would not have attended a public secondary school or remained until graduation.

Summary

It is the purpose of this study to determine the value and belief patterns of teachers and administrators in terms of the

egalitarian ideal and the relationship of this value to the commitment of the schools to provide an equally effective education for all students. Over the past 20 years, it has become increasingly apparent that public schools were being called upon to "take, retain and interest" all students and provide the student from whatever level of society, mental or physical condition, with an equally effective education. This egalitarian movement, complete with its principle of redress, has imposed upon the public school system the value of caring for and developing the potential of the disadvantaged.

However, despite this egalitarian commitment in education comes the demand for stronger academic and disciplinary standards aimed at producing higher achievement. Coleman (1981) cited the loss of educators' authority to court rulings, the rise of student rights (which has had an effect both in shaping a student-defined curriculum and in impeding discipline), and the lack of conscience among parents about the secondary schools' authority over and responsibility for their children as factors that, although designed to remedy particular social ills, have actually resulted in putting the average secondary school in an "untenable position" to bring about achievement. These factors, charged Coleman, have resulted in secondary schools reducing their academic demands through the reduction of standards, elimination of competition, and increase of undemanding elective courses.⁸⁵

In sum, the schools are being called upon to accomplish conflicting goals, supported by different value complexes. The concept that every student has a right to an equally effective education is

embodied in the egalitarian ideal. Programs and policies that are explicitly outlined in federal mandates, laws, and court decisions legitimize the egalitarian notion that educational resources should be directed toward meeting the needs of students who enter the educational process at a disadvantage. If, for example, a learning-disabled special education student cannot meet the standards or objectives of a particular class, then those standards and objectives are modified so that they are appropriate for the individual learning-disabled student. This process is accomplished at an Individual Educational Planning Committee meeting with input from the regular and special education teachers, school psychologist, administrator, parents, and occasionally the student himself. The point is that the standards are no longer fixed, but rather responsive to the individual needs of a particular student.

This example is in contrast to the meritocratic belief that the student meets the criteria for passing the class, or else he fails or is tracked into a class where the predetermined standards are at his level. Under the meritocratic plan, the standards are not compromised. The student must adjust. The class standards do not.

It is possible that some educators, based on their personal values and judgments, support the egalitarian ideal, its programs and policies because they believe it is the best or right way to educate students. Other educators, for the same reason, support a more meritocratic system of education. Obviously, when individuals

or groups differ in their basic beliefs as to how a process, such as educating students, should be accomplished, interpersonal conflict between the individuals or groups can result.

Footnotes--Chapter II

¹ Philip Cusick, The Egalitarian Ideal and the American High School (New York: Longman, 1983), p. 115.

² Anthony J. Cedoline, Job Burnout in Public Education (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1982), p. 104.

³ Cusick.

⁴ John Wilson, Equality (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1966), p. 40.

⁵ John Rawls, A Theory of Justice (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971), p. 60.

⁶ Walter A. Weisskopf, "The Dialectics of Equality," in The Inequality Controversy, ed. Donald M. Levine and Mary Jo Bane (New York: Basic Books, 1975), p. 223.

⁷ Herbert J. Gans, "The New Egalitarianism," Saturday Review 55 (May 6, 1972): 19.

⁸ H. G. Good, A History of American Education (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1962).

⁹ Godfrey Hodgson, America in Our Time (New York: Doubleday, 1976), p. 446.

¹⁰ James S. Coleman, "The Concept of Equality of Educational Opportunity," Harvard Educational Review 38 (Winter 1968): 7-22.

¹¹ Guide to the U.S. Supreme Court (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly, 1979).

¹² Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483, 74 S. Ct. 686 (1954).

¹³ Samuel Halperin, "ESEA Comes of Age: Some Historical Reflections," Educational Leadership 36 (February 1979): 5.

¹⁴ Mary M. Stump and Jeffrey A. Simering, eds., The 1978 Federal Funding Guide for Elementary and Secondary Education (Washington, D.C.: Educational Funding Research Council, 1978), p. 97.

¹⁵ Cynthia A. Carter, ed., An Analysis of the Educational Amendments of 1978 (Washington, D.C.: Educational Funding Research Council, 1978), pp. 14-24.

- ¹⁶Stump and Simering, p. 207.
- ¹⁷Rita Bornstein, "The Education of Women: Protection or Liberation?" Educational Leadership 36 (February 1979): 336.
- ¹⁸Coleman, p. 18.
- ¹⁹Hodgson, p. 26.
- ²⁰Daniel Bell, "On Meritocracy and Equality," in Power and Ideology in Education, ed. Jerome Karabel and A. H. Halsey (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), pp. 607-35.
- ²¹Coleman, pp. 23-24.
- ²²James W. Guthrie et al., Schools and Inequality (Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1971), pp. 138-39.
- ²³Cusick, p. 1.
- ²⁴Lawrence A. Cremin, ed., The Republic and the School: Horace Mann on the Education of Free Men (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1957), p. 8.
- ²⁵Edward J. Power, Main Currents in the History of Education (New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1970), pp. 576-77.
- ²⁶Lawrence A. Cremin, The Transformation of the School (New York: Random House, 1961), p. 9.
- ²⁷Smith-Hughes Act (1917), in Robert O. Hahn and David B. Bidna, eds., Secondary Education (New York: Macmillan, 1970), p. 104.
- ²⁸James W. Gardner, Foreword to The American High School Today: A First Report to Interested Citizens by James Conant (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959).
- ²⁹Thomas James and David Tyack, "Learning from Past Efforts to Reform the High School," Phi Delta Kappan 64 (February 1983): 6.
- ³⁰Daniel Tanner, "The Comprehensive High School in American Education," Educational Leadership 39 (May 1982): 8.
- ³¹Gardner.
- ³²Lawrence E. Metcalf and Maurice P. Hunt, "Relevance and the Curriculum," in Curriculum: Quest for Relevance, ed. William Van Til (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1974), p. 266.

³³William Van Til, "Prologue: The Key Word Is Relevance," in Curriculum: Quest for Relevance, ed. William Van Til (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1974), p. 235.

³⁵Allan C. Ornstein, "Curriculum Contrasts: A Historical Overview," Phi Delta Kappan 63 (February 1982): 407.

³⁶Metcalf and Hunt, p. 270.

³⁶_____ High School, "Program of Study 1982-83," p. 24.

³⁷Gail McCutcheon, "The Curriculum: Patchwork or Crazy Quilt?" Educational Leadership 36 (November 1978): 2.

³⁸James and Tyack.

³⁹Cusick, p. 44.

⁴⁰Neil Postman, Teaching as a Conserving Activity (New York: Delacorte Press, 1979).

⁴¹Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis, Schooling in Capitalist America (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1976), pp. 130-32.

⁴²Michael B. Katz, Class, Bureaucracy and the Schools: The Illusion of Educational Change in America (New York: Praeger, 1971).

⁴³Kern Alexander, School Law (St. Paul: West Publishing, 1980), p. 319.

⁴⁴Ibid., p. 343.

⁴⁵Hobson v. Bailey, 309 F. Supp. 1393 (D.C. Tenn. 1970), in School Law, 1980, p. 345.

⁴⁶Goss v. Lopez, 419 U.S. 565, 95 S. Ct. 729, in School Law, 1980, p. 346.

⁴⁷Richards v. Thurston, United States Court of Appeals, First Circuit, 1970 424 F. 2d 1281, in School Law, 1980, pp. 344, 388.

⁴⁸See Massie v. Henry, 455 F. 2d 799 (4th Cir. 1972), in School Law, 1980, p. 392.

⁴⁹Alexander, p. 358.

⁵⁰Ernest L. Boyer, "Public Law 94-142: A Promising Start?" Educational Leadership 36 (February 1979): 5.

⁵¹H. Svi Shapiro, "Society, Ideology and Reform of Special Education: A Study in the Limits of Educational Change," Educational Theory 30 (Summer 1980): 3.

⁵²Michigan Department of Education, The I.E.P.C. Process in Michigan (October 1980).

⁵³David L. Dagley, "Some Thoughts on Disciplining the Handicapped," Phi Delta Kappan 63 (June 1982): 10.

⁵⁴Stuart v. Nappi, 443 F. Supp. 1235 (D. Conn. 1978), in Public School Law: Teachers' and Students' Rights, by Martha M. McCarthy and Nelda H. Cambron (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1981), p. 240.

⁵⁵Doe v. Kroger, 480 F. Supp. 225 (N.D. Ind. 1979), in *ibid.*, p. 252.

⁵⁶Dagfey, p. 697.

⁵⁷McCarthy and Cambron, p. 198.

⁵⁸John W. Gardner, Excellence (New York: Harper and Row, 1961), p. 6.

⁵⁹Bell, p. 608.

⁶⁰Wilbur B. Brookover and Edsel L. Erickson, Sociology of Education (Homewood, Ill.: The Dorsey Press, 1975), pp. 110-13.

⁶¹James B. Conant, The Comprehensive High School (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967), p. 30.

⁶²Bowles and Gintis, p. 195.

⁶³Jeannie Oaks, "Classroom Social Relationships: Exploring the Bowles and Gintis Hypothesis," Sociology of Education 55 (October 1982): 197-212.

⁶⁴Hobson v. Hansen, 269 F. Supp. 401 (1967), in School Law (1980), p. 487.

⁶⁵Brookover and Erickson, p. 111.

⁶⁶Commission on Excellence in Education, David P. Gardner, Chairman, A Nation at Risk (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, April 1983).

⁶⁷National Association of Secondary School Principals, Almanac of National Reports (August 1983).

⁶⁸Cusick.

⁶⁹Joan Retsinas, Teachers and Professional Autonomy," The Educational Forum 47 (Fall 1982): 30.

⁷⁰Cedoline, pp. 48-53.

⁷¹American Heritage Dictionary, New College ed. (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1982).

⁷²Virgil E. Blanke and Marilyn Grady, "On Schooling for a Well Society," The Educational Forum 47 (Summer 1983): 4.

⁷³Robin M. Williams, Jr., "Change and Stability in Values and Value Systems: A Sociological Perspective," in Understanding Human Values, ed. Milton Rokeach (New York: The Free Press, 1979).

⁷⁴Milton Rokeach, ed., Understanding Human Values (New York: The Free Press, 1979), p. 17.

⁷⁵*Ibid.*, p. 51.

⁷⁶*Ibid.*, p. 18.

⁷⁷Daniel Katz and Donald L. Kahn, The Social Psychology of Organizations, 2nd ed. (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1978), p. 385.

⁷⁸*Ibid.*, p. 386.

⁷⁹Rokeach, p. 53.

⁸⁰*Ibid.*, pp. 53-54.

⁸¹*Ibid.*, p. 68.

⁸²*Ibid.*, p. 74.

⁸³C. Hodgkinson, "Organizational Influence on Value Systems," Educational Administration Quarterly (1971): 7.

⁸⁴Rokeach, p. 77.

⁸⁵James S. Coleman, "Quality and Equality in American Education: Public and Catholic Schools," Phi Delta Kappan 63 (November 1981): 3.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Chapter III presents the methods and procedures used in this study. The purpose of this research is to determine the value and belief patterns of teachers and administrators in terms of the egalitarian ideal and the relationship of this value to the commitment of the schools to provide an equally effective education for every student. It may be that some educators prefer a more meritocratic system of education with predetermined norms and standards. To determine whether or not the professional educator's value and belief patterns are consistent with the egalitarian ideal, a parsimonious method of eliciting response data from field-based educators was sought. The method needed to be meaningful to the respondents and structured to force them to make comparative judgments between statements reflecting egalitarian and meritocratic values and beliefs. To meet these criteria, the Q-sort technique was selected.

According to Kerlinger (1973), one of the strengths of the Q-method is that it requires respondents to make comparative judgments that they might not otherwise make systematically.¹ The items or statements used in this study were value statements elicited from interviews with administrators, counselors, and teachers of academic subjects and nonacademic subjects. These value statements reflected

either an egalitarian or meritocratic point of view of policies and practices regarding a wide range of educational issues.

Methodology Employed

The Q-method, devised by William Stephenson, was the methodology and technique used in this study to identify and analyze the value and belief patterns of five groups of educators. Stephenson (from Talbott) indicated that the "Q-technique provides a systematic way to handle a person's retrospections, his reflections about himself and others, and much else of an apparent subjective nature."² Talbott (1971) described the Q-technique as being particularly suited to the study of decision behavior where the focus is on personal choice and preference.³

In the Q-technique, the participant is asked to sort through cards and place them in piles according to some criterion. In this study, each educator sorted through 58 cards on which were written statements regarding meritocratic or egalitarian educational beliefs and practices and then placed each card in one of nine piles indicating intensity of agreement or disagreement. After the participant completed the procedure, the distribution of the cards reflected a normal distribution. Statistical treatment of the data was then used to establish clusters of respondents with similar belief patterns.

Selection of Participants

In Q-methodology the participants are purposefully selected to represent identifiable groups within the population to be studied. It would have been difficult to randomly select educators who would

compromise the number of members of each group to be studied. A contact person in each of the seven junior high schools and four high schools selected teachers representing various departments in both academic and nonacademic areas. All teachers who were asked to participate in the study agreed. The contact person also asked administrators, counselors, and special education teachers in each building to participate in the research.

The study sample was drawn from a large, all-white middle- to upper-middle-class suburban school district. The school district in the study is well known for its excellent teacher-administrator relationship. The district has never had a teacher strike and enjoys exceptional support from the community. The participants were from the secondary schools only, comprising four high schools of 1,600 to 2,000 students each, and seven junior high schools, each of which averaged 800 students. Participants were sought from the following areas: building administrators, teachers of academic classes, teachers of nonacademic classes, counselors, and special education teachers. Each group included representatives from both the junior and senior high school levels. In addition to completing the Q-sort, biographical data and teaching history were obtained from the participants by having them complete a short questionnaire. (See Appendix A.) A cover letter was also included in each packet in order to introduce the researcher, the purpose of the study, and to clarify the method of the Q-sort. (See Appendix B.)

The Participants

The study was limited to educators who are currently working in a secondary school (junior high school grades 7, 8, 9 or senior high school grades 10, 11, 12). The groups were identified according to the particular functions they serve in the school as well as the groups of students they come in contact with each day.

Administrators

The administrators selected for this study were all building principals or assistant principals and were considered as a single group. In the school district studied, building administrators are able to function with minimal directives from the central administration and are therefore able to establish many of their own policies and practices of building management. Their responsibilities include planning and delivering services for regular and special education, discipline, staffing, public relations, extracurricular activities, as well as management of noninstructional personnel.

Administrators were selected to participate in the study because each has the ultimate building-level authority for school programs. Their responsibility also includes assigning students to their classes through the scheduling process as well as assigning teachers to the schedule of classes they teach. In addition, administrators are accountable to all parents and the public for both the academic progress of students and the actions and attitudes of teachers. It is possible that principals can easily identify with the conflicting egalitarian and meritocratic goals because they must respond to parents and teachers who advocate each.

Counselors

Like administrators, counselors are in a position to observe and react to the overall structure of the school program and policies and the resultant effects on students and their parents. Although they do not evaluate students directly, counselors are in a position to judge how egalitarian and meritocratic values, as actualized in the educational process, affect student achievement and interest in school. For these reasons and the fact that they have primary responsibility for guiding and placing students in classes, counselors were also selected as a group to participate in the study.

Each counselor in the study has a caseload of approximately 450 students. The counselors' main responsibilities include guiding students in course selections, standardized testing, personal counseling, career education, working with the special education programs, advising parents, student placement in special classes, and working with teachers and other personnel on individual student problems.

Teachers

The teachers in this study were also from the same school district and represented the 11 secondary schools. There are considered to be well paid and, although unionized, have maintained good relationships with administration and have had little labor unrest. For the purpose of this study, the teachers are categorized in two groups, those who teach academic subjects and those who teach non-academic subjects.

1. Teachers of academic subjects: This group is identified as those teachers who instruct classes in math, English, science,

social studies, foreign languages, and particular advanced vocational courses such as business management and electricity. The total class load of most of these teachers is contractually limited to 155 students. Special education students would be more likely to receive their instruction in special academic classes or would receive significant special education support as well as modified grading if placed in an academic class.

2. Teachers of nonacademic subjects: Nonacademic classes include courses in the practical and vocational arts, such as woodshop, metalshop, drafting, autoshop, child care, foods, clothing, merchandising, and basic typing courses. Nonacademic classes in fine arts include band, vocal music, art, orchestra, and drama. Physical education is also a nonacademic class. Teachers of nonacademic classes have no contractual limit on the number of students in their classes (other than of "reasonable" size) and tend to have a higher representation of special education students in their classes than do regular education teachers.

Special Education Teachers

Special education teachers represent a unique group in this study since most of their positions are a result of the implementation of the egalitarian ideal in public education. The special education teacher's job is to individualize each student's instruction and to assist in modifying the regular education objectives when necessary. Modifying the objectives of regular education classes may result in the special education students receiving a "C" grade,

for example, when "regular" students may have to do more or better-quality work to receive the same grade. These efforts of the special education teacher to modify grading standards and expectations may or may not be agreeable to the general education teacher who also teaches the student.

Teachers of special education students have legal limits on the number of students they can serve. Twenty-one students is the maximum caseload for a teacher under a direct instructional model. However, only up to ten students can be instructed during a single class period. Under the teacher-consultant model, the special education teacher can serve up to 25 students on a tutorial basis by providing support to the regular education instruction. In the school district studied, a cross-categorical program is used, meaning that students with different disabilities (i.e., learning disabled, emotionally impaired, physically and otherwise health impaired, and educable mentally trainable) are taught or tutored in the same special education classroom by the same special education teacher. Moreover, the teacher's certification may or may not be congruent with the students' certified disabilities.

Concept Identification

Structured interviews were held with 16 educators from various educational areas. Interviewees included administrators, teachers of academic subjects, teachers of nonacademic subjects, counselors, and special education teachers. The purpose of the scheduled interviews was to learn about educators' beliefs regarding the goals of education,

evaluation standards for students, curriculum, the treatment of special education students, and discipline. Each interview lasted approximately two hours and was based on the responses to specific questions. (Interview questions are in Appendix C.)

At the conclusion of the interviews, the contents of the protocols were analyzed to gather ideas regarding the values and beliefs held by each educator. Statements reflecting beliefs about education in the areas of curriculum, discipline, the goals of education, student evaluation, and special education were isolated and tabulated to determine the commonality of response.

Listed below are 23 belief statements that were extracted from interview responses.

Curriculum:

1. Both males and females should have equal opportunity to select any elective.
2. A wide variety of course offerings keeps students interested in school and lowers the drop-out rate.
3. At the high school level, work-study (co-op) programs have undermined the importance of academic classes.
4. Teachers should have the freedom to decide what is taught in their classes.
5. Teachers should modify the curriculum to fit the needs of a particular class.
6. Teachers should not have the freedom to decide what is taught in their classes.
7. Student books and materials should not be provided free of charge unless the student can prove financial need.
8. Tracking in academic classes makes it easier to protect class standards.
9. Secondary school curriculum should offer something for everyone.

Student evaluation:

10. Even though a student has shown effort in a class but not achievement, a teacher should not give him a passing grade because it would imply the student knows the material.
11. Students should achieve minimum levels of competency in order to be promoted.
12. Schools should grant differentiated diplomas based on the student's achievement level.
13. Students should be required to repeat classes they fail.
14. Students should be required to attend school for a certain number of days in order to be promoted.

Discipline:

15. Schools should have dress codes.
16. The length of due process procedures reduces the effectiveness of discipline.
17. Students exhibiting persistent behavior problems should be removed from school.

Special education:

18. "Mainstreaming" has permitted handicapped students to develop social and academic skills.
19. It is difficult for regular education teachers to modify class expectations for special education students.
20. Regular education teachers have some responsibility for the special education students assigned to their classes.
21. Special education students should not have discipline standards modified for them.

Goals of education:

22. It is the responsibility of the public schools to teach the whole child.
23. The goal of education should be to ensure that all students are successful.

The list of statements reflects both egalitarian and meritocratic sentiments of the interviewees. While some presented beliefs that indicated their values of structuring education to meet the needs of the individual, others expressed beliefs that indicated valuing of specific standards against which all should be measured. The concepts indicated represent concepts three or more educators expressed, but not necessarily the point of view the three expressed. The fact that conflicting beliefs were expressed regarding the same concept (i.e., goals of schooling, student competency, responsibility for special education students) was an indication of varying beliefs and values.

Concept Reduction

Few steps were needed to reduce the concepts. The interviews were structured to elicit responses regarding the goals of education, discipline, student evaluation, curriculum, and special education. The responses made during the interviews were stated in concrete terms. However, particular statements regarding each of these areas were analyzed for other concepts expressed. For example, the statement "Teachers should follow the agreed-upon school curriculum" described not only an attitude toward a uniform curriculum but also an attitude toward teacher autonomy. That is, teachers may recognize a uniform curriculum but may choose not to follow it.

Analyzing each of the five areas considered important to public school educators--the goals of education, discipline, student evaluation, curriculum, and special education--resulted in the

generation of specific ideas from which the egalitarian and meritocratic items would be devised. Under the "goals of education," statements were extracted that reflected efforts to ensure student success, specific goals of public secondary schools, goals of schooling, and the evaluation of schools' efforts to meet these goals. This concept includes the belief that the goal of schooling is to ensure success for all students by raising their achievement to the same level and by providing opportunities for each student to develop socially, emotionally, and intellectually.

"Discipline" was the second area analyzed. In addition to a general category on discipline, or the school's responsibility to work with unruly students, the other areas generated were due process for students being disciplined and personal choice in student dress. All of these topics reflect the egalitarian emphasis on individual student liberty and constitutional rights within the school.

The concept of student evaluation most epitomizes the polarity between egalitarianism and meritocracy or between differentiated and uniform standards. Although some areas may overlap with the application of standards to special education students, the concept of student evaluation can be described through the specific areas of promotion, retention, view of students' efforts, and differentiated diplomas. The egalitarian basis for these topics focuses on what Wilson (1966) described as the value of effort and determination.⁴ That is, student effort would be valued as a reason for promotion. The meritocratic view would endorse only the acquisition of knowledge or the lack of it as reasons for promotion or retention. The

statements regarding the "view of student efforts" also tests the respondent's value of effort versus the acquisition of knowledge as a determinant of student evaluation. The idea of differentiated diplomas is based on the meritocratic idea of achievement as an indicator of specific standards the student has met in order to graduate.

The subject of "curriculum" concerns what Cusick described as the secondary schools' obligation to "take, retain and interest" all students. This egalitarian concept focuses on the wide variety of elective classes offered in hopes of meeting "educational needs" of students.⁵ High school academic teachers who were interviewed also indicated some students' preference for work-study (co-op) programs (designed to meet the needs of students who wished to work and receive academic credit) over non-income-producing academic classes. The meritocratic process of grouping or tracking students is still another aspect of curriculum. The practice of differentiating students by ability is opposed by egalitarians because it lessens student chances for social mobility (Bowles and Gintis, Katz).⁶ Whether to track students or not generates the question of uniform standards for particular subjects. The meritocratic need is for uniform standards throughout the school district, while the egalitarian supports curriculum standards based on the specific academic needs of individual classes.

The subject of special education generated considerable concern from those educators interviewed. Mainstreaming, evaluation of special education students in regular classrooms, professional

responsibility for special education students, and the management of emotionally impaired students were the areas of greatest concern. Some interviewees expressed a sense of responsibility for special education students, whereas others stressed that uniform standards for achievement and behavior should apply to any student enrolled in regular education classes.

Two additional areas were repeatedly described by the interviewees as important factors in secondary education. The educators cited the egalitarian practice of the school supplying the student with paper, pencils, and textbooks as detrimental to the student's sense of responsibility for his own education. Another major issue was the lack of a predetermined standard regarding the number of days that a student must attend school in order to be promoted. The topics of attendance and school supplies were added to the 17 topics previously generated.

Selection of the Q-Sort Items

Following the analysis of the concepts, specific items were developed in order to operationalize each concept. These items were stated in two ways. First, each idea was stated from an egalitarian point of view, reflecting the importance of individualism in terms of the concept. Second, each idea was then stated in meritocratic terms that reflected a sense of uniform standards as applied to each concept.

A consideration of prime importance was that the Q-sort items represent a broad range of school policy areas, especially those

resulting from state and federal mandated egalitarian efforts to meet the educational needs of the disadvantaged and handicapped. Therefore, after reviewing federal programs and school laws regarding special education and discipline, items concerning bilingual education, the National School Lunch Program, and additional items on special education were added. Again, reviewing studies by Coleman, Bell, and Cusick also generated items regarding the responsibility and obligation of schooling. In total, 68 items were generated.

These items were viewed by professors, local teachers, counselors, and administrators in order to select items that were relevant to the content of the study. The number of items was then reduced to 62. These items were then again reviewed by professors, local teachers, counselors, and administrators in order to increase the clarity of meaning of each item and remove possible redundancies. This examination of the items was done on an individual basis between the researcher and the reviewer in order to provide the researcher with specific information regarding the applicability of each item. Those interviewed were asked to judge each item by the following criteria:

1. Is the meaning of each item clear to the reader?
2. Are any areas unrepresented by the item sample?
3. Are any areas overemphasized?

Following minor revisions in language, those considering the items indicated the language of the items was clear and that they represented established concepts.

Pilot Test

Before administering the Q-sort to the study population, a pilot test was run. Participants in the pilot test included four administrators, one counselor, seven teachers of academic subjects, and two teachers of nonacademic subjects. At the time of the pilot test, no special education teachers were available. Both junior and senior high school educators were represented in the sample. The pilot test was submitted to both a two-factor and three-factor solution. However, the three-factor solution was rejected on the basis that the third factor did not meet the Humphrey Test of "meaningfulness."

In the two-factor solution, both factors were described as "meaningful." (A complete description of the treatment of data is described below under heading of the same.) Analysis of the data under the two-factor solution indicated two types of belief patterns. The views of educators who clustered around Type I indicated a stronger agreement with statements reflecting a meritocratic viewpoint. Type II reflected those more frequently agreeing with egalitarian statements. The determination of agreement for each item was a Z-score of +1.0 or higher. The determination of disagreement for a particular item was a Z-score of -1.0 or lower.

The scores for each type were also reflective, indicating that Type I more consistently agreed with meritocratic statements and disagreed with egalitarian statements. For Type II, the opposite was true.

In the pilot test, the Item Descriptions and Descending Array of Z-scores for Type I indicates an agreement with items that generally reflect the meritocratic ideal as previously defined--that uniform standards should apply to all students.

ITEM DESCRIPTIONS AND DESCENDING
ARRAY TO Z-SCORES FOR TYPE I

ITEM DESCRIPTION	Z-SCORE
19. Students should not be promoted unless they have demonstrated appropriate levels of learning (PROMOTION). MERITOCRATIC	2.390
57. The obligation of schooling is to provide educational opportunity for those students who want to and are capable of learning (GOAL OF SCHOOLING). MERITOCRATIC	2.202
21. Students should be retained if they have not met the necessary standards (RETENTION). MERITOCRATIC	1.685
26. Teachers should pass only students who have met course requirements (VIEW OF STUDENT EFFORTS). MERITOCRATIC	1.432
7. Teachers should follow the agreed-upon curriculum (TEACHER AUTONOMY). MERITOCRATIC	1.318
53. The standards for a particular subject (math, English, etc.) should be uniform throughout the school district (STANDARDS). MERITOCRATIC	1.282
59. Students should be required to attend school for a specified number of days in order to pass (ATTENDANCE). MERITOCRATIC	1.262
43. Emotionally impaired students should be expected to meet the school's standards of good behavior (SPECIAL EDUCATION). MERITOCRATIC	1.202
52. Student achievement is the individual student's responsibility (RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACHIEVEMENT). MERITOCRATIC	1.170

- | | | |
|-----|---|-------|
| 11. | Both male and female students should have equal opportunity to select any elective (SEX EQUITY).
EGALITARIAN | 1.077 |
| 2. | We have to face the fact that not all students can succeed in school (SUCCESS). MERITOCRATIC | 1.004 |

Type I disagreed with egalitarian statements that rejected the use of standards, particularly in the areas of student dress, promotion, and retention.

ITEM DESCRIPTIONS AND DESCENDING
ARRAY OF Z-SCORES FOR TYPE I

ITEM DESCRIPTION	Z-SCORE
8. Lower-achieving students suffer in tracked classes (TRACKING). EGALITARIAN	-1.051
18. As long as their clothing does not interfere with education, students should be able to wear what they wish to school (DRESS CODE). EGALITARIAN	-1.124
23. At the high school level, co-op (work-study) programs have undermined the importance of academic learning (CO-OP). MERITOCRATIC	-1.202
22. Retention does not work at the secondary level (RETENTION). EGALITARIAN	-1.238
20. In general social promotion is an acceptable practice (PROMOTION). EGALITARIAN	-1.428
16. The school should provide the student with school supplies (SUPPLIES). EGALITARIAN	-1.670
12. Male and female students should select electives appropriate to their sex (SEX EQUITY). MERITOCRATIC	-1.795
60. Students should not be penalized just because of poor attendance (ATTENDANCE). EGALITARIAN	-2.185
51. Assurance of individual student achievement is the school's responsibility (RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACHIEVEMENT). EGALITARIAN	-2.221

Those clustering under Type II indicated agreement with egalitarian items that reflected the school's responsibility to meet the needs of the individual. Items concerned with elective class offerings, special education, and the obligation of the schools to teach the whole child and provide opportunities for individual student success were rated highly by those identifying with egalitarian statements. The exception in the ranking for Type II was generally the agreement given to meritocratic statements concerning discipline and students' attitudes toward schooling.

ITEM DESCRIPTIONS AND DESCENDING
ARRAY OF Z-SCORES FOR TYPE II

ITEM DESCRIPTION	Z-SCORE
49. The goal of secondary schools is to develop each student socially, emotionally and intellectually (GOAL OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS). EGALITARIAN	2.238
47. A wide variety of elective classes allows students to develop their individual talents (ELECTIVES). EGALITARIAN	2.168
1. Every student should experience success in school (SUCCESS). EGALITARIAN	2.112
42. All teachers share in the responsibility to educate special education students (SPECIAL EDUCATION). EGALITARIAN	1.541
30. Due process for students has reduced the school's authority (DUE PROCESS). MERITOCRATIC	1.529
57. The obligation of schooling is to provide educational opportunity for those students who want to and are capable of learning (GOAL OF SCHOOLING). MERITOCRATIC	1.517
9. Schools spend too much time and effort with unruly students (DISCIPLINE). MERITOCRATIC	1.326

25.	Teachers should pass a student who has shown sincere effort (VIEW OF STUDENT EFFORTS). EGALITARIAN	1.317
35.	Mainstreaming has helped special education students (SPECIAL EDUCATION). EGALITARIAN	1.263
58.	The obligation of the school is to provide each student with a basic level of knowledge (GOAL OF SCHOOLING). EGALITARIAN	1.249
45.	The secondary school curriculum should maintain a large number of elective classes (ELECTIVES). EGALITARIAN	1.234
52.	Student achievement is the individual student's responsibility (RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACHIEVEMENT). MERITOCRATIC	1.100
8.	Teachers should respond to the needs of a particular class when deciding what material to teach (TEACHER AUTONOMY). EGALITARIAN	1.034

Type II found greatest disagreement in the meritocratic statements regarding special education. However, disagreement was also evident in the rejection of egalitarian attitudes toward student dress, due process, and the schools' responsibility for student achievement.

ITEM DESCRIPTIONS AND DESCENDING ARRAY OF Z-SCORES FOR TYPE II

ITEM DESCRIPTION	Z-SCORE
61. Schools should be judged on the academic achievements of their students (SCHOOL EVALUATION). MERITOCRATIC	-1.042
16. The school should provide the student with school supplies (SUPPLIES). EGALITARIAN	-1.044
46. There are too many elective choices in the secondary curriculum (ELECTIVES). MERITOCRATIC	-1.117
18. As long as their clothing does not interfere with education, students should be able to wear what they wish to school (DRESS CODE). EGALITARIAN	-1.176

31.	Due process procedures are necessary to protect student rights in the classroom (DUE PROCESS). EGALITARIAN	-1.183
40.	Special education students should be educated in special education classroom (SPECIAL EDUCATION). MERITOCRATIC	-1.486
41.	Special education students are the responsibility of the special education teachers (SPECIAL EDUCATION). MERITOCRATIC	-1.546
29.	Due process procedures are necessary to protect student rights (DUE PROCESS). EGALITARIAN	-1.566
36.	Special education students are not helped by mainstreaming (SPECIAL EDUCATION). MERITOCRATIC	-1.571
38.	Learning-disabled students should compete on an equal basis with other students in the classroom (SPECIAL EDUCATION). MERITOCRATIC	-1.691
51.	Assurance of individual student achievement is the school's responsibility (RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACHIEVEMENT). EGALITARIAN	-1.918

Type I and Type II

In the pilot test, certain groups of educators clustered at each type, indicating similar belief patterns. The seven teachers of academic classes clustered under Type I (meritocratic), and the two teachers of nonacademic classes clustered under Type II (egalitarian). The single counselor identified with Type II, while two administrators (high school) identified with Type I and the other two administrators (junior high) reflected Type II belief patterns.

Use of the Pilot Test

The pilot test was used not only to determine if particular types of values and belief patterns would emerge, but also to determine the quality and clarity of the items (statements). Following each

participant's completion of the Q-sort instrument, an interview was held to ascertain the clarity and intention of the items. Although the participants indicated that the content of the items was easily understood, the consistent reaction was that six of the items were redundant and caused unnecessary confusion in the responses. These six items were subsequently removed from the original 64 Q-sort items.

Summary

The results of the pilot test indicated that those educators tested had two distinct value and belief patterns regarding their commitment to egalitarianism and that these results supported the premise that some educators' value of the egalitarian ideal differed from the schools' commitment to it. Furthermore, it appeared, on a limited basis, that the function the educator serves in the school (i.e., teacher of academic or nonacademic classes) may reflect his commitment to egalitarianism. Thus, further study to determine the value and belief patterns of educators in terms of their commitment to egalitarianism in education appeared worthy of investigation.

Administration of the Q-Sort

Following the pilot test, the number of Q-sort items was reduced from 64 to 58 in order to further reduce redundancy in the items. The 58 statements were mimeographed onto 3 x 5 index cards suitable for sorting and were randomized for presentation to the respondents. Each participant was asked to sort the cards (items) into nine piles on a continuum ranging from very strongly agree to very strongly disagree, with varying degrees in between. These cards

were then placed in envelopes marked with the same degrees from very strongly agree to very strongly disagree. The participant was first required to read each item in the deck of 58 cards and then to select the 14 he/she most agreed with and place them in a pile on the left. The participant then sorted out the 14 he/she most disagreed with and placed them in a pile on the right. The remaining 30 cards, which reflected the respondent's most ambivalent feelings, were placed in the middle.

Next, the participant sorted through the 14 cards on the left (those items most agreed with) and further subdivided them, indicating more specific feelings of agreement. Three cards were placed in the envelope marked "very strongly agree," four cards were placed in the strongly agree envelope, and the remaining seven cards were placed in the moderately agree envelope. Participants were instructed to repeat the same procedure for the 14 cards on the right--those items the respondent disagreed with. The envelopes were labeled with degrees of disagreement; three cards were placed in the very strongly disagree envelope, four cards in the strongly disagree envelope, and seven cards in the moderately disagree envelope. Finally, the participant was instructed to place the remaining 30 cards in the center into envelopes reflecting the respondent's valuing of the items on the cards. Nine cards were placed in an envelope marked "slightly agree," nine cards were placed in the slightly disagree envelope, and the remaining 12 cards were placed in the envelope marked "neither agree nor disagree."

The participant was informed that it was allowable to go back and exchange the ranking of particular items, but the final distribution of the cards had to be in the following form:

Pile Number:	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Number of items:	3	4	7	9	12	9	7	4	3

The directions for completing the Q-sort were explained in an instruction sheet given to each of the participants. (See Appendix D.) A packet containing the Q-sort deck, the labeled envelopes, the directions, a cover letter, and a personal-information sheet was left with the participants for a few days so the process could be completed at their leisure.

Treatment of the Data

A Q-analysis computer program developed by N. Van Tubergen of the Mass Communications Research Bureau of the School of Journalism of the University of Iowa was used in the study.⁷ Data were processed in the following manner:

1. A Pearson product-moment correlation matrix was constructed by correlating every person's sort of the items with those of every other person's study. (Since the number of variables [persons] could not exceed the number of items, two separate matrices were produced from two separate analyses.)

2. Each matrix of intercorrelations was submitted to factor analysis so that individuals were variables and items were observations. A principal axis solution was obtained and submitted to a

varimax rotation which produced orthogonal factors. A factor represents a grouping of persons who have a common pattern of sorting the items.⁸ Therefore, each factor represents a group of persons with similar belief patterns.

3. Each pattern of sorting the items associated with each factor or type of person was estimated. This was done by weighting each item response of each person by the degree to which he/she is associated with a factor. The higher the degree of association with a given factor, the greater the weight the responses of that particular person. These weighted responses were then summed across each item separately. This produced an item array of weighted responses for each factor. These item arrays were then converted to Z-scores.

4. The item arrays were then arranged from most accepted to most rejected on the basis of their Z-scores. This provided a hierarchy of acceptance for each factor or type of person.

5. The Z-scores of the item arrays were compared for each factor to provide a measure of difference between the responses of each type to each item. A difference of 1.0 in Z-scores for an item was considered significant.

Validity

The purpose of this research was to test the theory that the value and belief patterns of teachers may not be consistent with the schools' commitment to the egalitarian ideal. Kerlinger defined the validity of the Q-sort to be: "If the theory is valid, and if the Q-sort adequately expresses the theory, two rather big ifs, the statistical analysis of the sorts should show the theory's validity."⁹

Reliability

Kerlinger said, "For statistical stability and reliability, a good range is from 60 to 90 cards." However, he acknowledged good results with as few as 40 items.¹⁰ For this study, 58 items was determined to represent the identified concepts.

Summary

The Q-method was selected as the statistical method in this research project. It was deemed appropriate because the Q-method requires the respondents to make comparative judgments regarding their values and beliefs that they might not otherwise make systematically. In this research, the participants selected randomized meritocratic or egalitarian value statements (items) that best reflected their values and beliefs concerning educational programs and policies.

The items were generated through 16 structured interviews with individuals representing various groups of educators and also through a review of the literature. Following a pilot test, the final 58 items of the Q-sort were administered to a group of 94 secondary educators from a large suburban school district, representing building administrators, counselors, special education teachers, teachers of academic classes, and teachers of nonacademic classes. The respondents prioritized the items in a forced-choice continuum from very strongly agree through seven other designations to very strongly disagree. The structure of each person's response approximated a normal curve.

Each response was coded and then submitted to a computer program. Since in a Q-technique the number of variables (94 respondents) cannot exceed the number of items (57), it was necessary to have two separate Q-analyses. The first analysis analyzed the responses of the 57 teachers of academic subjects, and the second analysis analyzed the responses of a total of 37 special education teachers, counselors, and administrators. A correlation matrix was constructed for each Q-analysis, which compared the responses of each participant to every other participant in the particular computer run. Each matrix was then submitted to varimax rotation, which produced orthogonal factors. Each factor represented a clustering of persons having common value and belief patterns or reflecting a "type" of person. Z-scores were then computed to measure the acceptance or rejection for each item by the particular type. A Z-score of +1.0 or higher indicated a significant acceptance of an item, and a Z-score of -1.0 or lower indicated a significant rejection of an item. This method was judged to be both valid and reliable.

Footnotes--Chapter III

¹Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research, 2nd ed. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973).

²Albert D. Talbott, "Q Technique and Its Methodology: A Brief Introduction and Consideration" (paper presented at the 1971 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, New York, February 1971).

³Ibid.

⁴John Wilson, Equality (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1966), p. 40.

⁵Philip Cusick, The Egalitarian Ideal and the American High School (New York: Longman, 1983).

⁶Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis, Schooling in Capitalist America (New York: Basic Books, 1976).

⁷James E. Ray, "A Study to Examine Belief Patterns About Teaching, Learning, and Classroom Organization Among Teachers, Administrators Engaged in Implementing Rational Management Models, and Elementary Principals" (Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1978).

⁸Talbott.

⁹Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964), p. 588.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 582.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine the value and belief patterns of various groups of teachers, counselors, and administrators in terms of the egalitarian ideal and the relationship of this value to the schools' commitment to provide an equally effective education for every student. It may be that teachers prefer a more meritocratic system of education and that tensions may exist as a result of the inconsistency between the teachers' value preferences and the institutionalization of egalitarian educational programs and policies.

The study was guided by the following exploratory questions:

1. Are teachers' value and belief patterns regarding their commitment to the egalitarian ideal consistent with the schools' commitment to provide an equally effective education for each student?
2. How do various groups of secondary educators, i.e., teachers of academic subjects, teachers of nonacademic subjects, special education teachers, counselors, and administrators, compare in their commitment to the egalitarian ideal?
3. Does conflict exist between the value and belief patterns of administrators who represent the goals of the organization and

thus the goal to provide an equally effective education for all students and the value and belief patterns of teachers who must actualize the goal in the classroom?

The schools' commitment to the egalitarian ideal was examined through investigation of the following areas: the goals of education, student evaluation, curriculum, discipline, and special education. The research focused on how each area was developed by and/or responded to societal pressures, federal mandates, and court decisions that attempted to actualize the egalitarian value that education be made equally effective for all children. The schools' obligation to "take, retain, and interest" all students despite the predilection of the student or the resources of the school became the responsibility of the teacher each day in the classroom.

To ascertain the beliefs of teachers and other groups of educators regarding the areas, 16 structured interviews were held. The results of these interviews were supplemented by a review of studies by Cusick, Coleman, Bell, Cedoline, and others as to how the schools' commitment to the egalitarian ideal was reflected in school policy and program as well as how it affected those who must actualize the ideal each day--namely, teachers, counselors, and administrators.

Analysis of the statements made by the interviewees, the studies cited, and particular federal programs affecting schools resulted in 64 items, subsequently reduced to 58, that were generated for the Q-sort. The items were written as pairs, one expressing an egalitarian viewpoint, value, or belief regarding the topic and the

other a meritocratic or opposite viewpoint. These 58 statements (items) were printed on 3 x 5 cards, randomized, and then submitted as a Q-sort to the participants.

The Q-sort was completed by a total of 94 teachers, counselors, and administrators from a large suburban school district. Each respondent sorted the 58 cards into nine piles according to the degree to which the participant either agreed or disagreed with the statement on the card. Respondents were allowed to place only a specific number of items in each pile so that their final distribution of the items was arranged as follows:

	Very Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Very Strongly Disagree
Pile no.	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
No. of cards	3	4	7	9	12	9	7	4	3

As indicated, the respondents placed three items they very strongly agreed with in pile 9, four items they strongly agreed with in pile 8, seven items they moderately agreed with in pile 7, nine items they slightly agreed with in pile 6, twelve items they neither agreed nor disagreed with in pile 5, nine items they slightly disagreed with in pile 4, seven items they moderately disagreed with in pile 3, four items they strongly disagreed with in pile 2, and three items they very strongly disagreed with in pile 1. The resulting distribution of items reflected an approximate normal curve of each

respondent's values and beliefs regarding these issues in terms of egalitarianism and meritocracy. For statistical purposes, each item was assigned a value based on the pile in which it was placed. The three items placed in pile 9 were each assigned a value of 9, the four items in pile 8 were each assigned a value of 8, the seven items placed in pile 7 were each assigned a value of 7, and so on. These values were transposed to code sheets, and an individual data-processing card for each respondent was obtained.

It was necessary to complete two analyses since Q-analysis does not allow the number of variables (respondents) to exceed the number of items. The respondents were categorized according to the function they serve in secondary education. Table 1 describes the participant composition of the first Q-analysis.

Table 1.--Participant composition--first Q-analysis.

Position	Number	Percentage
Academic teachers	38	66.7
Nonacademic teachers	19	33.3
Totals	57	100.0

The group that comprised the first analysis were 57 teachers who were identified as either teachers of academic subjects (38) or teachers of nonacademic subjects (19). Table 2 describes the participant composition of the second Q-analysis.

Table 2.--Participant composition--second Q-analysis.

Position	Number	Percentage
Special education teachers	12	32.43
Counselors	12	32.43
Administrators	13	35.14
Totals	37	100.00

The second analysis included the remaining 37 respondents. This group contained 12 special education teachers, 12 counselors, and 13 building administrators (principals and assistant principals). Teachers of academic and nonacademic subjects were grouped together for the first analysis because, as a total group, they deal directly with almost all students. Special education teachers, counselors, and administrators, on the other hand, deal with students on a more selective or indirect basis and were therefore included in the second group (second analysis). All participants were from either the junior or senior high levels.

In each analysis, matrices of intercorrelations were formed by correlating every person's sort with every other person's sort. In the first analysis (hereafter referred to as Teachers), the teachers instructing academic and nonacademic classes were correlated with each other. In the second analysis (hereafter referred to as Specialists), the responses of the special education teachers, counselors, and administrators were each correlated with one another.

Each matrix was then submitted to analysis with items as observations and persons as variables. A principal axis solution

was obtained and submitted to a varimax rotation. From the varimax rotation, three orthogonal factors were produced from the Teachers group (academic and nonacademic) and two orthogonal factors were produced for the Specialists group (special education teachers, counselors, and administrators).

For the Teachers group data on three factors appeared meaningful. Humphrey's test (a test that measures the significance of each factor) verified that the three factors were meaningful. The eigenvalues for the Teachers group indicating the strength of the factors were as follows: 18.2 for Factor 1, 6.1 for Factor 2, and 2.8 for Factor 3. The percentages of variance of the trace which measures the amount of information explained by each factor or type were as follows: 32 percent for Factor 1, 11 percent for Factor 2, and 5 percent for Factor 3. Factor or Type 1 is obviously the strongest factor of the three factors of the Teachers group.

In the second analysis, Humphrey's test indicated two factors as meaningful for the Specialists group (special education teachers, counselors, and administrators). The arrived eigenvalue of 13.1 for Factor 1 and 2.9 for Factor 2 indicated that both were meaningful. The percentage of variance of the trace for Type 1 is 44 percent and for Type 2 is 10 percent. Type 1 of the Specialists group explains more of the information for the second Q-analysis and is the stronger type. A description of how the particular respondents clustered around each factor is described in a subsequent section of this chapter.

Clarification of Types

Since two distinct Q-analyses were made and each produced its own meaningful factors or types 1 and 2 (i.e., Type 1 for the Teachers group, Type 2 for the Teachers group, Type 3 for the Teachers group; and Type 1 for the Specialists group and Type 2 for the Specialists group), the types for the Specialists group will be distinguished by changing their numbers. Type 1 for the Specialists group will be changed to the title of Type 4, and Type 2 for the Specialists group will become Type 5. Thus the Teachers group types are Type 1, Type 2, and Type 3. The types for the Specialists group are Type 4 and Type 5. Table 3 indicates the participant composition by type.

Table 3.--Participant composition by type.

	Type 1	Type 2	Type 3	Type 4	Type 5
Teachers (academic)	21	7	10	0	0
Teachers (nonacademic)	4	4	11	0	0
Teachers (special education)	0	0	0	8	4
Counselors	0	0	0	10	2
Administrators	0	0	0	6	7
Totals	25	11	21	24	13

Selected Characteristics of Participants

Ninety-four school personnel from a large, all-white suburban school district participated in the study. The group labeled as "teachers" included teachers of academic subjects and teachers of

nonacademic subjects. This total group of 57 teachers comprised the first analysis. The second group, comprised of special education teachers, counselors, and administrators, is labeled as "specialists." The second analysis was comprised of these three groups to form a total of 37 specialists.

Table 4 indicates the age, in years, of the total group of participants. The majority of the total participants (66 percent) fell within the age ranges 31-36 and 37-43.

Table 4.--Age analysis in years.

Age	Teachers	Specialists	Total by Age Range	Percentage of Study
Under 30	1	2	3	3.2
31-36	23	10	33	35.1
37-43	20	9	29	30.9
44-50	9	7	16	17.0
50 plus	4	9	13	13.8
Totals	57	37	94	100.0

Table 5 indicates that the female participants comprised 57.4 percent of the study. However, the Specialist group was almost evenly divided between male and female respondents.

The secondary level in which the participants work is presented in Table 6. The majority of the Teachers group and 52.1 percent of the total study were junior high school educators. The Specialists group participants had slightly greater representation from the senior high school level.

Table 5.--Sex of participants.

Sex	Teachers	Specialists	Total by Sex	Percentage of Study
Male	22	18	40	42.6
Female	35	19	54	57.4
Totals	57	37	94	100.0

Table 6.--Secondary level.

Level	Teachers	Specialists	Total by Level	Percentage of Study
Junior high school	32	17	49	52.1
Senior high school	25	20	45	47.9
Totals	57	37	94	100.0

Table 7 presents the participants' years of experience in the education profession. The largest group (47.9 percent) of the total participants had 9 to 16 years of experience in education. Nineteen of the 57 teachers had from 17 to 24 years of experience, and 12 of the 37 specialists had more than 25 years of experience.

Table 7.--Years of experience.

Experience in Years	Teachers	Specialists	Total by Years of Experience	Percentage of Study
1- 8	6	2	8	8.5
9-16	30	15	45	47.9
17-24	19	8	27	28.7
25 plus	2	12	14	14.9
Totals	57	37	94	100.0

Item Typal Belief Patterns

Five "types" reflecting five belief patterns regarding the relative importance of these educators' commitment to the egalitarian ideal of providing an equally effective education for all students were identical. These five types represent the five factors that were formed as a result of analyzing the data. To produce the item patterns (belief patterns) for each type, the program weighted each item response of each person by the degree to which the individual was associated with a particular type. The higher the degree of association with a given type, the greater the weight of responses of that particular person. These weighted responses were then summed across each item separately, producing an item array of weighted responses for each type. These item arrays were then converted to Z-scores. The numerical value of the Z-scores reflects the item believed to be most important by those respondents identifying with a specific type through the expression of similar values regarding

egalitarianism in education. Correspondingly, the lowest Z-score reflects the item considered least important by a particular type.

Structure of the Data

The data for each type or factor are presented in table form through an ordered listing of the items and the Z-score value for each item ranging from the item (belief statement) most agreed with to the item (belief statement) most rejected by those persons identifying with the particular factor or "type." The item number is listed on the left side of the page, followed by the item description. The educational concept that the item represents and the value content of the statement (egalitarian or meritocratic) are in parentheses following each item description. The Z-score values for each item are listed to the right of the item. For the purposes of this study, items ranking one or more standard deviations above or below the mean were considered to be significant. Those items with a Z-score value of +1.0 or higher were items that respondents identifying with the particular belief pattern or "type" strongly agreed. Items with Z-score values of -1.0 or below represented values or beliefs that were rejected or strongly disagreed with by persons identified with that particular type.

First Analysis: Teachers Group

The first analysis analyzed the responses of the total of 57 teachers of academic and nonacademic subjects according to the Q-methodology. A correlation matrix was formed and submitted to a varimax rotation. The varimax rotation produced three orthogonal

factors or "types" indicating clustering or similarity of value and belief patterns regarding meritocracy and egalitarianism for this total group of teachers. The three types that emerged are described as meritocratic-oriented teachers, combination meritocratic/egalitarian-oriented teachers, and egalitarian-oriented teachers. The selected personal characteristics of the respondents whose value and belief patterns are described by each type are indicated below.

Type 1 (Meritocratic-Oriented Teacher) Belief Patterns

The ranking of value and belief statements for those teachers who are most associated with a meritocratic view of secondary education is presented in Table 8. From the ranking of the items, it is apparent that these teachers value specific standards against which to measure student achievement. These values are most significantly related to the areas of student promotion and retention, as indicated by the three highest ranked items. This group of teachers (N = 25), which included 21 teachers of academic classes and 4 teachers of nonacademic classes, valued student promotion only on the basis of specific levels of achievement and retention if the level of achievement was not attained. The concept of specific standards was also supported by Type 1 in the areas of attendance, curriculum, and student evaluation. These teachers indicated that students should meet minimum attendance requirements in order to pass and should be evaluated on a standard of knowledge rather than on the effort the student exhibits in the learning process. The teachers included in Type 1 also applied standards to themselves by strongly agreeing that

teachers should follow the agreed-upon school curriculum rather than responding to the needs of a particular class.

The concept of student responsibility for education was also highly valued by this group. They indicated that students should be responsible to pay for their own supplies and are responsible for their own achievement as well. The group acknowledged and accepted the fact that not all students would or could accept responsibility for their achievement and therefore would not be successful in school.

The only egalitarian concept this group agreed with was regarding sex equity. All of the groups strongly agreed that both male and female students should have the option to select any elective they desire. It is interesting, however, that this was the only group of the five not to rank the egalitarian items that the goal of secondary schools is to develop each student socially, emotionally, and intellectually and that a wide variety of electives helps students to develop their individual talents.

Type 1 was also reflective in rejecting other egalitarian concepts. That is, this group rejected with equal intensity the polarized egalitarian concepts that matched the meritocratic items with which they had significantly agreed. For example, the area of strongest agreement was the meritocratic belief that students should not be promoted unless they had demonstrated appropriate levels of learning. Likewise, the area of strongest disagreement was the counter-poised egalitarian concept that social promotion or promotion without standards is an acceptable practice. These and other items

Table 8.--Item descriptions and descending array of Z-scores for meritocratic-oriented teachers
(significant items above +1.0).

Item	Item Description	Z-Score
23	Students should not be promoted unless they have demonstrated appropriate levels of learning. (PROMOTION) MERITOCRATIC	2.332
25	Students should be retained if they have not met the necessary standards. (RETENTION) MERITOCRATIC	1.975
30	Teachers should pass only students who have met course requirements. (VIEW OF STUDENT EFFORTS) MERITOCRATIC	1.654
59	Both male and female students should have equal opportunity to select any elective. (SEX EQUITY) EGALITARIAN	1.621
19	Students should pay for their own school supplies. (SUPPLIES) MERITOCRATIC	1.324
48	Student achievement is the individual student's responsibility. (RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACHIEVEMENT) MERITOCRATIC	1.257
55	Students should be required to attend school for a specified number of days in order to pass. (ATTENDANCE) MERITOCRATIC	1.206
13	Teachers should follow the agreed-upon curriculum. (TEACHER AUTONOMY) MERITOCRATIC	1.162
51	Grades should reflect knowledge rather than effort. (STUDENT EVALUATION) MERITOCRATIC	1.018
46	The goal of secondary schools is to prepare students for jobs or college. (GOAL OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS) MERITOCRATIC	1.007

Table 8.--Continued.

Item	Item Description	Z-Score
12	We have to face the fact that not all students can succeed in school. (SUCCESS) MERITOCRATIC	1.001
15	Schools spend too much time and effort with unruly students. (DISCIPLINE) MERITOCRATIC	.973
17	High schools should award different diplomas based on level of achievement. (DIFFERENTIATED DIPLOMAS) MERITOCRATIC	.649
49	The standards for a particular subject (math, English, etc.) should be uniform throughout the school district. (STANDARDS) MERITOCRATIC	.643
45	The goal of secondary schools is to develop each student socially, emotion- ally, and intellectually. (GOAL OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS) EGALITARIAN	.626
64	Students should be able to use the English language before they are placed in the classroom. (BILINGUAL) MERITOCRATIC	.611
39	Emotionally impaired students should be expected to meet the school's standards of good behavior. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) MERITOCRATIC	.581
66	Student rights policies have reduced the teacher's authority. (DUE PROCESS) MERITOCRATIC	.529
58	Schools should be judged on the efforts they make to meet the needs of their students. (SCHOOL EVALUATION) EGALITARIAN	.486
43	A wide variety of elective classes allows students to develop their individual talents. (ELECTIVES) EGALITARIAN	.421

Table 8.--Continued.

Item	Item Description	Z-Score
50	Teachers should have the right to determine the standards for each of their classes. (STANDARDS) EGALITARIAN	.388
44	Too many elective classes undermines the importance of academic classes. (ELECTIVES) MERITOCRATIC	.362
21	Schools should have specific dress codes for students. (DRESS CODE) MERITOCRATIC	.224
31	Mainstreaming has helped special education students. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) EGALITARIAN	.178
42	There are too many elective choices in the secondary curriculum. (ELECTIVES) MERITOCRATIC	.121
53	The obligation of schooling should be to educate only those students who want to learn. (GOAL OF SCHOOLING) MERITOCRATIC	.099
27	At the high school level, co-op (work-study) programs have undermined the importance of academic learning. (CO-OP) MERITOCRATIC	.050
35	Special education students should be educated in the least restrictive environment. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) EGALITARIAN	.046
65	Teachers should be careful to protect the student's individual rights. (DUE PROCESS) EGALITARIAN	.041

that Type 1 most strongly disagreed with are presented in Table 9. These items have a Z-score value of -1.0 or lower. The items primarily refer to the teachers' rejection of egalitarian practices that do not include a definitive standard or norm. Items that negate the student's responsibility for his own achievement, supplies, and attendance are also rejected.

Type 2 (Combination Meritocratic/
Egalitarian-Oriented Teacher)
Belief Patterns

Type 2 (N = 11) included seven teachers of academic subjects and four teachers of nonacademic subjects. Table 10 presents the array of item statements this group most strongly agreed with, as indicated by the Z-scores of +1.0 or higher. Unlike the other groups, who followed a fairly consistent value and belief pattern reflecting either an egalitarian or meritocratic point of view, this type agreed with items reflecting both values. The most strongly accepted item was the egalitarian concept that the goal of secondary schools is to develop each student socially, emotionally, and intellectually. This egalitarian reaction to student needs is indicated in the importance placed on offering a wide variety of elective classes to develop individual student talents, allowing teachers to determine their own standards for particular classes, and assuring that every student should experience success in school.

In contrast to these egalitarian beliefs, Type 2 also places a high value on student responsibility for achievement, supplies, and attendance, as evidenced by the significant ranking

Table 9.--Item descriptions and descending array of Z-scores for meritocratic-oriented teachers (significant items below -.10).

Item	Item Description	Z-Score
61	Schools should furnish a free or reduced-price lunch for students in financial need. (LUNCH PROGRAM) EGALITARIAN	-.002
62	It is not the school's responsibility to run a free or reduced-price lunch program. (LUNCH PROGRAM) MERITOCRATIC	-.073
36	Special education students should be educated in special education classrooms. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) MERITOCRATIC	-.144
37	Special education students are the responsibility of the special education teachers. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) MERITOCRATIC	
33	Regular education teachers should provide modified objectives for learning disabled students mainstreamed in their classes. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) EGALITARIAN	-.165
11	Every student should experience success in school. (SUCCESS) EGALITARIAN	-.187
40	Emotionally impaired students should be given more understanding when they misbehave. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) EGALITARIAN	-.197
67	When the slow students are tracked only with each other they lose the opportunity to learn from brighter students. (TRACKING) EGALITARIAN	-.208
41	The secondary school curriculum should maintain a large number of elective classes. (ELECTIVES) EGALITARIAN	-.220
38	All teachers share in the responsibility to educate special education students. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) EGALITARIAN	-.233

Table 9.--Continued.

Item	Item Description	Z-Score
63	The bilingual program is necessary to meet the educational needs of non-English-speaking students. (BILINGUAL) EGALITARIAN	-.234
28	Co-op (work-study) programs offer a way to meet the particular needs of many students. (CO-OP) EGALITARIAN	-.282
57	Schools should be judged on the academic achievements of their students. (SCHOOL EVALUATION) MERITOCRATIC	-.416
68	Tracking is essential for efficient learning. (TRACKING) MERITOCRATIC	-.551
32	Special education students are not helped by mainstreaming. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) MERITOCRATIC	-.590
14	Teachers should be able to decide the curriculum for each of their classes. (TEACHER AUTONOMY) EGALITARIAN	-.609
29	Teachers should pass a student who has shown sincere effort. (VIEW OF STUDENT EFFORTS) EGALITARIAN	-.634
34	Learning disabled students should compete on an equal basis with other students in the classroom. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) MERITOCRATIC	-.721
22	As long as their clothing does not interfere with education, students should be able to wear what they wish to school. (DRESS CODE) EGALITARIAN	-.722
16	It is the obligation of the school to find ways to help students with behavior problems. (DISCIPLINE) EGALITARIAN	-.984

Table 9.--Continued.

Item	Item Description	Z-Score
47	Assurance of individual student achievement is the school's responsibility. (RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACHIEVEMENT) EGALITARIAN	-1.509
20	The school should provide the student with school supplies. (SUPPLIES) EGALITARIAN	-1.513
60	Male and female students should select electives appropriate to their sex. (SEX EQUITY) MERITOCRATIC	-1.536
52	Grades should reflect level of effort more than knowledge attained. (STUDENT EVALUATION) EGALITARIAN	-1.609
26	Retention does not work at the secondary level. (RETENTION) EGALITARIAN	-1.649
18	All students should receive the same high school diploma when they graduate regardless of their level of achievement. (DIFFERENTIATE DIPLOMAS) EGALITARIAN	-1.782
54	The obligation of the schools is to make certain that all students reach the same basic level of knowledge. (GOAL OF SCHOOLING) EGALITARIAN	-1.794
56	Students should not be penalized just because of poor attendance. (ATTENDANCE) EGALITARIAN	-1.839
24	In general, social promotion is an acceptable practice. (PROMOTION) EGALITARIAN	-2.020

Table 10.--Item descriptions and descending array of Z-scores for combination meritocratic/egalitarian-oriented teachers (significant items above +1.0).

Item	Item Description	Z-Score
45	The goal of secondary schools is to develop each student socially, emotionally, and intellectually. (GOAL OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS) EGALITARIAN	2.458
23	Students should not be promoted unless they have demonstrated appropriate levels of learning. (PROMOTION) MERITOCRATIC	1.948
43	A wide variety of elective classes allows students to develop their individual talents. (ELECTIVES) EGALITARIAN	1.809
59	Both male and female students should have equal opportunity to select any elective. (SEX EQUITY) EGALITARIAN	1.647
50	Teachers should have the right to determine the standards for each of their classes. (STANDARDS) EGALITARIAN	1.563
55	Students should be required to attend school for a specified number of days in order to pass. (ATTENDANCE) MERITOCRATIC	1.382
48	Student achievement is the individual student's responsibility. (RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACHIEVEMENT) MERITOCRATIC	1.374
19	Students should pay for their own school supplies. (SUPPLIES) MERITOCRATIC	1.197

Table 10.--Continued.

Item	Item Description	Z-Score
11	Every student should experience success in school. (SUCCESS) EGALITARIAN	1.064
41	The secondary school curriculum should maintain a large number of elective classes. (ELECTIVES) EGALITARIAN	.978
37	Special education students are the responsibility of the special education teachers. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) MERITOCRATIC	.951
14	Teachers should be able to decide the curriculum for each of their classes. (TEACHER AUTONOMY) EGALITARIAN	.946
25	Students should be retained if they have not met the necessary standards. (RETENTION) MERITOCRATIC	.920
46	The goal of secondary schools is to prepare students for jobs or college. (GOAL OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS) MERITOCRATIC	.883
36	Special education students should be educated in special education classrooms. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) MERITOCRATIC	.794
30	Teachers should pass only students who have met course requirements. (VIEW OF STUDENT EFFORTS) MERITOCRATIC	.780

Table 10.--Continued.

Item	Item Description	Z-Score
28	Co-op (work-study) programs offer a way to meet the particular needs of many students. (CO-OP) EGALITARIAN	.687
49	The standards for a particular subject (math, English, etc.) should be uniform throughout the school district. (STANDARDS) MERITOCRATIC	.538
64	Students should be able to use the English language before they are placed in the classroom. (BILINGUAL) MERITOCRATIC	.461
39	Emotionally impaired students should be expected to meet the school's standards of good behavior. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) MERITOCRATIC	.449
62	It is not the school's responsibility to run a free or reduced-price lunch program. (LUNCH PROGRAM) MERITOCRATIC	.324
12	We have to face the fact that not all students can succeed in school. (SUCCESS) MERITOCRATIC	.269
65	Teachers should be careful to protect the student's rights. (DUE PROCESS) EGALITARIAN	.072
21	Schools should have specific dress codes for students. (DRESS CODE) MERITOCRATIC	.031

given to these areas. Meritocratic standards as the basis for promotion are also considered important.

The items that Type 2 strongly disagree with have a Z-score value of -1.0 or lower and are presented in Table 11. In keeping with the value and belief patterns of the agreement items for Type 2, the items Type 2 disagrees with also include both egalitarian and meritocratic beliefs. The items concerning sex equity, student attendance, student responsibility for school supplies, and elective classes as a way of meeting individual student needs are reflective. That is, they reflect the opposite sentiment of the same area indicated in the agreement section. Overall, however, Type 2 recognizes the meritocratic need for standards along with the egalitarian emphasis of responding to particular student needs. In addition, this group rejects the meritocratic idea that the obligation of the school is to educate only those who want to learn.

Type 3 (Egalitarian-Oriented Teacher) Belief Patterns

Teachers who identify with the egalitarian ideal constitute the third significant type in the teacher group. The items ranked most important in this group have a Z-score of +1.0 or higher and are presented in Table 12. In contrast to the meritocratic Type 1 group, who strongly favored specific standards to measure achievement, Type 3 values educational programs and policies designed to meet the needs of individual students. This type, like all but Type 1, believes that the goal of secondary schools is to develop each student socially, emotionally, and intellectually and places almost equal

Table 11.--Item descriptions and descending array of Z-scores for combination meritocratic/egalitarian-oriented teachers (significant items below -.10).

Item	Item Description	Z-Score
51	Grades should reflect knowledge rather than effort. (STUDENT EVALUATION) MERITOCRATIC	-.013
40	Emotionally impaired students should be given more understanding when they misbehave. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) EGALITARIAN	-.038
33	Regular education teachers should provide modified objectives for learning disabled students mainstreamed in their classes. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) EGALITARIAN	-.060
17	High schools should award different diplomas based on level of achievement. (DIFFERENTIATED DIPLOMAS) MERITOCRATIC	-.063
66	Student rights policies have reduced the teacher's authority. (DUE PROCESS) MERITOCRATIC	-.088
67	When the slow students are tracked only with each other they lose the opportunity to learn from brighter students. (TRACKING) EGALITARIAN	-.125
58	Schools should be judged on the efforts they make to meet the needs of their students. (SCHOOL EVALUATION) EGALITARIAN	-.165
13	Teachers should follow the agreed-upon curriculum. (TEACHER AUTONOMY) MERITOCRATIC	-.172
47	Assurance of individual student achievement is the school's responsibility. (RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACHIEVEMENT) EGALITARIAN	-.179

Table 11.--Continued.

Item	Item Description	Z-Score
29	Teachers should pass a student who has shown sincere effort. (VIEW OF STUDENT EFFORTS) EGALITARIAN	-.182
63	The bilingual program is necessary to meet the educational needs of non-English-speaking students. (BILINGUAL) EGALITARIAN	-.250
54	The obligation of the schools is to make certain that all students reach the same basic level of knowledge. (GOAL OF SCHOOLING) EGALITARIAN	-.300
16	It is the obligation of the school to find ways to help students with behavior problems. (DISCIPLINE) EGALITARIAN	
18	All students should receive the same high school diploma when they graduate, regardless of their level of achievement. (DIFFERENTIATED DIPLOMAS) EGALITARIAN	-.449
38	All teachers share in the responsibility to educate special education students. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) EGALITARIAN	-.455
32	Special education students are not helped by mainstreaming. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) MERITOCRATIC	-.475
68	Tracking is essential for efficient learning. (TRACKING) MERITOCRATIC	-.477
31	Mainstreaming has helped special education students. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) EGALITARIAN	-.526

Table 11.--Continued.

Item	Item Description	Z-Score
15	Schools spend too much time and effort with unruly students. (DISCIPLINE) MERITOCRATIC	-.773
24	In general, social promotion is an acceptable practice. (PROMOTION) EGALITARIAN	-.781
61	Schools should furnish a free or reduced-price lunch for students in financial need. (LUNCH PROGRAM) EGALITARIAN	-.792
35	Special education students should be educated in the least restrictive environment. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) EGALITARIAN	-.839
52	Grades should reflect level of effort more than knowledge attained. (STUDENT EVALUATION) EGALITARIAN	-.856
22	As long as their clothing does not interfere with education, students should be able to wear what they wish to school. (DRESS CODE) EGALITARIAN	-.969
44	Too many elective classes undermines the importance of academic classes. (ELECTIVES) MERITOCRATIC	-1.072
26	Retention does not work at the secondary level. (RETENTION) EGALITARIAN	-1.163

Table 11.--Continued.

Item	Item Description	Z-Score
34	Learning disabled students should compete on an equal basis with other students in the classroom. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) MERITOCRATIC	-1.216
57	Schools should be judged on the academic achievements of their students. (SCHOOL EVALUATION) MERITOCRATIC	-1.337
60	Male and female students should select electives appropriate to their sex. (SEX EQUITY) MERITOCRATIC	-1.390
27	At the high school level, co-op (work-study) programs have undermined the importance of academic learning. (CO-OP) MERITOCRATIC	-1.416
53	The obligation of schooling should be to educate only those students who want to learn. (GOAL OF SCHOOLING) MERITOCRATIC	-1.528
42	There are too many elective choices in the secondary curriculum. (ELECTIVES) MERITOCRATIC	-1.553
56	Students should not be penalized just because of poor attendance. (ATTENDANCE) EGALITARIAN	-1.630
20	The school should provide the student with school supplies. (SUPPLIES) EGALITARIAN	-1.881

Table 12.--Item descriptions and descending array of Z-scores for egalitarian-oriented teachers
(significant items above +1.0).

Item	Item Description	Z-Score
45	The goal of secondary schools is to develop each student socially, emotionally, and intellectually. (GOALS OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS) EGALITARIAN	2.333
11	Every student should experience success in school. (SUCCESS) EGALITARIAN	2.042
59	Both male and female students should have equal opportunity to select any elective. (SEX EQUITY) EGALITARIAN	2.038
43	A wide variety of elective classes allows students to develop their individual talents. (ELECTIVES) EGALITARIAN	1.392
28	Co-op (work-study) programs offer a way to meet the particular needs of many students. (CO-OP) EGALITARIAN	1.281
38	All teachers share in the responsibility to educate special education students. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) EGALITARIAN	1.272
58	Schools should be judged on the efforts they make to meet the needs of their students. (SCHOOL EVALUATION) EGALITARIAN	1.208
33	Regular education teachers should provide modified objectives for learning disabled students mainstreamed in their classes. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) EGALITARIAN	1.104
31	Mainstreaming has helped special education students. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) EGALITARIAN	1.012
25	Students should be retained if they have not met the necessary standards. (RETENTION) MERITOCRATIC	.911

Table 12.--Continued.

Item	Item Description	Z-Score
46	The goal of secondary schools is to prepare students for jobs or college. (GOAL OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS) MERITOCRATIC	.878
16	It is the obligation of the school to find ways to help students with behavior problems. (DISCIPLINE) EGALITARIAN	.825
65	Teachers should be careful to protect the student's individual rights. (DUE PROCESS) EGALITARIAN	.820
23	Students should not be promoted unless they have demonstrated appropriate levels of learning. (PROMOTION) MERITOCRATIC	.814
67	When the slow students are tracked only with each other, they lose the opportunity to learn from brighter students. (TRACKING) EGALITARIAN	.742
19	Students should pay for their own school supplies. (SUPPLIES) MERITOCRATIC	.706
40	Emotionally impaired students should be given more understanding when they misbehave. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) EGALITARIAN	.603
47	Assurance of individual student achievement is the school's responsibility. (RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACHIEVEMENT) EGALITARIAN	.538
55	Students should be required to attend school for a specified number of days in order to pass. (ATTENDANCE) MERITOCRATIC	.499
41	The secondary school curriculum should maintain a large number of elective classes. (ELECTIVES) EGALITARIAN	.443

Table 12.--Continued.

Item	Item Description	Z-Score
13	Teachers should follow the agreed-upon curriculum. (TEACHER AUTONOMY) MERITOCRATIC	.434
62	It is not the school's responsibility to run a free or reduced-price lunch program. (LUNCH PROGRAM) MERITOCRATIC	.410
39	Emotionally impaired students should be expected to meet the school's standards of good behavior. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) MERITOCRATIC	.396
63	The bilingual program is necessary to meet the educational needs of non-English- speaking students. (BILINGUAL) EGALITARIAN	
17	High schools should award different diplomas based on level of achievement. (DIFFERENTIATED DIPLOMAS) MERITOCRATIC	.369
29	Teachers should pass a student who has shown sincere effort. (VIEW OF STUDENT EFFORTS) EGALITARIAN	.360
49	The standards for a particular subject (math, English, etc.) should be uniform throughout the school district. (STANDARDS) MERITOCRATIC	.326
50	Teachers should have the right to determine the standards for each of their classes. (STANDARDS) EGALITARIAN	.190
30	Teachers should pass only students who have met course requirements. (VIEW OF STUDENT EFFORTS) MERITOCRATIC	.149

importance on the value of success for every students. These teachers believe that all teachers share in the responsibility to educate special education students and that regular education objectives should be modified to meet the particular learning disabilities of these students. Such egalitarian efforts of schools to meet individual needs are also reflected in ranking given to the importance of co-op programs and varied elective course offerings. This group differed from the teacher groups but was consistent with the two types of special education, counselor, and administrative groups in their belief that schools should be judged on the effort they make to meet the needs of all students.

The Type 3 group ($N = 21$) was almost evenly split between teachers of academic subjects (10) and teachers of nonacademic subjects (11). However, the representation of the latter group was the highest of the three teacher groups. In the Type 1 group, the non-academic teachers comprised 21 percent of the total group (meritocratic), and in Type 2 (combination meritocratic-egalitarian), the nonacademic teachers comprised 21 percent of the total. Based on their representation in the third group, 58 percent, it appears that teachers of nonacademic subjects place a higher value on the egalitarian statements.

The items with which Type 3 most strongly disagrees have a Z-score of -1.0 or lower and are presented in Table 13. This type is consistent with the other teacher groups in strongly rejecting student selection of electives based on sex, the lack of standards for student attendance, the responsibility of the school to provide

Table 13.--Item descriptions and descending array of Z-scores for egalitarian-oriented teachers
(significant items below -1.0).

Item	Item Description	Z-Score
64	Students should be able to use the English language before they are placed in the classroom. (BILINGUAL) MERITOCRATIC	-.084
22	As long as their clothing does not interfere with education, students should be able to wear what they wish to school. (DRESS CODE) EGALITARIAN	-.127
35	Special education students should be educated in the least restrictive environment. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) EGALITARIAN	-.153
15	Schools spend too much time and effort with unruly students. (DISCIPLINE) MERITOCRATIC	-.207
12	We have to face the fact that not all students can succeed in school. (SUCCESS) MERITOCRATIC	-.243
52	Grades should reflect level of effort more than knowledge attained. (STUDENT EVALUATION) EGALITARIAN	-.293
66	Student rights policies have reduced the teacher's authority. (DUE PROCESS) MERITOCRATIC	-.377
61	Schools should furnish a free or reduced-price lunch for students in financial need. (LUNCH PROGRAM) EGALITARIAN	-.443
26	Retention does not work at the secondary level. (RETENTION) EGALITARIAN	-.460
14	Teachers should be able to decide the curriculum for each of their classes. (TEACHER AUTONOMY) EGALITARIAN	-.479

Table 13.--Continued.

Item	Item Description	Z-Score
57	Schools should be judged on the academic achievements of their students. (SCHOOL EVALUATION) MERITOCRATIC	-.534
21	Schools should have specific dress codes for students. (DRESS CODE) MERITOCRATIC	-.545
68	Tracking is essential for efficient learning. (TRACKING) MERITOCRATIC	-.610
48	Student achievement is the individual student's responsibility. (RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACHIEVEMENT) MERITOCRATIC	-.640
51	Grades should reflect knowledge rather than effort. (STUDENT EVALUATION) MERITOCRATIC	-.746
18	All students should receive the same high school diploma when they graduate, regardless of their level of achievement. (DIFFERENTIATED DIPLOMAS) EGALITARIAN	-.953
56	Students should not be penalized just because of poor attendance. (ATTENDANCE) EGALITARIAN	-1.082
20	The school should provide the student with school supplies. (SUPPLIES) EGALITARIAN	-1.127
37	Special education students are the responsibility of the special education teachers. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) MERITOCRATIC	-1.149
44	Too many elective classes undermines the importance of academic classes. (ELECTIVES) MERITOCRATIC	-1.176

Table 13.--Continued.

Item	Item Description	Z-Score
42	There are too many elective choices in the secondary curriculum. (ELECTIVES) MERITOCRATIC	-1.193
24	In general, social promotion is an acceptable practice. (PROMOTION) EGALITARIAN	-1.195
53	The obligation of schooling should be to educate only those students who want to learn. (GOAL OF SCHOOLING) MERITOCRATIC	-1.202
32	Special education students are not helped by mainstreaming. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) MERITOCRATIC	-1.329
54	The obligation of the schools is to make certain that all students reach the same basic level of knowledge. (GOAL OF SCHOOLING) EGALITARIAN	-1.360
27	At the high school level, co-op (work-study) programs have undermined the importance of academic learning. (CO-OP) MERITOCRATIC	-1.439
36	Special education students should be educated in special education classrooms. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) MERITOCRATIC	-1.640
34	Learning disabled students should compete on an equal basis with other students in the classroom. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) MERITOCRATIC	-1.787
60	Male and female students should select electives appropriate to their sex. (SEX EQUITY) MERITOCRATIC	-1.904

student supplies, and the acceptability of social promotion. Type 3 differs from the other teacher groups, however, in its strong rejection of the meritocratic beliefs regarding special education. These items are reflective of the positive response given to the egalitarian beliefs regarding special education. The beliefs of Type 3 appear to be most consistent with those of Type 4.

Second Analysis (Specialists Group)

The second analysis consisted of the item analysis of the responses of 12 special education teachers, 12 counselors, and 13 administrators. The additional run was necessary since the Q-analysis technique used does not allow the number of variables or respondents (94) to exceed the number of items (58).

The first analysis of the responses of 57 classroom teachers (38 teachers of academic subjects and 19 teachers of nonacademic subjects) resulted in three factors or types. Type 1 is described as meritocratic, Type 2 as a combination of egalitarian and meritocratic, and Type 3 as egalitarian. The second analysis revealed two factors that will be described as Type 4 and Type 5.

Type 4 (Egalitarian-Oriented Special Education Teachers, Counselors, Administrators [Specialists]) Belief Patterns

Type 4 (N = 24) consists of eight special education teachers (67 percent of total special education teachers), ten counselors (83 percent of total counselors), and six administrators (46 percent of total administrators). The item array for Type 4 is presented in Table 14. The items that Type 4 most strongly agree with have a

Table 14.--Item descriptions and descending array of Z-scores for egalitarian-oriented specialists (significant items above +1.0).

Item	Item Description	Z-Score
45	The goal of secondary schools is to develop each student socially, emotionally, and intellectually. (GOAL OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS) EGALITARIAN	1.813
38	All teachers share in the responsibility to educate special education students. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) EGALITARIAN	1.723
31	Mainstreaming has helped special education students. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) EGALITARIAN	1.662
35	Special education students should be educated in the least restrictive environment. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) EGALITARIAN	1.656
43	A wide variety of elective classes allows students to develop their individual talents. (ELECTIVES) EGALITARIAN	1.522
59	Both male and female students should have equal opportunity to select any elective. (SEX EQUITY) EGALITARIAN	1.353
58	Schools should be judged on the efforts they make to meet the needs of their students. (SCHOOL EVALUATION) EGALITARIAN	1.288
28	Co-op (work-study) programs offer a way to meet the particular needs of many students. (CO-OP) EGALITARIAN	1.281
33	Regular education teachers should provide modified objectives for learning disabled students mainstreamed in their classes. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) EGALITARIAN	1.127

Table 14.--Continued.

Item	Item Description	Z-Score
65	Teachers should be careful to protect the student's individual rights. (DUE PROCESS) EGALITARIAN	1.107
11	Every student should experience success in school. (SUCCESS) EGALITARIAN	.972
16	It is the obligation of the school to find ways to help students with behavior problems. (DISCIPLINE) EGALITARIAN	.829
63	The bilingual program is necessary to meet the educational needs of non-English-speaking students. (BILINGUAL) EGALITARIAN	.804
40	Emotionally impaired students should be given more understanding when they misbehave. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) EGALITARIAN	.787
13	Teachers should follow the agreed-upon curriculum. (TEACHER AUTONOMY) MERITOCRATIC	.755
41	The secondary school curriculum should maintain a large number of elective classes. (ELECTIVES) EGALITARIAN	.661
55	Students should be required to attend school for a specified number of days in order to pass. (ATTENDANCE) MERITOCRATIC	.652
49	The standards for a particular subject (math, English, etc.) should be uniform throughout the school district. (STANDARDS) MERITOCRATIC	.628

Table 14.--Continued.

Item	Item Description	Z-Score
62	It is not the school's responsibility to run a free or reduced-price lunch program. (LUNCH PROGRAM) MERITOCRATIC	.612
46	The goal of secondary schools is to prepare students for job or college. (GOAL OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS) MERITOCRATIC	.543
12	We have to face the fact that not all students can succeed in school. (SUCCESS) MERITOCRATIC	.494
26	Retention does not work at the secondary level. (RETENTION) EGALITARIAN	.412
19	Students should pay for their own school supplies. (SUPPLIES) MERITOCRATIC	.363
29	Teachers should pass a student who has shown sincere effort. (VIEW OF STUDENT EFFORTS) EGALITARIAN	.354
47	Assurance of individual student achievement is the school's responsibility. (RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACHIEVEMENT) EGALITARIAN	.297
50	Teachers should have the right to determine the standards for each of their classes. (STANDARDS) EGALITARIAN	.288
67	When the slow students are tracked only with each other they lose the opportunity to learn from brighter students. (TRACKING) EGALITARIAN	.072

Z-score of +1.0 or above. The beliefs of Type 4, although not listed in the same priority, are most consistent with those of Type 3. These beliefs reflect a high value placed on the individual needs of students. In keeping with the beliefs of Types 2 and 3 and to a lesser extent Type 5, the most valued belief of Type 4 is the goal of secondary schools to develop each student socially, emotionally, and intellectually. Following this goal, Type 4 places a consistently high priority on the individual needs of special education students and their right to be educated with modified standards in the regular education program. Meeting the needs of all students is reflected in other values such as the desirability of a wide variety of elective classes and the importance of co-op programs. Type 4 agreed with Types 3 and 5 by giving exactly the same priority to the concept that schools should be judged on the efforts they make to meet the needs of all students.

The items rejected by Type 4 are primarily reflective of those highly valued. These significant items are listed in Table 15 and received a Z-score of -1.0 or lower. Type 4 rejects the meritocratic statements that fail to support programs and policies designed to meet individual student needs. The segregation of special education students is rejected, as is the statement that these students are solely the responsibility of the special education teacher. The limiting of the number of electives is also rejected. Type 4 believes that the goal of schools should be to educate all students and rejects the idea that the goal of schooling should be to educate only those students who wish to be educated.

Table 15.--Item descriptions and descending array of Z-scores for egalitarian-oriented specialists (significant items below -1.0).

Item	Item Description	Z-Score
23	Students should not be promoted unless they have demonstrated appropriate levels of learning. (PROMOTION) MERITOCRATIC	-.039
15	Schools spend too much time and effort with unruly students. (DISCIPLINE) MERITOCRATIC	-.103
21	Schools should have specific dress codes for students. (DRESS CODE) MERITOCRATIC	-.117
18	All students should receive the same high school diploma when they graduate, regardless of their level of achievement. (DIFFERENTIATED DIPLOMAS) EGALITARIAN	-.159
51	Grades should reflect knowledge rather than effort. (STUDENT EVALUATION) MERITOCRATIC	-.178
48	Student achievement is the individual student's responsibility. (RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACHIEVEMENT) MERITOCRATIC	-.186
39	Emotionally impaired students should be expected to meet the school's standards of good behavior. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) MERITOCRATIC	-.225
64	Students should be able to use the English language before they are placed in the classroom. (BILINGUAL) MERITOCRATIC	-.292
25	Students should be retained if they have not met the necessary standards. (RETENTION) MERITOCRATIC	-.329
22	As long as their clothing does not interfere with education, students should be able to wear what they wish to school. (DRESS CODE) EGALITARIAN	-.336

Table 15.--Continued.

Item	Item Description	Z-Score
52	Grades should reflect level of effort more than knowledge attained. (STUDENT EVALUATION) EGALITARIAN	-.367
57	Schools should be judged on the academic achievements of their students. (SCHOOL EVALUATION) EGALITARIAN	-.371
30	Teachers should pass only students who have met course requirements. (VIEW OF STUDENT EFFORTS) MERITOCRATIC	-.489
14	Teachers should be able to decide the curriculum for each of their classes. (TEACHER AUTONOMY) EGALITARIAN	-.494
68	Tracking is essential for efficient learning. (TRACKING) MERITOCRATIC	-.530
24	In general, social promotion is an acceptable practice. (PROMOTION) EGALITARIAN	-.532
20	The school should provide the student with school supplies. (SUPPLIES) EGALITARIAN	-.558
17	High schools should award different diplomas based on level of achievement. (DIFFERENTIATED DIPLOMAS) MERITOCRATIC	-.567
66	Student rights policies have reduced the teacher's authority. (DUE PROCESS) MERITOCRATIC	-.676
61	Schools should furnish a free or reduced-price lunch for students in financial need. (LUNCH PROGRAM) EGALITARIAN	-.833
53	The obligation of schooling should be to educate only those students who want to learn. (GOAL OF SCHOOLING) MERITOCRATIC	-1.053

Table 15.--Continued.

Item	Item Description	Z-Score
42	There are too many elective choices in the secondary curriculum. (ELECTIVES) MERITOCRATIC	-1.153
56	Students should not be penalized just because of poor attendance. (ATTENDANCE) EGALITARIAN	-1.304
54	The obligation of the schools is to make certain that all students reach the same basic level of knowledge. (GOAL OF SCHOOLING) EGALITARIAN	-1.331
44	Too many elective classes undermines the importance of academic classes. (ELECTIVES) MERITOCRATIC	-1.367
27	At the high school level, co-op (work-study) programs have undermined the importance of academic learning. (CO-OP) MERITOCRATIC	-1.499
37	Special education students are the responsibility of the special education teachers. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) MERITOCRATIC	-1.572
34	Learning disabled students should compete on an equal basis with other students in the classroom. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) MERITOCRATIC	-1.624
60	Male and female students should select electives appropriate to their sex. (SEX EQUITY) MERITOCRATIC	-1.670
36	Special education students should be educated in special education classrooms. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) MERITOCRATIC	-1.791
32	Special education students are not helped by mainstreaming. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) MERITOCRATIC	-2.312

Type 4 appears to be most like the egalitarian-oriented teacher, Type 3. However, the two types placed different priority on the items they most strongly agreed with (with the exception of the first and seventh ranked items) and also had some notable differences. Type 4 was the only group to strongly support the education of special education students in the least restrictive environment, which is the basis of PL 94-142, the special education law. Another unique item was Type 4's support of due process for students. Type 4 respondents believed it important for teachers to protect the rights of students.

Type 5 (Meritocratic-Oriented
Special Education Teachers,
Counselors, Administrators
[Specialists]) Belief Patterns

The values and beliefs most representative of Type 5 are indicated by a Z-score of +1.0 or higher and are presented in Table 16. Although designated as "meritocratic" in their values, this group (N = 13) of special education teachers (four or 33 percent of total special education teachers), counselors (two or 17 percent of total counselors), and administrators (seven or 54 percent of total administrators) does not share many of the same values as Type 1 (meritocratic-oriented teachers). Type 5 supported specific educational standards in more than half of the significant (+1.0 or higher) values in which the group was in agreement. These standards were applied to both teachers and students. Given highest priority was the belief that teachers should follow the agreed-upon curriculum. A similar sentiment was supported in the belief that academic standards for particular subjects should be uniform throughout the school

Table 16.--Item descriptions and descending array of Z-scores for meritocratic-oriented specialists (significant items above +1.0).

Item	Item Description	Z-Score
13	Teachers should follow the agreed-upon curriculum. (TEACHER AUTONOMY) MERITOCRATIC	1.913
23	Students should not be promoted unless they have demonstrated appropriate levels of learning. (PROMOTION) MERITOCRATIC	1.722
59	Both male and female students should have equal opportunity to select any elective. (SEX EQUITY) EGALITARIAN	1.674
25	Students should be retained if they have not met the necessary standards. (RETENTION) MERITOCRATIC	1.571
49	The standards for a particular subject (math, English, etc.) should be uniform throughout the school district. (STANDARDS) MERITOCRATIC	1.374
46	The goal of secondary schools is to prepare students for jobs or college. (GOAL OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS) MERITOCRATIC	1.286
58	Schools should be judged on the efforts they make to meet the needs of their students. (SCHOOL EVALUATION) EGALITARIAN	1.219
17	High schools should award different diplomas based on level of achievement. (DIFFERENTIATED DIPLOMAS) MERITOCRATIC	1.216
45	The goal of secondary schools is to develop each student socially, emotionally, and intellectually. (GOAL OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS) EGALITARIAN	1.197
15	Schools spend too much time and effort with unruly students. (DISCIPLINE) MERITOCRATIC	1.076

Table 16.--Continued.

Item	Item Description	Z-Score
43	A wide variety of elective classes allows students to develop their individual talents. (ELECTIVES) EGALITARIAN	1.051
48	Student achievement is the individual student's responsibility. (RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACHIEVEMENT) MERITOCRATIC	.992
30	Teachers should pass only students who have met course requirements. (VIEW OF STUDENT EFFORTS) MERITOCRATIC	.933
19	Students should pay for their own school supplies. (SUPPLIES) MERITOCRATIC	.862
51	Grades should reflect knowledge rather than effort. (STUDENT EVALUATION) MERITOCRATIC	.796
41	The secondary school curriculum should maintain a large number of elective classes. (ELECTIVES) EGALITARIAN	.760
38	All teachers share in the responsibility to educate special education students. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) EGALITARIAN	.752
39	Emotionally impaired students should be expected to meet the school's standards of good behavior. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) MERITOCRATIC	.669
28	Co-op (work-study) programs offer a way to meet the particular needs of many students. (CO-OP) EGALITARIAN	.593
31	Mainstreaming has helped special education students. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) EGALITARIAN	.520

Table 16.--Continued.

Item	Item Description	Z-Score
11	Every student should experience success in school. (SUCCESS) EGALITARIAN	.520
40	Emotionally impaired students should be given more understanding when they misbehave. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) EGALITARIAN	.465
12	We have to face the fact that not all students can succeed in school. (SUCCESS) MERITOCRATIC	.452
55	Students should be required to attend school for a specified number of days in order to pass. (ATTENDANCE) MERITOCRATIC	.343
33	Regular education teachers should provide modified objectives for learning disabled students mainstreamed in their classes. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) EGALITARIAN	.260
16	It is the obligation of the school to find ways to help students with behavior problems. (DISCIPLINE) EGALITARIAN	.213
65	Teachers should be careful to protect the student's individual rights. (DUE PROCESS) EGALITARIAN	.170
66	Student rights policies have reduced the teacher's authority. (DUE PROCESS) MERITOCRATIC	.079
67	When the slow students are tracked only with each other they lose the opportunity to learn from brighter students. (TRACKING) EGALITARIAN	.060

district. The meritocratic value that students meet predetermined levels of knowledge in order to be promoted is reflected in the significant Z-scores of the items dealing with student promotion and retention. This concept was also evident in the Type 5 priority on differentiated diplomas for students meeting various achievement levels. Although Type 5 supported the egalitarian concept that the goal of the secondary school was to develop each student socially, emotionally, and intellectually, it was the only group to hold the belief that schools spend too much time with unruly students. However, this group did support the concept that schools should be judged on the efforts they make to meet the needs of all students.

The belief statements with which Type 5 strongly disagrees have a Z-score of -1.0 or lower and are presented in Table 17. The egalitarian items concerning standards for student achievement regarding the issues of promotion, retention, differentiated diplomas, and teacher autonomy to decide the curriculum are reflective. Reflective means that the items, when stated in egalitarian terms, are as strongly disagreed with as those items are agreed with when stated in meritocratic terms. The exception for Type 5 to the application of standards for all students appears to be in the area of special education. The meritocratic ideas that mainstreaming has not helped special education students and that learning-disabled students should compete on an equal basis with regular education students were both rejected, as was the idea that co-op programs undermine the academic program. Like the other groups, Type 5 also rejected the lack of

Table 17.--Item descriptions and descending array of Z-scores for meritocratic-oriented specialists (significant items below -1.0).

Item	Item Description	Z-Score
57	Schools should be judged on the academic achievements of their students. (SCHOOL EVALUATION) MERITOCRATIC	-.018
62	It is not the school's responsibility to run a free or reduced-price lunch program. (LUNCH PROGRAM) MERITOCRATIC	-.083
22	As long as their clothing does not interfere with education, students should be able to wear what they wish to school. (DRESS CODE) EGALITARIAN	-.112
53	The obligation of schooling should be to educate only those students who want to learn. (GOAL OF SCHOOLING) MERITOCRATIC	-.233
61	Schools should furnish a free or reduced-price lunch for students in financial need. (LUNCH PROGRAM) EGALITARIAN	-.240
47	Assurance of individual student achievement is the school's responsibility. (RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACHIEVEMENT) EGALITARIAN	-.461
68	Tracking is essential for efficient learning. (TRACKING) MERITOCRATIC	-.468
64	Students should be able to use the English language before they are placed in the classroom. (BILINGUAL) MERITOCRATIC	-.507
37	Special education students are the responsibility of the special education teachers. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) MERITOCRATIC	-.529
44	Too many elective classes undermines the importance of academic classes. (ELECTIVES) MERITOCRATIC	-.554

Table 17.--Continued.

Item	Item Description	Z-Score
36	Special education students should be educated in special education classrooms. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) MERITOCRATIC	-.572
50	Teachers should have the right to determine the standards for each of their classes. (STANDARDS) EGALITARIAN	-.590
29	Teachers should pass a student who has shown sincere effort. (VIEW OF STUDENT EFFORTS) EGALITARIAN	-.658
35	Special education students should be educated in the least restrictive environment. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) EGALITARIAN	-.674
63	The bilingual program is necessary to meet the educational needs of non-English-speaking students. (BILINGUAL) EGALITARIAN	-.730
21	Schools should have specific dress codes for students. (DRESS CODE) MERITOCRATIC	-.783
24	In general, social promotion is an acceptable practice. (PROMOTION) EGALITARIAN	-.884
42	There are too many elective choices in the secondary curriculum. (ELECTIVES) MERITOCRATIC	-.964
32	Special education students are not helped by mainstreaming. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) MERITOCRATIC	-1.049
26	Retention does not work at the secondary level. (RETENTION) EGALITARIAN	-1.072

Table 17.--Continued.

Item	Item Description	Z-Score
34	Learning disabled students should compete on an equal basis with other students in the classroom. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) MERITOCRATIC	-1.176
56	Students should not be penalized just because of poor attendance. (ATTENDANCE) EGALITARIAN	-1.179
27	At the high school level, co-op (work-study) programs have undermined the importance of academic learning. (CO-OP) MERITOCRATIC	-1.204
20	The school should provide the student with school supplies. (SUPPLIES) EGALITARIAN	-1.214
14	Teachers should be able to decide the curriculum for each of their classes. (TEACHER AUTONOMY) EGALITARIAN	-1.578
52	Grades should reflect level of effort more than knowledge attained. (STUDENT EVALUATION) EGALITARIAN	-1.601
54	The obligation of the schools is to make certain that all students reach the same basic level of knowledge. (GOAL OF SCHOOLING) EGALITARIAN	-1.819
60	Male and female students should select electives appropriate to their sex. (SEX EQUITY) MERITOCRATIC	-1.906
18	All students should receive the same high school diploma when they graduate, regardless of their level of achievement. (DIFFERENTIATED DIPLOMAS) EGALITARIAN	-1.920

attendance standards for students, the responsibility of the schools to furnish supplies, and the selection of electives based on sex.

Descending Array of Difference Between Types

An aspect of this study was to compare the value and belief patterns of various groups of educators in terms of their commitment to the egalitarian ideal. As described in the previous section, an analysis of the data indicated three factors or "types" of teachers of academic subjects and teachers of nonacademic subjects. Type 1 described meritocratic-oriented teachers. Type 2 characterized combination egalitarian/meritocratic-oriented teachers, and Type 3 reflected egalitarian-oriented teachers. A second analysis described as the "specialists" was comprised of special education teachers, counselors, and administrators and revealed two factors or types. Type 4 described the egalitarian-oriented specialists, and Type 5 portrayed the meritocratic-oriented specialists. Thus far, the analysis of the data has been based on an individual assessment of each type. The data in this section are based on a comparison of the responses between each particular type. Significant differences between two groups regarding item responses are those items having a "difference" Z-score of ± 1.0 .

A comparison between the value and belief patterns of Type 1, meritocratic-oriented teachers, and Type 2, the combination meritocratic/egalitarian-oriented teachers, is presented in Table 18. The first set of comparisons indicates that these two groups differ in their values and beliefs regarding meritocratic attitudes toward

Table 18.--Comparisons between Types 1 and 2 (significant differences above a Z-score value of +1.0).

Item	Item Description	Differences Between Types 1 and 2		
		1	2	Difference
15	Schools spend too much time and effort with unruly students. (DISCIPLINE) MERITOCRATIC	.973	- .773	1.745
42	There are too many elective choices in the secondary curriculum. (ELECTIVES) MERITOCRATIC	.121	-1.553	1.673
53	The obligation of schooling should be to educate only those students who want to learn. (GOAL OF SCHOOLING) MERITOCRATIC	.099	-1.528	1.627
27	At the high school level, co-op (work-study) programs have undermined the importance of academic learning. (CO-OP) MERITOCRATIC	.050	-1.416	1.465
44	Too many elective classes undermines the importance of academic classes. (ELECTIVES) MERITOCRATIC	.362	-1.072	1.434
13	Teachers should follow the agreed-upon curriculum. (TEACHER AUTONOMY) MERITOCRATIC	1.162	- .172	1.334
25	Students should be retained if they have not met the necessary standards. (RETENTION) MERITOCRATIC	1.975	.920	1.055
51	Grades should reflect knowledge rather than effort. (STUDENT EVALUATION) MERITOCRATIC	1.018	- .013	1.031

the schools' role in meeting the needs of students and maintaining standards for grading and promotion. The greatest difference between the two groups is reflected in their beliefs regarding the schools' role in the toleration of unruly students. The meritocratic-oriented type believe the schools spend too much time with these students; the Type 2 (combination egalitarian/meritocratic-oriented) group rejects this belief. This commitment to seemingly uninterested students is also reflected in the disparity in Type 2's strong rejection of the concept that the schools are only obligated to educate those students who want to learn. Additional areas of difference include beliefs toward the elective program and the meritocratic belief that educators should adhere to specific predetermined standards regarding both curriculum and student promotion.

In assessing the differences between meritocratic-oriented teachers (Type 1) and the combination meritocratic/egalitarian-oriented teachers (Type 2), eight items received a Z-score of +1.0 or above and 11 received a score of -1.0 or below. Many of the items falling in the -1.0 Z-score range are reflective of those items above +1.0. The issues in the one standard deviation below range also reflect the difference in values between the groups regarding the meeting of student needs through offering a wide variety of elective classes and the need for standards for student achievement. These teachers also differ regarding their perceptions of the necessity for each student to experience success in school. The teachers' control of the curriculum and the schools' responsibility for student success as well as teachers' responsibility for special education

students. The area that reflected significant difference between the two groups through the indication of two items was the goal of schooling. The meritocratic-oriented teachers strongly reject the egalitarian belief that the obligation of schools is to make certain that all students reach the same level of knowledge, while the combination meritocratic/egalitarian-oriented group strongly believes that the goal of schooling should be to develop each student socially, emotionally, and intellectually. This information is reported in Table 19.

Table 20 presents significant differences between meritocratic-oriented teachers and egalitarian-oriented teachers. These differences were reflected in 14 items having a standard deviation of ± 1.0 or above and nine items with a score of -1.0 or below. These two groups differ basically in their values and beliefs regarding the responsibility for student achievement, the elective program, standards for promotion, the goal of schooling, discipline, and special education. The meritocratic-oriented teachers believe that students are responsible for their own achievement and that not all students can be successful in school. The egalitarian-oriented teachers, however, view students differently. They reject the concept that the schools should educate only those students who want to learn and disagree with meritocratic-oriented teachers that the schools spend too much time with unruly students. The egalitarian-oriented teachers indicate a far stronger rejection of the belief that there are too many elective choices in the secondary schools and that these classes undermine

Table 19.--Comparisons between Types 1 and 2 (significant differences below a Z-score value of -1.0).

Type	Item Description	Differences Between Types 1 and 2	
		1	2 Difference
37	Special education students are the responsibility of the special education teachers. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) MERITOCRATIC	- .163	.951 -1.114
50	Teachers should have the right to determine the standards for each of their classes. (STANDARDS) EGALITARIAN	.388	1.563 -1.174
41	The secondary school curriculum should maintain a large number of elective classes. (ELECTIVES) EGALITARIAN	- .220	.978 -1.198
24	In general, social promotion is an acceptable practice. (PROMOTION) EGALITARIAN	-2.020	-.781 -1.239
11	Every student should experience success in school. (SUCCESS) EGALITARIAN	- .187	1.064 -1.251
47	Assurance of individual student achievement is the school's responsibility. (RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACHIEVEMENT) EGALITARIAN	-1.509	-.175 -1.330

Table 19.--Continued.

Item	Item Description	Differences Between Types 1 and 2	
		1	2 Difference
18	All students should receive the same high school diploma when they graduate, regardless of their level of achievement. (DIFFERENTIATED DIPLOMAS) EGALITARIAN	-1.782	-.449 -1.334
43	A wide variety of elective classes allows students to develop their individual talents. (ELECTIVES) EGALITARIAN	.421	1.809 -1.387
54	The obligation of the schools is to make certain that all students reach the same basic level of knowledge. (GOAL OF SCHOOLING) EGALITARIAN	-1.794	.300 -1.494
14	Teachers should be able to decide the curriculum for each of their classes. (TEACHER AUTONOMY) EGALITARIAN	- .609	.946 -1.555
45	The goal of secondary schools is to develop each student socially, emotionally, and intellectually. (GOAL OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS) EGALITARIAN	.626	2.458 -1.831

Table 20.--Comparisons between Types 1 and 3 (significant differences above a Z-score value of +1.0).

Item	Item Description	Differences Between Types 1 and 3		
		1	3	Difference
48	Student achievement is the individual student's responsibility. (RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACHIEVEMENT) MERITOCRATIC	1.257	-.640	1.897
51	Grades should reflect knowledge rather than effort. (STUDENT EVALUATION) MERITOCRATIC	1.018	-.746	1.764
44	Too many elective classes undermines the importance of academic classes. (ELECTIVES) MERITOCRATIC	.362	-1.176	1.537
23	Students should not be promoted unless they have demonstrated appropriate levels of learning. (PROMOTION) MERITOCRATIC	2.332	.814	1.518
30	Teachers should pass only students who have met course requirements. (VIEW OF STUDENT EFFORTS) MERITOCRATIC	1.654	.149	1.505
36	Special education students should be educated in special education classrooms. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) MERITOCRATIC	-.144	-1.640	1.496

Table 20.--Continued.

Item	Item Description	Differences Between Types 1 and 3		
		1	2	Difference
27	At the high school level, co-op (work-study) programs have undermined the importance of academic learning. (CO-OP) MERITOCRATIC	.050	-1.439	1.489
42	There are too many elective choices in the secondary curriculum. (ELECTIVES) MERITOCRATIC	.121	-1.193	1.314
53	The obligation of schooling should be to educate only those students who want to learn. (GOAL OF SCHOOLING) MERITOCRATIC	.099	-1.202	1.302
12	We have to face the fact that not all students can succeed in school. (SUCCESS) MERITOCRATIC	1.001	-.243	1.244
15	Schools spend too much time and effort with unruly students. (DISCIPLINE) MERITOCRATIC	.973	-.207	1.180
34	Learning disabled students should compete on an equal basis with other students in the classroom. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) MERITOCRATIC	1.975	.911	1.064
25	Students should be retained if they have not met the necessary standards. (RETENTION) MERITOCRATIC	1.975	.911	1.064

the importance of academic classes. The meritocratic-oriented group indicated a slight agreement with these values.

The difference in values regarding nine egalitarian items having a difference Z-score of -1.0 or below is indicated in Table 21. Again, meritocratic-oriented teachers and egalitarian teachers differed in their attitudes toward the schools' role in educating all students, as reflected in the items regarding student success, responsibility for achievement, discipline, the goal of secondary schools, special education, student evaluation, and the co-op program. The areas of most significant difference were the conflicting beliefs that every student should experience success in school and that the assurance of this success is the schools' responsibility. The egalitarian-oriented teachers view the school as much more actively involved and more responsible for facilitating student success. The meritocratic-oriented teachers and the egalitarian-oriented teachers differed on the belief that the schools have an obligation to help students with behavior problems. The conflict regarding responsibility for students with problems is also reflected in the egalitarian support for all teachers sharing in the education of special education students and providing modified objectives for these students when necessary.

As indicated in Table 22, fewer significant differences were noted between Type 2, the combination egalitarian/meritocratic-oriented teachers, and Type 3, egalitarian-oriented teachers. Seven items were indicated as areas of significant difference with a

Table 21.--Comparisons between Types 1 and 3 (significant differences below a Z-score value of -1.0).

Item	Item Description	Differences Between Types 1 and 3		
		1	3	Difference
26	Retention does not work at the secondary level. (RETENTION) EGALITARIAN	-1.649	-.460	-1.190
33	Regular education teachers should provide modified objectives for learning disabled students mainstreamed in their classes. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) EGALITARIAN	-.165	1.104	-1.268
52	Grades should reflect level of effort more than knowledge attained. (STUDENT EVALUATION) EGALITARIAN	-1.609	-.293	-1.315
38	All teachers share in the responsibility to educate special education students. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) EGALITARIAN	-.233	1.272	-1.505
28	Co-op (work-study) programs offer a way to meet the particular need of many students. (CO-OP) EGALITARIAN	-.282	1.287	-1.562
45	The goal of secondary schools is to develop each student socially, emotionally, and intellectually. (GOAL OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS) EGALITARIAN	.626	2.333	-1.706
16	It is the obligation of the school to find ways to help students with behavior problems. (DISCIPLINE) EGALITARIAN	-.984	.825	-1.809
47	Assurance of individual student achievement is the school's responsibility. (RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACHIEVEMENT) EGALITARIAN	-1.509	.538	-2.046
11	Every student should experience success in school. (SUCCESS) EGALITARIAN	-.187	2.042	-2.230

Table 22.--Comparisons between Types 2 and 3 (significant differences above a Z-score value of +1.0).

Item	Item Description	Differences Between Types 2 and 3		
		1	2	Difference
36	Special education students should be educated in special education classrooms. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) MERITOCRATIC	.794	-1.640	2.434
37	Special education students are the responsibility of the special education teachers. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) MERITOCRATIC	.951	-1.149	2.100
48	Student achievement is the individual student's responsibility. (RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACHIEVEMENT) MERITOCRATIC	1.374	-.640	2.014
14	Teachers should be able to decide the curriculum for each of their classes. (TEACHER AUTONOMY) EGALITARIAN	.946	-.479	1.425
50	Teachers should have the right to determine the standards for each of their classes. (STANDARDS) EGALITARIAN	1.563	.190	1.373
23	Students should not be promoted unless they have demonstrated appropriate levels of learning. (PROMOTION) MERITOCRATIC	1.948	.814	1.134
54	The obligation of the schools is to make certain that all students reach the same basic level of knowledge. (GOAL OF SCHOOLING) EGALITARIAN	-.300	-1.360	1.061

Z-score of +1.0 or higher. Meritocratic statements regarding special education are indicated as areas of greatest difference between the two groups. Egalitarian-oriented teachers strongly rejected the meritocratic belief statements that special education students should be educated in special education classrooms and that these students are the responsibility of the special education teachers. The combination egalitarian-meritocratic teachers supported the concept that students are responsible for their own achievement and that they should be promoted only if they have demonstrated appropriate levels of learning. This group also had stronger beliefs that teachers should have the right to determine the standards and curriculum for their classes. The differences between these two groups were not clearly egalitarian or meritocratic, but represented a combination of value statements.

Table 23 presents the differences between the groups with a standard deviation of -1.0 or below. Of the five egalitarian items, three reflected differences on the issue of special education. The egalitarian-oriented teachers indicated strong beliefs that mainstreaming has helped special education students, that all teachers share in the responsibility to help these students, and that regular education teachers should provide modified objectives for the learning-disabled students mainstreamed in their classes. The other two items reflected a difference in beliefs on responding to the needs of students. The egalitarian-oriented teachers believed more strongly that schools should be judged on the efforts they make to meet the

Table 23.--Comparisons between Types 2 and 3 (significant differences below a Z-score value of -1.0).

Item	Item Description	Differences Between Types 2 and 3		
		2	3	Difference
16	It is the obligation of the school to find ways to help students with behavior problems. (DISCIPLINE) EGALITARIAN	-.311	.825	-1.137
33	Regular education teachers should provide modified objectives for learning disabled students mainstreamed in their classes. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) EGALITARIAN	-.060	1.104	-1.164
58	Schools should be judged on the efforts they make to meet the needs of their students. (SCHOOL EVALUATION) EGALITARIAN	-.165	1.208	-1.373
31	Mainstreaming has helped special education students. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) EGALITARIAN	-.526	1.012	-1.538
38	All teachers share in the responsibility to educate special education students. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) EGALITARIAN	-.455	1.272	-1.727

needs of students and that it is the obligation of the schools to find ways to help students with behavior problems.

The descending array of differences with a Z-score of +1.0 or higher resulting from the second analysis comprised of the responses of special education teachers, counselors, and administrators is reflected in Table 24. These three groups, labeled the "Specialists," responded with value and belief patterns that reflected two types, the egalitarian-oriented Specialists group, Type 4, and the meritocratic-oriented group, Type 5. The eight items reflecting significant differences between the two groups are all egalitarian issues. Two of the items reflect a difference in beliefs regarding special education. The egalitarian-oriented specialists believe strongly that these students should be educated in the least restrictive environment and that they have benefited from mainstreaming. The egalitarian statements that negated standards were those statements most objected to by the meritocratic-oriented specialists. The items that all students should receive the same high school diploma, regardless of their level of achievement; that retention does not work at the secondary level; that grades should reflect level of effort more than knowledge attained; and that teachers should pass a student who has shown sincere effort were all areas of significant difference between the two groups. Other areas that reflected responsiveness to the needs of students, such as the necessity of the bilingual program and the ability of the teacher to decide on the curriculum for specific classes, were areas of disagreement between the two groups.

Table 24.--Comparisons between Types 4 and 5 (significant differences above a Z-score value of +1.0).

Item	Item Description	Differences Between Types 4 and 5	
		4	5
			Difference
35	Special education students should be educated in the least restrictive environment. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) EGALITARIAN	1.656	- .674
			2.330
18	All students should receive the same high school diploma when they graduate, regardless of their level of achievement. (DIFFERENTIATED DIPLOMAS) EGALITARIAN	-.159	-1.920
			1.761
63	The bilingual program is necessary to meet the educational needs of non-English-speaking students. (BILINGUAL) EGALITARIAN	.804	- .730
			1.534
26	Retention does not work at the secondary level. (RETENTION) EGALITARIAN	.412	-1.072
			1.484
52	Grades should reflect level of effort more than knowledge attained. (STUDENT EVALUATION) EGALITARIAN	-.367	-1.601
			1.233
31	Mainstreaming has helped special education students. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) EGALITARIAN	1.662	.561
			1.101
14	Teachers should be able to decide the curriculum for each of their classes. (TEACHER AUTONOMY) EGALITARIAN	-.494	-1.578
			1.084
29	Teachers should pass a student who has shown sincere effort. (VIEW OF STUDENT EFFORTS) EGALITARIAN	.354	-.658
			1.012

Table 25 presents comparisons between the two groups reflecting items that had a Z-score of -1.0 or below. All of the ten items indicating a significant difference were meritocratic statements. Three of the ten items again indicated differences in beliefs regarding the way special education students should be treated in schools. The egalitarian-oriented specialists strongly rejected items that advocated the segregation of special education students from regular education or made these students only the responsibility of the special education teacher. Four items of greatest difference between the groups reflected divergent views regarding predetermined standards. The meritocratic Specialist group strongly agreed with meritocratic statements concerning student achievement of specific standards as a prerequisite for promotion. Students not attaining these standards should, according to the value and belief patterns of this group, be retained. The meritocratic-oriented Specialists (Type 5) also advocated differentiated diplomas as a means of reflecting achievement. The egalitarian specialists rejected these issues. Other areas of difference in beliefs were concerned with the amount of time schools spend with unruly students, the student's responsibility for achievement, and the meritocratic view that teachers should follow the predetermined curriculum.

Summary

An analysis of the item array of differences as indicated in Tables 18 to 25 reveals that various groups of educators have conflicting value and belief patterns regarding their commitment to

Table 25.--Significant differences between Types 4 and 5 (significant differences below a Z-score of -1.0).

Item	Item Description	Differences Between Types 4 and 5		
		4	5	Difference
37	Special education students are the responsibility of the special education teachers. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) MERITOCRATIC	-1.572	-.529	-1.043
13	Teachers should follow the agreed-upon curriculum. (TEACHER AUTONOMY) MERITOCRATIC	-.755	1.913	-1.157
48	Student achievement is the individual student's responsibility. (RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACHIEVEMENT) MERITOCRATIC	-.186	.992	-1.178
15	Schools spend too much time and effort with unruly students. (DISCIPLINE) MERITOCRATIC	-.103	1.076	-1.178
36	Special education students should be educated in special education classrooms. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) MERITOCRATIC	-1.791	-.572	-1.219
32	Special education students are not helped by mainstreaming. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) MERITOCRATIC	-2.312	-1.049	-1.263
30	Teachers should pass only students who have met course requirements. (VIEW OF STUDENT EFFORTS) MERITOCRATIC	-.489	.933	-1.422
23	Students should not be promoted unless they have demonstrated appropriate levels of learning. (PROMOTION) MERITOCRATIC	-.039	1.722	-1.761
17	High schools should award different diplomas based on level of achievement. (DIFFERENTIATED DIPLOMAS) MERITOCRATIC	-.567	1.216	-1.783
25	Students should be retained if they have not met the necessary standards. (RETENTION) MERITOCRATIC	-.329	1.571	-1.900

the egalitarian ideal. The conflict among the value and belief patterns of the groups centers on the egalitarian efforts to meet the needs of all students through such areas as the goals of education, curriculum, and special education and the meritocratic values of predetermined standards as the basis for student evaluation and promotion. Analysis of the comparisons between the types indicated a significant number of educational issues on which the types differed in their professed value and belief patterns.

Consensus Items

The consensus items for the Teacher group comprised of Types 1, Type 2, and Type 3 are presented in Table 26. From a total of 25 consensus items, three were collectively agreed on and three were collectively disagreed with at the Z-score significance level of +1.0 or -1.0. The teachers, both of academic and nonacademic classes, felt most strongly that both male and female students should have the right to select any elective. The reflective item that students should select electives based on their sex was most strongly rejected. The other two significant items were also reflective. Teachers agreed that students should be required to purchase their own school supplies and should be required to attend school for a specified number of days in order to be promoted.

The second group, which included special education teachers, counselors, and administrators, had 40 consensus items, which are presented in Table 27. Of the 40 items, six items were accepted and judged as significant at the +1.0 Z-score level. The second group

Table 26.--Consensus items: Teachers group.

Item	Item Description	Average Z
59	Both male and female students should have equal opportunity to select any elective. (SEX EQUITY) EGALITARIAN	1.769
19	Students should pay for their own school supplies. (SUPPLIES) MERITOCRATIC	1.076
55	Students should be required to attend school for a specified number of days in order to pass. (ATTENDANCE) MERITOCRATIC	1.029
46	The goal of secondary schools is to prepare students for jobs or college. (GOAL OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS) MERITOCRATIC	.922
49	The standards for a particular subject (math, English, etc.) should be uniform throughout the school district. (STANDARDS) MERITOCRATIC	.502
39	Emotionally impaired students should be expected to meet the school's standards of good behavior. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) MERITOCRATIC	.475
64	Students should be able to use the English language before they are placed in the classroom. (BILINGUAL) MERITOCRATIC	.329
17	High schools should award different diplomas based on level of achievement. (DIFFERENTIATED DIPLOMAS) MERITOCRATIC	.318
65	Teachers should be careful to protect the student's individual rights. (DUE PROCESS) EGALITARIAN	.311

Table 26.--Continued.

Item	Item Description	Average Z
62	It is not the school's responsibility to run a free or reduced-price lunch program. (LUNCH PROGRAM) MERITOCRATIC	.220
67	When the slow students are tracked only with each other they lose the opportunity to learn from brighter students. (TRACKING) EGALITARIAN	.136
40	Emotionally impaired students should be given more understanding when they misbehave. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) EGALITARIAN	.123
66	Student rights policies have reduced the teacher's authority. (DUE PROCESS) MERITOCRATIC	.021
63	The bilingual program is necessary to meet the educational needs of non-English-speaking students. (BILINGUAL) EGALITARIAN	-.033
21	Schools should have specific dress codes for students. (DRESS CODES) MERITOCRATIC	-.096
29	Teachers should pass a student who has shown sincere effort. (VIEW OF STUDENT EFFORTS) EGALITARIAN	-.152
35	Special education students should be educated in the least restrictive environment. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) EGALITARIAN	-.315

Table 26.--Continued.

Item	Item Description	Average Z
61	Schools should furnish a free or reduced-price lunch for students in financial need. (LUNCH PROGRAM) EGALITARIAN	-.412
68	Tracking is essential for efficient learning. (TRACKING) MERITOCRATIC	-.546
22	As long as their clothing does not interfere with education, students should be able to wear what they wish to school. (DRESS CODE) EGALITARIAN	-.606
57	Schools should be judged on the academic achievements of their students. (SCHOOL EVALUATION) MERITOCRATIC	-.762
32	Special education students are not helped by mainstreaming. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) MERITOCRATIC	-.796
20	The school should provide the student with school supplies. (SUPPLIES) EGALITARIAN	-1.507
56	Students should not be penalized just because of poor attendance. (ATTENDANCE) EGALITARIAN	-1.517
60	Male and female students should select electives appropriate to their sex. (SEX EQUITY) EGALITARIAN	-1.610

Table 27.--Consensus items: Specialists group.

Item	Item Description	Average Z
59	Both male and female students should have equal opportunity to select any elective. (SEX EQUITY) EGALITARIAN	1.514
45	The goal of secondary schools is to develop each student socially, emotionally, and intellectually. (GOAL OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS) EGALITARIAN	1.505
43	A wide variety of elective classes allows students to develop their individual talents. (ELECTIVES) EGALITARIAN	1.286
58	Schools should be judged on the efforts they make to meet the needs of their students. (SCHOOL EVALUATION) EGALITARIAN	1.253
38	All teachers share in the responsibility to educate special education students. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) EGALITARIAN	1.237
49	The standards for a particular subject (math, English, etc.) should be uniform throughout the school district. (STANDARDS) MERITOCRATIC	1.001
28	Co-op (work-study) programs offer a way to meet the particular needs of many students. (CO-OP) EGALITARIAN	.937
46	The goal of secondary schools is to prepare students for jobs or college. (GOAL OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS) MERITOCRATIC	.914
11	Every student should experience success in school. (SUCCESS) EGALITARIAN	.746
41	The secondary school curriculum should maintain a large number of elective classes. (ELECTIVES) EGALITARIAN	.711

Table 27.--Continued.

Item	Item Description	Average Z
33	Regular education teachers should provide modified objectives for learning disabled students mainstreamed in their classes. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) EGALITARIAN	.693
65	Teachers should be careful to protect the student's individual rights. (DUE PROCESS) EGALITARIAN	.638
40	Emotionally impaired students should be given more understanding when they misbehave. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) EGALITARIAN	.626
19	Students should pay for their own school supplies. (SUPPLIES) MERITOCRATIC	.613
16	It is the obligation of the school to find ways to help students with behavior problems. (DISCIPLINE) EGALITARIAN	.521
55	Students should be required to attend school for a specified number of days in order to pass. (ATTENDANCE) MERITOCRATIC	.497
12	We have to face the fact that not all students can succeed in school. (SUCCESS) MERITOCRATIC	.473
51	Grades should reflect knowledge rather than effort. (STUDENT EVALUATION) MERITOCRATIC	.309
62	It is not the school's responsibility to run a free or reduced-price lunch program. (LUNCH PROGRAM) MERITOCRATIC	.265
39	Emotionally impaired students should be expected to meet the school's standards of good behavior. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) MERITOCRATIC	.222
67	When the slow students are tracked only with each other they lose the opportunity to learn from brighter students. (TRACKING) EGALITARIAN	.066

Table 27.--Continued.

Item	Item Description	Average Z
47	Assurance of individual student achievement is the school's responsibility. (RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACHIEVEMENT) EGALITARIAN	-.082
56	Teachers should have the right to determine the standards for each of their classes. (STANDARDS) EGALITARIAN	-.151
57	Schools should be judged on the academic achievements of their students. (SCHOOL EVALUATION) MERITOCRATIC	-.154
22	As long as their clothing does not interfere with education, students should be able to wear what they wish to school. (DRESS CODE) EGALITARIAN	-.224
66	Student rights policies have reduced the teacher's authority. (DUE PROCESS) MERITOCRATIC	-.299
64	Students should be able to use the English language before they are placed in the classroom. (BILINGUAL) MERITOCRATIC	-.400
21	Schools should have specific dress codes for students. (DRESS CODE) MERITOCRATIC	-.450
68	Tracking is essential for efficient learning. (TRACKING) MERITOCRATIC	-.499
61	Schools should furnish a free or reduced-price lunch for students in finan- cial need. (LUNCH PROGRAM) EGALITARIAN	-.537
53	The obligation of schooling should be to educate only those students who want to learn. (GOAL OF SCHOOLING) EGALITARIAN	-.643

Table 27.--Continued.

Item	Item Description	Average Z
24	In general, social promotion is acceptable practice. (PROMOTION) EGALITARIAN	-.708
20	The school should provide the student with school supplies. (SUPPLIES) EGALITARIAN	-.886
44	Too many elective classes undermines the importance of academic classes. (ELECTIVES) MERITOCRATIC	-.960
42	There are too many elective choices in the secondary curriculum. (ELECTIVES) MERITOCRATIC	-1.058
56	Students should not be penalized just because of poor attendance. (ATTENDANCE) EGALITARIAN	-1.241
27	At the high school level, co-op (work-study) programs have undermined the importance of academic learning. (CO-OP) MERITOCRATIC	-1.352
34	Learning disabled students should compete on an equal basis with other students in the classroom. (SPECIAL EDUCATION) MERITOCRATIC	-1.400
54	The obligation of the schools is to make certain that all students reach the same basic level of knowledge. (GOAL OF SCHOOLING) EGALITARIAN	-1.575
50	Male and female students should select electives appropriate to their sex. (SEX EQUITY) MERITOCRATIC	-1.788

was consistent with the Teachers group in their agreement that male and female students should have equal opportunity to select any elective. The special education teacher, counselor, and administrator group (Specialists group) indicated four other areas of agreement with egalitarian items. This group agrees that the goal of secondary schools is to develop each student socially, emotionally, and intellectually and that a large number of elective classes should be maintained in order to develop the talents of each student. The issue of the needs of individual students is also reflected in the agreement item regarding the judgment of effective schools being based on the school's efforts to meet the needs of students. A consensus was also indicated that the education of special education students was the responsibility of all teachers. The only meritocratic item to be agreed upon by Types 4 and 5 was that standards for a particular subject should be consistent throughout the school district.

The Specialist group (Types 4 and 5) indicated six consensus items that were considered least important or significantly rejected, as indicated in Table 28, by a Z-score of -1.0 or lower. Two of these consensus items were also rejected by the Teachers group. All groups disagreed that students should not be penalized just because of poor attendance and that students should select their electives based on their sex. Types 4 and 5 were in agreement in rejecting the meritocratic curriculum items regarding an excessive number of elective classes in the secondary program and the charge that co-op programs undermine academic classes. These types also

rejected the egalitarian notion that the obligation of schools is to be certain that all students reach the same basic level of knowledge.

Relationship Between Selected Personal
Characteristics of Participants and
Their Value and Belief Patterns

An aspect of this study was to determine the relationship between selected personal characteristics, i.e., age, sex, level of secondary school employment, experience in education, and position as an educator, of the participants and their value and belief patterns in relationship to egalitarianism and meritocracy.

Cross-tabulation tables were used to depict the relationship between the variables. These tables with tests of statistical significance were generated through the computer program, "Statistical Package for the Social Sciences."

The chi-square test of statistical significance was used to determine if a systematic relationship exists between the variables of the participants' value and belief patterns and the selected personal characteristics. Since chi-square only determines if a relationship exists between variables, the phi and Cramer's V statistical tests were applied to assess the strength of the relationships. These statistical tests were selected based on the number of rows and columns used in each table for each set of variables.

Based on a significance level of alpha equal to or less than .05, it was determined that the only significant personal characteristic that demonstrated a statistical relationship to value and belief patterns was the professional position held by the teacher.

That is, only the teacher's position as to whether or not the teacher taught classes categorized as academic or nonacademic was significantly related to their value and belief patterns in terms of meritocracy and egalitarianism. These results are presented in Table 28. No statistically significant relationship between the selected personal characteristics and the value and belief patterns of the Specialists group was indicated. This information is presented in Table 29.

Table 28.--Statistical significance of selected personal characteristics of Teachers group.

Personal Characteristics	Cramer's V	p-Value
Age	.21371	.7353
Sex	.13329	.6081
Level: junior high, senior high	.11800	.6724
Experience	.20418	.5759
Position: academic, nonacademic	.34677	.0325

Significance level: $\alpha \leq .05$.

Table 29.--Statistical significance of selected personal characteristics of Specialist group.

Personal Characteristics	Phi	Cramer's V	p-Value
Age		.44361	.1218
Sex	.3037		.1339
Level: junior high, senior high	.11053		.7438
Experience		.22646	.5940
Position: academic, nonacademic		.32090	.1488

Significance level: $\alpha \leq .05$.

Summary

An analysis of the Q-sort data indicates that many educators in the study had value and belief systems consistent with the egalitarian ideal to provide each student with an equally effective education. Two Q-analyses were made to analyze the responses of the 94 participants in the study. The first group, labeled the Teachers group, consisted of 38 teachers of academic subjects and 19 teachers of nonacademic subjects. The responses of this group clustered into three common value and belief patterns: meritocratic-oriented teachers, combination meritocratic/egalitarian-oriented teachers, and egalitarian-oriented teachers. These groups differed on their values and beliefs regarding special education, student evaluation, the goals of education, curriculum, and aspects of student discipline. The Teachers group, however, agreed on the areas of standards for student attendance, the necessity for students to supply their own school supplies, and the equality of females and males in selection of their elective classes. The only selected personal characteristic that was significant in terms of whether or not a teacher would tend to be meritocratic or egalitarian depended on the teacher's position. That is, teachers of academic subjects tended to be meritocratic, whereas teachers of nonacademic subjects tended to be egalitarian.

The second Q-analysis consisted of the responses of 12 special education teachers, 12 counselors, and 13 building administrators. This total group of 37 educators was labeled as "Specialists" for the purpose of this study. An analysis of their Q-sort responses indicated that they clustered around two value and belief patterns:

egalitarian-oriented specialists and meritocratic-oriented specialists. The egalitarian specialists valued curriculum and programs that responded to the individual needs of students and believed that each student should be successful in school. The meritocratic group placed a higher priority on predetermined standards for curriculum and student evaluation. Both types supported the rights of males and females to select any elective and, among other things, believed that the goal of the school was to develop each student socially, emotionally, and intellectually. No selected personal characteristics appeared to be significantly related to value and belief patterns.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the value and belief patterns of teachers, counselors, and administrators in terms of the egalitarian ideal to provide an equally effective education for every student. It was believed that some educators, particularly teachers, would prefer a more meritocratic system of education. Secondary school programs and policies were examined in both egalitarian and meritocratic terms in relation to the goals of secondary schools, special education, discipline, curriculum, and student evaluation. The values and priorities placed on these areas by each educator group were examined to determine if possible areas of conflict exist between educator groups reflecting egalitarian-oriented educational values and those reflecting meritocratic-oriented values.

The following specific questions were studied in this research:

1. Do teachers have value and belief patterns that are consistent with the schools' commitment to provide an equally effective education for every student?
2. How do various groups of secondary educators, i.e., teachers of academic subjects, teachers of nonacademic subjects,

special education teachers, counselors, and administrators compare in their commitment to the egalitarian ideal?

3. Does tension exist as a result of the inconsistency between the value and belief patterns of administrators who represent the goals of the organization and thus the goal to provide an equally effective education for all students and the value and belief patterns of teachers who must actualize this goal in the classroom?

Procedure

The first step in the data-collection process was to develop an information base regarding the value and belief patterns of educators from which a Q-sort instrument could be developed. To ascertain the beliefs of teachers and other groups of educators regarding the goals of secondary education, special education, student discipline, curriculum, and student evaluation, 16 structured interviews were held. The results of these interviews were supplemented by a review of studies by Cusick, Coleman, Bell, Cedoline, and others as to how the schools' commitment to the egalitarian ideal was reflected in school policy and program.

Analysis of the statements made by the interviewees, the studies cited, and reviews of federal programs affecting schools ultimately resulted in the generation of 58 items for the Q-sort. The items were written as pairs, each expressing either an egalitarian or a meritocratic viewpoint on a particular secondary school program, policy, or goal. These 58 statements (items) were printed on 3 x 5 cards and randomized for presentation to the respondents.

Each participant was asked to sort the cards (items) into nine piles on a continuum ranging from very strongly agree to very strongly disagree, with varying degrees in between. These cards were then placed in envelopes labeled with the indicators of agreement or disagreement. Of the 58 items, the participant was allowed to place three cards in the envelopes marked "very strongly agree" and "very strongly disagree," four cards in each of the envelopes labeled "strongly agree" and "strongly disagree," seven cards in each envelope marked "moderately agree" and "moderately disagree," nine cards in each envelope marked "slightly agree" and "slightly disagree," and 12 cards in the remaining envelope labeled "neither agree nor disagree." The resulting configuration was a continuum of value statements that approximated a normal curve.

A Q-analysis computer program processed the data in the following manner:

1. A Pearson product-moment correlation matrix was constructed. (Since the number of variables (persons) cannot exceed the number of items, two separate matrices were produced from two Q-analyses.)
2. Each matrix of intercorrelations was submitted to factor analysis so that individuals are variables and items are observations. A principal-axis solution was obtained and submitted to a varimax rotation, which produced orthogonal factors. A factor represents a grouping of persons who have a common pattern of sorting the items. Therefore, each factor represents a group or type of persons with similar belief patterns.

3. Each pattern of sorting the items associated with each factor or type of person was estimated. This was done by weighting each item response of each person by the degree to which the individual is associated with a factor. The higher the degree of association with a given factor, the greater the weight the responses of that particular person. These weighted responses were then summed across each item separately. This produced an item array of weighted responses for each factor. These item arrays were converted to Z-scores.

4. The item arrays were then arranged from most accepted to most rejected on the basis of Z-scores. This provided a hierarchy of acceptance for each factor or type of person.

5. The Z-scores of the item arrays were compared for each factor to provide a measure of difference between the responses of each type to each item. A difference of ± 1.0 in Z-scores for an item was considered significant.

Participants

The subjects who participated in the study were drawn from a large white, suburban school district. The participants were representative of the school district's four large high schools and seven junior high schools. Participants included teachers of academic classes, teachers of nonacademic classes, special education teachers, school counselors, and building administrators. The respondents were specifically selected to represent a particular position.

Summary of Findings

Belief Patterns

Respondents in this study formed five meaningful factors. Each factor represented the collective views of a particular "type" of educator in terms of egalitarian and meritocratic values and beliefs regarding specific secondary school policies and programs. Types One, Two, the Three reflected the belief patterns of teachers of academic and nonacademic subjects, while Types Four and Five indicated the belief patterns of special education teachers, counselors, and administrators. It was found that teachers of academic subjects tended to be meritocratic and placed a high value on predetermined standards for students. The second group, under Type Two, supported both egalitarian and meritocratic values. Teachers indicating a combination of these beliefs reflected almost even percentages of the teachers of academic and nonacademic classes. While these teachers supported efforts to develop the total student and to provide opportunities for student success, they also upheld the concepts of student responsibility for his education and predetermined standards. The egalitarian-oriented teachers were described by Type Three. A high representation of teachers of nonacademic subjects were included in this group. The egalitarian-oriented teachers indicated a strong commitment to meeting the needs of all students, including those in special education.

Types Four and Five were generated from the second Q-analysis and reflected the responses of special education teachers, counselors, and administrators. Type Four, like Type Three, reflected

strong support of the egalitarian ideal. This type, labeled the egalitarian-oriented specialists, included the majority of the special education teachers and counselors but slightly fewer than half of the administrators. This group was primarily concerned with meeting the individual needs of special education students and the needs of other students through the curriculum and personal treatment. The type described as meritocratic specialists reflected the value and belief patterns indicated by Type Five. The majority of this group was made up of administrators. This group differed from the meritocratic teachers group in that the emphasis in Type Five was on a uniform curriculum. These educators believed that while effort is needed to meet the needs of students, a higher priority is placed on a uniform curriculum and predetermined standards measuring for student achievement.

All of the groups agreed on the issue of sex equity. They believed that males and females should have equal opportunity to select any elective. The Teachers group supported specific attendance requirements and the responsibility of the student to provide school supplies. The Specialists group gave high priority to the egalitarian goal of developing each child socially, emotionally, and intellectually.

Conclusions

In this study the value and belief patterns of various groups of secondary school educators were examined in terms of their consistency with the egalitarian ideal, as exemplified through

secondary school programs and policies. The conclusions regarding value and belief patterns that resulted from this investigation are limited to the school personnel involved in this study. It is unknown to what extent these conclusions may be applicable to other educator groups, and the reader is cautioned in that regard.

The study addressed the three specific questions indicated below. Following each question are the conclusions reached as a result of the investigation.

1. Do teachers have value and belief patterns that are consistent with the schools' commitment to provide an equally effective education for every student?

Through the analysis of the data resulting from this investigation, three distinct value and belief patterns regarding egalitarianism and meritocracy emerged for the Teachers group. This group, comprised of teachers of academic subjects and teachers of nonacademic subjects, indicated a personal value and belief pattern that was consistent with either a meritocratic system, a combination egalitarian/meritocratic system, or an egalitarian system. Further examination of the data for this group revealed a high significance between position (whether teacher of academic or nonacademic subjects) and specific value and belief patterns. Teachers of academic subjects tended to be meritocratic, while teachers of nonacademic classes were more likely to be egalitarian. Approximately one-fifth of each group fell into the combination meritocratic/egalitarian group.

The Meritocratic-Oriented Teachers

The meritocratic-oriented teachers group represented 55 percent of the academic teachers and 21 percent of the teachers of non-academic subjects. Of the 48 percent of the variance that could be accounted for, this type accounted for 32 percent of the variance of the three types. The value and belief patterns of these teachers reflect items that are not consistent with the egalitarian ideal to pursue equal results with all students or to provide each student with an equally effective education. With the exception of the egalitarian value regarding sex equity, the meritocratic-oriented teachers indicated a strong priority for definitive, predetermined standards for students. The three items of highest rank all related to student achievement of specific standards as the criterion for promotion. This group agreed that grades should reflect knowledge rather than effort and that not all students can succeed in school.

The consistency of the meritocratic-oriented teachers' values, especially the acknowledgment that not all students can succeed in school, appears to place these teachers in conflict between their own values and beliefs regarding education and the value placed on the egalitarian ideal, as demonstrated through programs and policies in secondary schools.

The beliefs and values of the meritocratic-oriented teachers are important to this study for two reasons. First, they reflect the largest single group of teachers who reject the basic egalitarian values of the educational organization. This concept is critical because in rejecting the egalitarian values and, more specifically,

in accepting the concept that not all students can be successful in school, these teachers are also rejecting the ideal of equal opportunity for all individuals. The meritocratic-oriented teachers place high priority on predetermined standards and on the necessity of the student meeting these standards in order to be promoted. The priority of this group is not to guarantee equal educational results, but rather to place the responsibility on the student to meet a predetermined standard of achievement. As described previously, the meritocratic-oriented teachers believe that we have to face the fact that not all students will be successful at meeting these standards, and therefore, not all students will be successful in school.

The second reason that the values and beliefs of the meritocratic-oriented teachers are important is, in a sense, related to the first reason. It is important to note that while these teachers reject the concept of success for every student, they are also the teachers with whom the student will most likely come into contact. As previously explained, it can be statistically predicted that academic teachers tend to be meritocratic. Since most students (with the possible exception of severely intellectually impaired special education students) are required to take specified academic subjects (English, math, science, social studies), they are likely to take them from teachers holding meritocratic rather than egalitarian values. The teachers can do one of two things. They can hold to their meritocratic values, or they can compromise their own values and beliefs in favor of egalitarian beliefs and values. Either way, conflict results.

If the teachers hold to their meritocratic value and belief patterns, they will be inviting a number of opportunities to experience conflict within the school, as well as with the promise that is implicit in public education. That is, all students will not be able to take advantage of the equal opportunity said to be provided through education if they cannot meet the predetermined standards set by meritocratic teachers or educational systems. While the egalitarian system supports ways and methods designed to recompense the student for disadvantages he brings with him to the educational process, the meritocratic teacher supports only the criterion of whether or not the student meets the educational standard of the school. Instead of modifying the curriculum or standards of her class to meet the particular needs of students, the meritocratic teacher chooses, instead, to have students achieve standards that have been predetermined for them. The meritocratic teacher puts the responsibility for achievement on the student and measures success only through actual achievement, rather than the sincerity of the students' efforts to achieve the standards. If the students fail to meet the meritocratic teacher's standards and are graded accordingly, the teacher may find herself facing angry parents and members of the community for being unresponsive to student needs and failing to assure student achievement.

However, if the meritocratic teacher compromises her value and belief systems in favor of more egalitarian practices, she may find herself in continual inner conflict over actualizing values and beliefs to which she is opposed. This incongruence between

values and overt actions can result in the teacher becoming unhappy and frustrated with her employment.

The meritocratic teacher has many opportunities to experience inconsistency between her values and school programs and practices. For example, a probable area of conflict for meritocratic-oriented teachers is the placement of mainstreamed special education students in their classrooms. Given the high rating of the values of the attainment of specific knowledge, the demonstration of appropriate levels of learning and the belief that students must meet course requirements, these teachers may find it difficult to agree to modified and reduced standards for special education students. The rejection of the egalitarian beliefs that all students should receive the same diploma and that social promotion is an acceptable practice further supports this group's belief that grades or promotion should be based on merit or achievement. Other hard-to-deal-with students may also be troublesome for these teachers. Although the charge to public secondary schools may be to "take, retain and interest all students," these teachers view the student as responsible for his own learning. The student's rejection of this responsibility and the teacher's belief that he or she should meet particular standards can certainly result in conflict.

The Combination Meritocratic/ Egalitarian-Oriented Teachers

The 19 percent of the total teacher group who identified with a combination of egalitarian and meritocratic beliefs and values are, in part, consistent with the egalitarian commitment to provide

an equally effective education for all students. While this type places their highest priority on the goal of secondary schools to develop each student socially, emotionally, and intellectually and believe that every student should experience success in school, they also place importance on the meritocratic view that students should achieve specific levels of competence in order to be promoted. In other words, they value the efforts to meet student needs but also believe in the importance of students meeting particular standards.

It is likely that this group will strongly agree with the educational programs and policies of the secondary school, as evidenced by their rejection of meritocratic items that challenge the number of elective classes and question the placement of learning-disabled students in the regular classroom. This group is more likely to be in conflict with specific egalitarian practices and policies, such as providing the student with school supplies, or the absence of specific standards for student attendance. This judgment is made on the basis that clear-cut issues do not emerge from this group's responses. For example, they reject the meritocratic statement that learning-disabled students should not compete on an equal basis with other students, yet support the concept that students should not be promoted unless they have attained appropriate levels of learning.

The Egalitarian-Oriented Teachers

The third teachers group to emerge as a particular type were the egalitarian-oriented teachers. These teachers reflected value

and belief patterns that were more consistent with the egalitarian ideal than were the value and belief patterns of any other group. This group gave the individual needs of students consistently high priority and with the same consistency rejected items that violated this value. The egalitarian-oriented teachers comprised 37 percent of the total teacher group and included 58 percent of the teachers of nonacademic subjects who participated in the study.

The teachers of nonacademic subjects probably come into contact with special-education students more than other regular education teachers since these students are often first mainstreamed in nonacademic classes. It is interesting that the egalitarian-oriented teachers gave the egalitarian statements reflecting special education a high priority. They supported the beliefs that all teachers share in the responsibility to educate special education students, that these students should receive modified objectives in regular education classes, and that mainstreaming has been beneficial to them. It appears that the egalitarian-oriented teachers believe that special education students can be helped through the regular education program.

This group of teachers are distinguished by their emphasis on a student-centered educational system. They believe that it is the goal of education to develop each student socially, emotionally, and intellectually and that every student should experience success in school. The teachers support the egalitarian goal to develop the individual students through offering a wide variety of elective classes. Although the egalitarian-oriented teachers reject the

lack of standards for attendance and do not believe social promotion to be an acceptable practice, their other responses did not indicate an emphasis placed on predetermined standards. Through analysis of their responses, it can be concluded that these teachers value the personal development of each student through the responsiveness of the curriculum and teacher attitude. It also appears that these teachers support the ideal of an equally effective education for all students and are willing to adjust their classwork and expectations to ensure individual student success.

In sum, the value and belief patterns for teachers focused on the issues of special education, curriculum, the goals of education, and the evaluation of students. Discipline did not appear to be a topic differentiating the types. Academic teachers' value and belief patterns reflected meritocratic values and beliefs that were not consistent with the egalitarian ideal. The meritocratic-oriented teachers were a majority of the total group and deemed predetermined standards to be important and indicated that all students should be measured against them. What the student actually knows, not how hard he tried to learn, is important to these educators. The egalitarian-oriented teachers represented a majority of the nonacademic teachers but a minority of the total group. The values and beliefs of this group were consistent with the tenets of the egalitarian ideal. That is, this type strongly supported an educational system responsive to individual student needs and believed that it is the responsibility of the school to provide the student with a successful experience. A

third type, a minority of the total group, had a combination of meritocratic and egalitarian values and beliefs that were indicated by the other two types.

2. How do various groups of secondary educators, i.e., teachers of academic subjects, teachers of nonacademic subjects, special education teachers, counselors, and administrators compare in their commitment to the egalitarian ideal?

An analysis of the selected characteristics (i.e., position, secondary level, age, degree attained, years of experience, and sex) revealed that position was the only significant variable in the teacher group. At a statistically significant level ($p = .0325$), one is able to predict the probable value and belief patterns of teachers of academic classes and teachers of nonacademic classes. As discussed previously, teachers of nonacademic classes indicated a much stronger commitment to egalitarian educational practices and policies than did their counterparts teaching academic classes.

Teacher Group

The examination of the item responses revealed that in the Teachers group, Type I, which included 21 of the 38 (55 percent) teachers of academic subjects, indicated values that were consistent with a meritocratic belief and value system. This compares to Type III, which included 58 percent or 11 of 19 teachers of nonacademic classes, who indicated a value and belief system consistent with the egalitarian ideal. The remaining Type II included 11 teachers from both areas who indicated value and belief patterns reflecting a

combination of egalitarian and meritocratic values. The specific description of each of these "types" has been discussed at length previously in this study.

Specialists Q-Analysis

The specialists Q-analysis included the responses of special education teachers, counselors, and administrators. The analysis revealed two types of value and belief pattern orientations, egalitarian and meritocratic. The egalitarian-oriented specialists, Type IV, reflected the stronger type. Of the variance that could be accounted for, Type IV accounted for 44 percent between the two types. The meritocratic-oriented specialists, Type V, had 10 percent of the variance accounted for by the two types.

Egalitarian-oriented specialists.--The egalitarian-oriented specialists, Type IV, included 24 of the 37 specialists, or 65 percent of the total group. Type IV specialists support educational practices and programs consistent with the egalitarian ideal. This group supported the belief that the goal of schooling is to develop each student socially, emotionally, and intellectually. In addition, Type IV specialists viewed the responsibility of the school to include special education students and judged the school's success on its efforts to meet the needs of all students. The egalitarian specialists group reflected the value and belief patterns of the majority of the counselors and special education teachers and slightly less than half of the administrators studied.

The individual group demonstrating the greatest commitment to the egalitarian ideal was the counselors. Of the 12 counselors in the study, ten or 83 percent indicated a value and belief system consistent with the egalitarian ideal. The extent of this commitment by a single group may be due to the fact that the professional training the counselor receives is compatible with egalitarian values. Counseling theories such as those based on the tenet of "unconditional positive regard" for students are congruent with basic educational values that reflect success for all students. Moreover, the counselor's job is to find and guide students into the appropriate educational programs so that the student can be successful. It would follow, then, that the counselor would support a varied elective program since it would facilitate the placement of all students in classes.

As the designated "student advocate" in the school, it would also be consistent with the role of the counselor that he or she would support egalitarian educational programs and policies. As the educator responsible for placing students in classes, the counselor would likely welcome programs that would facilitate the placement of special education students, bilingual students, and other students with special needs. When students feel that they have been treated unfairly by a teacher, the educator they probably first contact for support is their counselor. Therefore, it would not be surprising that counselors would favor policies that would give the student some protection in regard to individual rights. Finally, the counselor interacts with students on a one-to-one basis. The

counselor does not have to deal with the interaction of emotionally impaired students in a regular education classroom. In addition, the counselor does not have to adjust class standards in order to equitably grade a learning-disabled student. Counselors may support egalitarian programs and policies because the values that underlie such programs are consistent not only with their own personal values but with their preparation and role as a counselor. In addition, such programs and policies facilitate the counselor's role in the educational placement of students. The counselor usually does not have to deal personally with conflicts that may arise through the implementation of the egalitarian ideal.

Two-thirds or 66 percent of the special education teachers in the study indicated a belief and value system consistent with the egalitarian ideal. This was not an unexpected result since the special education program, as it currently exists, is a product of the egalitarian-influenced federal mandate, PL 94-142. The goal of the special education program is to maximize the ability of each special education student through such means as determined by the student's Individualized Educational Planning Committee (IEPC). The resources, both human and financial, that are used to maximize each special education student's potential exceed the resources directed toward regular education students. These efforts are a prime example of the egalitarian concern with "leveling-up" or "redressing" the disadvantages with which a student may enter the educational process. The special education programs are designed

to maximize educational opportunity with the goal of results equal to students in regular education.

It is also expected that special education teachers would support efforts to modify regular education programs, objectives, and evaluation techniques to ensure the special education students' achievement. Usually, it is the special education teacher who works with regular education teachers to design the plan to modify regular education objectives. In fact, one would expect the special education teachers to support almost all of the egalitarian efforts to provide equal opportunity to special education students.

Slightly less than half of the administrators in the study, or 46 percent of the total number of administrators, indicated value and belief patterns that were consistent with the egalitarian ideal. This was an unexpected result since it was expected that a larger percentage of administrators would fall into the egalitarian-oriented specialists group due to the building administrator's responsibility to deliver egalitarian-influenced programs and policies. The building administrator is directly responsible for the building schedule, which would include the allocation of academic and elective classes within the schedule, the delivery of the special education programs, and student discipline. The building administrator also articulates the goals of the school and supervises the evaluation of students. The results of this study indicate that slightly less than half of the administrators in the study have a value and belief pattern that would support an egalitarian approach to these areas.

Meritocratic-oriented specialists.--Type V, the meritocratic-oriented specialists, included 13 of the 37 specialists or 35 percent of the total Specialists group. This group believed in predetermined standards applied uniformly throughout the school district, as well as an agreed-upon curriculum that all students would follow. Type V also supported predetermined standards to be applied in the promotion and retention of students and believed that differentiated diplomas should reflect various levels of achievement.

The individual group of educators indicating value and belief patterns consistent with a more meritocratic approach to secondary educational programs and policies was the administrators. Of the 13 administrators in the study, 7 or 54 percent preferred a more meritocratic system. As described previously, this was an unexpected result since school administrators are directly responsible for many egalitarian educational programs and policies. However, the preference for a more meritocratic system may be due to the values and beliefs the administrator held at the time he or she entered the educational field. Since teachers of academic subjects also prefer a more meritocratic system, it may be that the same values and beliefs that the administrators held as teachers continued after they became administrators. However, since the difference between those administrators identifying with egalitarianism and those reflecting meritocratic beliefs favor the latter group by only one administrator, inferences made would probably be inconclusive. What the most equal division between the administrative identification of both egalitarianism

and meritocracy does point out, however, is that the value and belief pattern of administrators in this study can least be determined by position.

The special education teachers comprised 31 percent of the total meritocratic-oriented Specialists group. These special education teachers reflect one-third of the total group of special education teachers in the study. The fact that one-third of the special education teachers indicated value and belief patterns consistent with meritocracy was also an unexpected result. However, this belief and value orientation may be due to the motivation that some special education teachers may have for entering this aspect of the educational program. With declining enrollments in regular education and the resulting teacher layoffs, some teachers are pursuing special education certification in the hopes of maintaining their employment. Since special education is growing in numbers while regular education is declining, it may be that meritocratic-oriented teachers find themselves in an egalitarian program in order to save their jobs.

The counselors group represents 15 percent of the meritocratic-oriented Specialists or 2 of the 12 counselors in the study. It was expected that within each educator group there would be some difference in value and belief patterns. A group of two counselors is not of significant size from which to draw conclusions.

3. Does tension exist as a result of the inconsistency between the value and belief patterns of administrators who represent the goals of the organization and thus the goals to provide an equally

effective education for all students and the value and belief patterns of teachers who must actualize the goal in the classroom?

From the findings it cannot be determined if conflict or tension exists between administrators representing the goals of the organization, which in this study are assumed to be the egalitarian goals of providing an equally effective education for all students, and the teachers who must actualize the goal in the classroom. Rather, it can be inferred that tension may exist between administrators holding egalitarian values and teachers reflecting a meritocratic value and belief system. Whether or not this conflict between the values of the administrator and teacher occurs depends on the particular administrator and the position of the teacher. That is, the values of the administrator cannot be inferred on the basis of position, but in this study it was likely that teachers of academic classes would hold meritocratic views while teachers of nonacademic classes would hold egalitarian values. For example, in a particular school either teachers of academic classes or teachers of nonacademic classes would experience tension as a result of the conflict of values between that particular group and the values the building administrator happened to possess. This can explain why different administrators appeal to different groups of teachers. An egalitarian-oriented administrator would support efforts to diversify the curriculum to meet student needs. The same efforts in the meritocratic-oriented administrator's school might not be as successful since the meritocratic-oriented administrator places higher priority on teachers following the agreed-upon curriculum. The examples could be extended

to the differentiated degree of support various administrators give to the special education program, the ways administrators handle discipline, student promotion, and evaluation, as well as their view of what should be the priorities in education. Depending on the demands made by the organization and the particular values of the administrator, it may be that it is the administrator who experiences tension between himself and the organization if his values are in conflict with the egalitarian expectations of the organization.

From the observations made in this study, tension exists between counselors and teachers of academic subjects. As counselors place students in academic classes, particularly students with special needs, it is likely that they are met with resistance from the academic teacher. Conflict and tension can exist when the counselor represents the student who has shown a great deal of effort in a particular class but has difficulty mastering the subject. While the egalitarian-oriented educator would reward the student's effort in learning the material, the meritocratic-oriented teacher would pass the student only if he or she could demonstrate mastery of the subject by meeting a predetermined standard. Tension then results between the educators over the value of the student's effort versus his or her actual achievement. Tension and conflict result from a difference in value and belief patterns of educators regarding the purpose and function of education in terms of the egalitarian ideal. This research demonstrates that there are conflicting value and belief patterns between groups of educators, as well as within each group of educators.

Recommendations

The findings of this study must be limited to the school personnel who participated in it. Nevertheless, it is recommended that the results of the investigation be considered seriously by those who seek to alter or modify the basic goals of education. Education has been viewed as the means to achieve the American promise of equal opportunity for all. The concept of equal opportunity, however, has been modified to mean an equally effective education or one that produced equal results. The egalitarian efforts that were needed to nullify the disadvantages of some students in order to equalize their educational opportunity resulted in differential treatment of these students. This differential treatment has been overtly supported, in fact in some instances mandated through law, by the federal government.

However, there are obvious signs that the emphasis is changing from the quest for equality of opportunity to the quest for excellence. Gardner's question has been revived: "Can we be equal and excellent too?"¹ Studies such as "The Nation at Risk," "Action for Excellence," and others point to the need for more challenging definitive standards against which to measure academic achievement. On December 8, 1983, Terrell Bell, United States Secretary of Education, speaking at the National Forum on Excellence in Education, suggested three priority learning outcomes for schools across the country. He suggested that "we cut out of the school curriculum whatever must be cut to reach [these] three high priority learning outcomes" of proficiency in language arts, mathematics, and social

studies. Bell emphasized these priorities because he said that "the schools have tried to do almost everything and respond to many special concerns."²

The pendulum is beginning the swing from an egalitarian-oriented educational system to a more meritocratic one. An analysis of the recent reports in education maintains, however, that new thrusts toward quality should not reduce the accomplishments of the recent improvements in equality. "A Nation at Risk" indicates that "the twin goals of equity and high-quality schooling have profound and practical meaning for our economy and society, and we cannot permit one to yield to the other in principle or in practice."³ Most of the other reports echo this sentiment.⁴ An analysis of the studies describes the goal of maintaining both quality and equality as perhaps the most difficult of the recommendations to implement.⁵

This statement represents, in part, the conflicts described in this study. The conflict between the egalitarian goal of meeting the needs of all students and the meritocratic goal of establishing predetermined standards is continuing. Bell charged the states with reducing the drop-out rate by 10 percent over the next five years. This charge was given along with the challenge of requiring students to pass examinations based on completing four years of English and three years of math, science, and social studies.⁶ The federal government is clearly establishing new and conflicting goals for education.

Goodlad (1983) indicated that parents do not rank the problem of standards and requirements with the same intensity as the problem

of student behavior (which was also highest ranked by students).

Rather, Goodlad reported that parents expressed concern as to whether their children were nurtured as individuals in the school setting.

He described the efforts that

in seeking to improve our schools, we may discover that some gains in standardized achievement test scores will not satisfy the full array of interests that parents and students have in their schools, interests that reach to the whole life and extend well beyond academics.⁷

The point is that meeting the needs of students is a complex problem.

This research supports the idea that the value and belief patterns of all teachers were not consistent with the egalitarian goal to provide an equally effective education for all students and that such a goal was a point of conflict between various groups of educators. The policy statement by the National Education Association on teachers' views of equity and excellence recognizes the progress gained from the egalitarian educational policies that began 20 years ago.⁸

It appears that particular groups of people and, in this research, particular groups of educators, hold value and belief patterns that are consistent with particular educational ideals. If improvements or changes are to take place in education, they would be best accomplished if the values and beliefs of those who must actualize the changes are understood. Whether the egalitarian policies of the 1960s or the more meritocratic policies of today, those instituting the policies would do well to understand the complexity and apparently contradicting beliefs of those who work together at the local school level.

Implications

The major implication that can be drawn from this study is that educators themselves do not agree; that is, they do not share similar values and beliefs regarding secondary school public education. The two strongest types in this study had value and belief patterns that reflected divergent views on the same educational issues. The majority of the Teachers group supported meritocratic-oriented educational programs and policies, whereas a majority of the Specialists group supported the egalitarian approach to education. Other belief patterns also exist in each of the two groups, as evidenced by the responses of the egalitarian-oriented teachers, the combination meritocratic/egalitarian-oriented teachers, and the meritocratic-oriented specialists.

If the value and belief patterns of the "gatekeepers" of the educational institution--the teachers, counselors, and administrators--are in conflict, what can be said of the values of the institution itself? It is difficult to place priorities in the educational program if those who are responsible for the program cannot agree on basic values regarding secondary education.

The inconsistency of the value and belief patterns of educators can be a source of problems and tension in the educational system for several reasons. The conflicting priorities placed on various educational programs and practices by educators themselves (in this study within a single school district) make it difficult to focus on particular goals in the educational process. Egalitarian-oriented educators, for example, view the school as responsible for

the development of the "whole" student, socially, emotionally and intellectually and therefore promote the allocation of time and resources to programs and policies designed to actualize this goal. Meritocratic-oriented teachers, on the other hand, argue that the school is responsible for academic achievement and acknowledge that not all students will be successful. They believe that time and resources should be limited to academic training.

The lack of agreement regarding the goals of education can make it difficult for schools to deal with issues basic to their function. Opposing values and beliefs regarding not only the goals of education, but also curriculum, special education, and student evaluation make consistent interpretation and application of policies and programs difficult. The conflicting views between meritocratic-oriented academic teachers, egalitarian-oriented teachers of non-academic subjects, and egalitarian specialists groups can result in conflict within the school. Management of school personnel and programs is a challenging task if teachers who must actualize the programs and respond to egalitarian directives do so with continual inner conflict.

Opposing value and belief systems within the educational profession also make it difficult for this group to respond to change. Although current reports on education, such as "A Nation at Risk," acknowledge the importance of the "twin goals" of equity and excellence, the emphasis in this report and others has been concentrated on the need for higher standards and a more basic, common curriculum.

While the meritocratic-oriented teachers welcome such recommendations, egalitarian-oriented groups may view them as not responding to needs faced by many students, especially those who are disadvantaged in some way. From the results of this study, it does not appear that recommendations and changes advocated for education will take place without conflict within the educational profession.

Footnotes--Chapter V

¹ John W. Gardner, Excellence (New York: Harper and Row, 1961.

² Terrell Bell, "Concluding Remarks," National Forum on Excellence in Education, Indianapolis, Indiana, 8 December 1983. (Mimeographed.)

³ National Commission on Excellence in Education, David P. Gardner, Chairman, A Nation at Risk (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1983), p. 13.

⁴ Jack L. Davidson and M. Montgomery, An Analysis of Reports on the Status of Education in America: Findings, Recommendations, and Implications (Tyler, Texas: Tyler Independent School District, October 1983), p. 14.

⁵ J. Lynn Griesemer and C. Butler, Education Under Study: An Analysis of Recent Major Reports on Education (Cheemsford, Mass.: The Northeast Regional Exchange, November 1983), p. 8.

⁶ Bell.

⁷ John I. Goodlad, A Place Called School (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1983), p. 75.

⁸ National Education Association, "Teachers' Views on Equity and Excellence" (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1983).

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

INFORMATION FORM

INFORMATION FORM

Please mark the appropriate spaces:

I am a teacher____ counselor____ administrator____

Age____ Sex____

I teach the following subject(s): _____

Junior High____

Senior High____

Highest degree attained_____

Years as a teacher_____

Years as a counselor_____

Years as an administrator_____

PLACE THE COMPLETED FORM IN THE MANILA ENVELOPE.

APPENDIX B

LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS

LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS

Dear _____,

Thank you for taking time to assist me in my research. The purpose of my study is to examine the values of educators as they relate to the ideals of egalitarianism and meritocracy. In other words, I am researching how different groups of educators such as teachers, counselors, and administrators vary in their attitudes and values to the concepts of equality of opportunity and the establishment of specific standards.

The methodology used in my research is known as the Q-Sort. This procedure requires you to place a certain number of items (statements written on cards) in an envelope, which indicates the degree to which you agree or disagree with the statements. There are no right or wrong answers. I only wish to know to what extent you agree or disagree with the statements.

The time needed to sort the cards varies. Some people complete the process in about a half an hour; others may take a little more or less time. You do not need to spend a great deal of time on each item, but please give the process some thought.

Results of the study will be available to you upon request.

Before reading the directions, please complete the Information Form. The individual results of this test are completely anonymous. Please DO NOT put your name or school on the Information Form, but I appreciate your completion of the other information.

Again, thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Barbara Markle

APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. How would you describe your "philosophy of education"?
2. What do you feel should be the goal of American education?
3. Should students be treated equally? Under what conditions?
4. What do you believe in so strongly regarding education that you would find difficult to compromise?
5. What do you think are the most important or "core values" of secondary schools?
6. What issues in your job do you find most stressful?
7. What has caused you stress in the evaluation of students?
8. To what extent should students be tracked? (if at all)
9. How should educators allocate time and teaching efforts for each student?
10. What is the responsibility of special education?
11. What part do standards of academic achievement play in the educational process?
12. What part do standards of student behavior play?
13. If you could change something about the educational system, what would it be?

APPENDIX D

DIRECTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE Q-SORT

DIRECTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE Q-SORT

Each manila envelope should include the following items:

1. Nine envelopes indicating degrees of agreement-disagreement from very strongly agree to very strongly disagree
2. A stack of 58 cards with written statements on them (Please disregard the numbers in the lower right-hand corner of each card. These numbers are for coding purposes only.)
3. Rubber bands
4. Information Form

You will need a flat surface such as a desk or table on which to work. The purpose of the Q-Sort is to determine to what extent you agree or disagree with the belief statements about education written on the cards. Please turn to the next page for the sort procedure.

SORTING PROCEDURE

Please READ these directions

1. Take the nine white envelopes and arrange them in the order indicated below:

Very Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Very Strongly Disagree
#... 3	#... 4	#... 7	#... 9	#... 12	#... 9	#... 7	#... 4	#... 3

2. Read through the 58 cards and select the 14 cards you most AGREE WITH and place them on your left. Then place the 14 cards you most DISAGREE WITH on the right. Place the remaining 30 cards in the center. BE CERTAIN YOU HAVE COUNTED THE CARDS IN THE THREE PILES CORRECTLY. Nothing is placed in the envelopes at this point.

3. Placing the cards in the envelopes:

- a. Take the first stack of cards on the left (those you most agree with) and further subdivide this pile by placing the three cards you most strongly agree with in the envelope marked "very strongly agree." Next, place the four items you strongly agree with in the envelope marked "strongly agree." Place the remaining seven cards in the envelope marked "moderately agree."
- b. Next, take the stack of 14 cards on your right (those statements you most disagree with) and subdivide this pile by placing the three items you most strongly disagree with in the envelope marked "very strongly disagree." Then place the four items with which you strongly disagree in the envelope marked "strongly disagree," and place the remaining seven cards in the envelope marked "moderately disagree."
- c. Finally, take the middle stack of 30 cards and place the nine items you slightly agree with in the envelope marked "slightly agree." Then place the nine items you slightly disagree with in the envelope marked "slightly disagree." Last, place the remaining 12 items that you neither agree nor disagree with in the envelope marked the same.

IMPORTANT: While sorting the cards, you may go back and change the position of a particular card, but be certain that you end up with the correct number of cards per envelope.

4. Place a rubber band around each envelope when you are finished and place the envelope in the large manila envelope.
5. Complete the Information Form and place it in the envelope. THIS IS IMPORTANT. Place the directions back in the envelope.
6. CLIP THE ENVELOPE CLOSED AND DO NOT REOPEN.

YOU HAVE NOW COMPLETED THE Q-SORT.

Thank you.

APPENDIX E

VALUE AND BELIEF STATEMENTS

ITEM STATEMENTS REPRESENTING VALUE AND BELIEF PATTERNS

1. Success

1. Every student should experience success in school.
2. We have to face the fact that not all students can succeed in school.

2. Tracking

3. In tracked classes the slow students lose the opportunity to learn from brighter students.
4. Tracking is essential for efficient learning.
5. Tracking makes it easier to protect high standards.
6. Lower-achieving students suffer in tracked classes.

3. Teacher Autonomy

7. Teachers should follow the agreed-upon school curriculum.
8. Teachers should respond to the needs of a particular class when deciding what material to teach.

4. Discipline

9. Schools spend too much time and effort with unruly students.
10. It is the obligation of the school to find ways to help students with behavior problems.

5. Sex Equity

11. Both male and female students should have equal opportunity to select any elective.
12. Male and female students should select electives appropriate to their sex.

6. Differentiated Diplomas

- 13. High schools should award different diplomas based on level of achievement.
- 14. All students should receive the same high school diploma when they graduate, regardless of their level of achievement.

7. Supplies

- 15. Students should pay for their own school supplies.
- 16. The school should provide the student with school supplies.

8. Dress Code

- 17. Schools should have specific dress codes for students.
- 18. As long as the clothes do not interfere with education, students should be able to wear what they wish to school.

9. Promotion

- 19. Students should not be promoted unless they have demonstrated appropriate levels of learning.
- 20. In general, social promotion is a good practice.

10. Retention

- 21. Students should be retained if they have not met the necessary standards.
- 22. Retention does not work at the secondary level.

11. Co-op

- 23. At the high school level, co-op (work-study) programs have undermined the importance of academic learning.
- 24. Co-op (work-study) programs offer a way to meet the particular needs of many students.

12. View of Students' Efforts

- 25. Teachers should pass a student who has shown sincere effort.
- 26. Teachers should pass only students who have met the course requirements.

13. Lunch Program

- 27. Schools should furnish a free or reduced-price lunch for students in financial need.
- 28. It is not the school's responsibility to run a free or reduced-price lunch program.

14. Due Process

- 29. Due process procedures are necessary to protect students' rights.
- 30. Due process for students has reduced the schools' authority.
- 31. Due process procedures are necessary to protect student rights in the classroom.
- 32. Due process for students has reduced the teachers' authority.

15. Bilingual

- 33. The bilingual program is necessary to meet the educational needs of non-English-speaking students.
- 34. Students should be able to use the English language before they are placed in the classroom.

16. Special Education

- 35. "Mainstreaming" has helped handicapped students.
- 36. Handicapped students are not helped by "mainstreaming."
- 37. Regular education teachers should provide modified objectives for learning disabled students mainstreamed in their classes.
- 38. Learning disabled students should compete on an equal basis with other students in the classroom.

- 39. Special education students should be educated in the "least restrictive environment."
- 40. Special education students should be educated in special education classrooms.
- 41. Special education students are the responsibility of the special education teachers.
- 42. All teachers share in the responsibility to educate special education students.
- 43. Emotionally impaired students should be expected to meet the school's standards of good behavior.
- 44. Emotionally impaired students should be given more understanding when they misbehave.

17. Electives

- 45. The secondary school curriculum should maintain a large number of elective classes.
- 46. There are too many elective choices in the secondary curriculum.
- 47. A wide variety of elective classes allows students to develop their individual talents.
- 48. Too many elective classes undermines the importance of academic classes.

18. Goal (Function) of Public Secondary Schools

- 49. The goal of secondary schools is to develop each student socially, emotionally, and intellectually.
- 50. The goal of secondary schools is to prepare students for jobs or college.

19. Responsibility for Achievement

- 51. Assurance of individual student achievement is the school's responsibility.
- 52. Student achievement is the individual student's responsibility.

20. Standards

- 53. The standards for a particular subject (math, English, etc.) should be uniform throughout the school district.
- 54. Teachers should have the right to determine the standards for each of their classes.

21. Grading (Student Evaluation)

- 55. Grades should reflect knowledge rather than effort.
- 56. Grades should reflect level of effort more than knowledge attained.

22. Goal of Schooling

- 57. The obligation of schooling is to provide educational opportunity for those students who want to and are capable of learning.
- 58. The obligation of the schools is to provide each student with a basic level of knowledge.

23. Attendance

- 59. Students should be required to attend school for a specified number of days in order to pass.
- 60. Students should not be penalized just because of poor attendance.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Alexander, Kern. School Law. St. Paul: West Publishing, 1980.
- American Heritage Dictionary. New college ed. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1982.
- Bowles, Samuel, and Gintis, Herbert. Schooling in Capitalist America. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1976.
- Brookover, Wilbur B., and Erickson, Edsel L. Sociology of Education. Homewood, Ill.: The Dorsey Press, 1975.
- Carter, Cynthia A., ed. An Analysis of the Educational Amendments of 1978. Washington, D.C.: Educational Funding Research Council, 1978.
- Cedoline, Anthony J. Job Burnout in Public Education. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1982.
- Coleman, James. High School Achievement. New York: Basic Books, 1982.
- Commission on Excellence in Education, David P. Gardner, Chairman. A Nation at Risk. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, April 1983.
- Conant, James. The American High School Today. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.
- _____. The Comprehensive High School. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.
- Cremen, Lawrence A. The Transformation of the School. New York: Random House, 1961.
- _____, ed. The Republic and the School. Horace Mann on the Education of Free Men. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1957.
- Cusick, Philip. The Egalitarian Ideal and the American High School. New York: Longman, 1983.

- Davidson, Jack L., and Montgomery, M. An Analysis of Reports on the Status of Education in America: Findings, Recommendations, and Implications. Tyler, Texas: Tyler Independent School District, October 1983.
- Gardner, John W. Excellence. New York: Harper and Row, 1961.
- Good, H. G. A History of American Education. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1962.
- Goodlad, John I. A Place Called School. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1983.
- Griesemer, J. Lynn, and Butler, C. Education Under Study: An Analysis of Recent Major Reports on Education. Chelmsford, Mass.: The Northeast Regional Exchange, November 1983.
- Guide to the U.S. Supreme Court. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly, 1979.
- Guthrie, James W. et al. Schools and Inequality. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1971.
- Hahn, Robert O., and Bidna, David B., eds. Secondary Education. New York: Macmillan, 1979.
- Hansen, Donald A., and Gerstl, Joel E., eds. On Education: Sociological Perspectives. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1967.
- Hodgon, Godfrey. America in Our Time. New York: Doubleday, 1976.
- Jencks, Christopher et al. Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America. New York: Basic Books, 1972.
- Karabel, Jerome, and Halsey, A. H. Power and Ideology in Education. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Katz, Daniel, and Kahn, Donald L. The Social Psychology of Organizations. 2nd ed. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1978.
- Katz, Michael B. Class, Bureaucracy and the Schools: The Illusion of Educational Change in America. New York: Praeger, 1971.
- Lazar, Harry. The American Political System in Transition. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1967.
- Levine, Donald M., and Bane, Mary Jo. The Inequality Controversy. New York: Basic Books, 1975.
- Lewin, Kurt. Field Theory in Social Science. New York: Harper and Row, 1951.

- Lortie, Dan C. Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.
- McCarthy, Martha M., and Cambron, Nelda H. Public School Law: Teachers' and Student Rights. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1981.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education, David P. Gardner, Chairman. A Nation at Risk. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1983.
- Nennally, J. C. Psychometric Theory. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1978.
- Postman, Neil. Teaching as a Conserving Activity. New York: Delacorte Press, 1979.
- Power, Edward J. Main Currents in the History of Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.
- Ravitch, Diane. The Revisionists Revised. New York: Basic Books, 1977.
- _____. The Troubled Crusade: American Education 1945-1980. New York: Basic Books, 1983.
- Rawls, John. A Theory of Justice. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971.
- Rokeach, Milton. Understanding Human Values. New York: The Free Press, 1979.
- Stump, Mary M., and Simering, Jeffry A., eds. The 1978 Federal Funding Guide for Elementary and Secondary Education. Washington, D.C.: Educational Funding Research Council, 1978.
- Thomas, Lawrence G., ed. Philosophical Redirection of Educational Research. The Seventy-First Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, pt. 1. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972.
- VanTil, William, ed. Curriculum: Quest for Relevance. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1974.
- Williams, Robin. American Society: A Sociological Interpretation. New York: Knopf, 1951.
- Wilson, John. Equality. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1966.
- Wise, Arthur E. Rich Schools, Poor Schools: The Promise of Equal Educational Opportunity. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.

Periodicals

- Bensky, Jeffrey M. et al. "Public Law 94-142 and Stress: A Problem for Educators." Exceptional Children 47 (September 1980).
- Berke, Joel S., and Moore, Mary T. "A Developmental View of the Current Federal Government Role in Elementary and Secondary Education." Phi Delta Kappan 63 (January 1982).
- Berry, Mary F. "Student Competency Testing." The High School Journal (January 1979).
- Bidwell, Charles E., and Kasarda, Joan D. "School District Organization and Student Achievement." American Sociological Review 40 (February 1975).
- Blanck, Virgil, and Grady, Marilyn. "On Schooling for a Well Society." The Educational Forum 68 (Summer 1983).
- Bornstein, Rita. "The Education of Women: Protection or Liberation?" Educational Leadership 36 (February 1979).
- Boyer, Ernest L. "Public Law 94-142: A Promising Start?" Educational Leadership 36 (February 1979).
- Cawelti, Gordon. "Redefining General Education for the American High School." Educational Leadership 39 (May 1982).
- Cohen, David K., and Neufeld, Barbara. "The Failure of High Schools and the Progress of Education." Daedalus 110 (Summer 1981).
- Coleman, James S. "The Concept of Equality of Educational Opportunity." Harvard Educational Review 38 (Winter 1968).
- _____. "Quality and Equality in American Education: Public and Catholic Schools." Phi Delta Kappan 63 (November 1981).
- Corrigan, Dean C. "Educational Human Rights: Legislation and Leadership." Educational Leadership 36 (February 1979).
- Cuban, Larry. "Persistent Instruction: The High School Curriculum." Phi Delta Kappan 64 (October 1982).
- Dagley, David L. "Some Thoughts on Disciplining the Handicapped." Phi Delta Kappan 63 (June 1982).
- Down, A. Graham. "Inequality, Testing, Utilitarianism: The Three Killers of Excellence." Education Week, October 12, 1983.
- Eckland, Bruce K. "Education in the Meritocracy." American Journal of Education (November 1981).

- Etzioni, Amitai. "Schools: Educational Experiences First--Part I." American Education 18 (November 1982).
- Fuchs, Victor R. "Educational Reform Begins at Home." Wall Street Journal, June 17, 1983.
- Gallup, George H. "The 14th Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools." Phi Delta Kappan 64 (September 1982).
- Gans, Herbert J. "The New Egalitarian." Saturday Review, May 6, 1972.
- Halperin, Samuel. "ESEA Comes of Age: Some Historical Reflections." Educational Leadership 36 (February 1979).
- Hampel, Robert L. "The American High School Today: James B. Conant's Reservations and Reconsiderations." Phi Delta Kappan 64 (May 1983).
- Haney, Walt, and Madus, George. "Making Sense of the Competency Testing Movement." Harvard Educational Review 48 (November 1978).
- Havighurst, Robert. "Common Experience Versus Diversity in the Curriculum." Educational Leadership 36 (November 1968).
- Hodgkinson, C. "Organizational Influence on Value Systems." Educational Administration Quarterly (1971).
- James, Thomas, and Tyack, David. "Learning From Past Efforts to Reform the High School." Phi Delta Kappan 64 (February 1983).
- Joiner, Lee M., and Sabatino, David A. "A Policy Study of P.L. 94-142." Exceptional Children 48 (September 1981).
- Katz, Michael B. "Reflections on the Purpose of Educational Reform." Educational Theory 30 (Spring 1980).
- Lapati, Americo D. "Education: Privilege, Claim or Right?" Educational Theory 26 (Winter 1976).
- Martin, John Henry. "Reconsidering the Goals of High School Education." Educational Leadership 37 (January 1980).
- McCutcheon, Gail. "The Curriculum: Patchwork or Crazy Quilt?" Educational Leadership 36 (November 1978).
- Michaelson, Jacob B. "Revision, Bureaucracy, and School Reform: A Critique of Katz." School Review 85 (February 1977).

- National Association of Secondary School Principals. Almanac of National Reports (August 1983).
- Oakes, Jeannie. "Classroom Social Relationships: Exploring the Bowles and Gintis Hypothesis." Sociology of Education 55 (October 1982).
- Oldequist, Andrew. "The Decline of American Education in the '60s and '70s." American Education 19 (May 1983).
- Ornstein, Allan C. "Curriculum Contrasts: A Historical Overview." Phi Delta Kappan 63 (February 1982).
- _____. "Educating Disadvantaged Learners." Education Forum 44 (Winter 1983).
- Ravitch, Diane. "The Meaning of the New Coleman Report." Phi Delta Kappan 62 (June 1981).
- Reisler, Raymond F. "An Education Agenda for the Eighties." Phi Delta Kappan 62 (February 1981).
- Retsinas, Joan. "Teachers and Professional Autonomy." The Educational Forum 44 (Fall 1982).
- Shannon, Thomas A. "The Emerging Role of the Federal Government in Public Education." Phi Delta Kappan 63 (May 1982).
- Shapiro, H. Sui. "Society, Ideology and Reform of Special Education: A Study in the Limits of Educational Change." Educational Theory 30 (Summer, 1980).
- Snowden, Petra E. "Equity: A Future Issue in American Education." Education 102 (Winter 1981).
- Tanner, David. "The Comprehensive High School in American Education." Educational Leadership 39 (May 1982).
- Tomlinson, Tommy M. "The Troubled Years: An Interpretive Analysis of Public Schooling Since 1950." Phi Delta Kappan 62 (January 1981).
- Turnbell, Brenda J.; Smith, Marshall S.; and Gensburg, Alan J. "Issues for a New Administration: The Federal Role in Education." American Journal of Education (August 1981).
- Weiler, Hans N. "Education, Public Confidence, and the Legitimacy of the Modern State: Do We Have a Crisis?" Phi Delta Kappan 64 (September 1982).

Wirtenberg, Jeana; Klein, Susan; Richardson, Barbara; and Thomas, Veronica. "Sex Equity in American Education." Educational Leadership 38 (January 1981).

Unpublished Materials

Bell, Terrell. "Concluding Remarks." National Forum on Excellence in Education, Indianapolis, Indiana, 8 December 1983. (Mimeographed.)

_____ High School. "Program of Study 1982-83."

Michigan Department of Education. "The I.E.P.C. Process in Michigan." October 1980.

Monahan, William G. "The Generation of Typological Categories in the Study of Different Administrative Issues and Affirmity of Q-Methodology for Theory-Building." Paper presented at the Q-Methodology Symposium, American Education Research Association Convention, New York City, February 1971.

National Education Association. "Teachers' Views on Equity and Excellence." Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1983.

Ray, James E. "A Study to Examine Belief Patterns About Teaching, Learning, and Classroom Organization Among Teachers, Administrators Engaged in Implementing Rational Management Models, and Elementary Principals." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1978.

Talbott, Albert D. "Q Technique and Its Methodology: Brief Introduction and Consideration." Paper presented at the 1971 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, New York, February 1971.