



A comparison of the demographic characteristics and attitudes of teachers in target schools and teachers in non-target schools
by Judith Leota Tasset

A thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE in EDUCATION
Montana State University
© Copyright by Judith Leota Tasset (1967)

Abstract:

A questionnaire and an adaptation of the semantic differential measuring instrument were administered to determine differences in demographic characteristics and attitudes in teachers working with disadvantaged (target) children and with non-disadvantaged (non-target) children. Names of the two types of schools were drawn separately. There were 107 teachers in the target sample and 87 teachers in the non-target sample.

Significant differences were found in both areas of investigation. With respect to demographic findings, non-target teachers: had higher salaries; were more likely to have graduated from colleges offering graduate degrees in education; had a greater number of years of teaching experience; had a greater number of years of teaching experience in the same or a similar socio-economic area.

Whereas target teachers generally had more favorable attitudes toward concepts such as Negro, Spanish-American People, Minority Groups, non-target respondents had more favorable attitudes toward concepts such as My Job, My Teaching "Rewards", My Students, My School, My Student's Parents, Middle-Class Whites, and Me.

221

A COMPARISON OF THE DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS
AND ATTITUDES
of
TEACHERS IN TARGET SCHOOLS
and
TEACHERS IN NON-TARGET SCHOOLS
by
JUDITH LEOTA TASSET

A thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
in
EDUCATION

Approved:

Earl N. Ringo
Head, Major Department

Elnora A. Knight
Chairman, Examining Committee

Jervis D. Smith
Graduate Dean

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
Bozeman, Montana

August, 1967

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The investigator wishes to thank Dr. Kenneth Oberholtzer, Superintendent of Schools in the research city, whose interest and cooperation made this study possible; thanks are due Dr. Elnora Wright of Montana State University for her guidance throughout the past four years; grateful appreciation is expressed to Joyce Martin for attending to thousands of small details for me; and special thanks to my family for their interest, support and patience.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Vita	ii
Acknowledgement	iii
List of Tables	v
Abstract	vi
PART ONE: INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY	1
I. Introduction	1
II. Background Research	3
III. Culturally Disadvantaged Children: Their Learning Style Factors in the Educational Environment	11
IV. Sources of Data	19
V. Procedures for Collection of Data	20
VI. Explanation of Research Instruments	21
VII. Pretest of Research Instruments	26
PART TWO: PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS	27
I. Demographic Findings	27
II. Semantic Differential Findings	42
PART THREE: DISCUSSION AND INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS	50
I. Demographic Data	50
II. Semantic Differential Data	70
PART FOUR: CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY	83
I. Conclusion	83
II. Summary: Significant Demographic Findings	84
III. Summary: Significant Semantic Differential Findings	87
LITERATURE CITED	88
APPENDIX	91
Appendix "A"	92
Appendix "B"	93
Appendix "C"	94
Appendix "D"	95
Appendix "E"	96

LIST OF TABLES

I.	Age of Teachers	30
II.	Sex of Teachers	31
III.	Current Salary Per Year	31
IV.	Number of Years College Attendance	33
V.	Teachers Graduated From Colleges Offering Graduate Degrees in Education	33
VI.	Teachers Graduated from Colleges Offering Graduate Degrees in Other Curricula	34
VII.	Teachers Holding Graduate Degrees	34
VIII.	Graduate Degrees Held by Teachers	34
IX.	Years Teaching Experience	35
X.	Years Teaching in Similar Socio-Economic Area	35
XI.	Number of Professional Journals Read Monthly	36
XII.	Current Membership in Teachers' Associations	37
XIII.	Number of Current Memberships in Teachers' Associations	37
XIV.	College Membership in Teachers' Associations	37
XV.	Number of College Memberships in Teachers' Associations	38
XVI.	Number of Daily Student-Teacher Contacts	38
XVII.	Attendance at Institutes or Workshops for Teachers	40
XVIII.	Number of Institutes or Workshops Attended	40
XIX.	After-School Hours Given for Teaching-Related Activities	41
XX.	If You Had It To Do Over Again, Would You Be A Teacher?	41
XXI.	Reasons for Teaching in Particular Schools	41
XXII.	Evaluative Profile	47
XXIII.	Potency Profile	48
XXIV.	Activity Profile	49
XXV.	Summary of Demographic Findings	86
XXVI.	Summary of Semantic Differential Findings	87

ABSTRACT

A questionnaire and an adaptation of the semantic differential measuring instrument were administered to determine differences in demographic characteristics and attitudes in teachers working with disadvantaged (target) children and with non-disadvantaged (non-target) children. Names of the two types of schools were drawn separately. There were 107 teachers in the target sample and 87 teachers in the non-target sample.

Significant differences were found in both areas of investigation. With respect to demographic findings, non-target teachers: had higher salaries; were more likely to have graduated from colleges offering graduate degrees in education; had a greater number of years of teaching experience; had a greater number of years of teaching experience in the same or a similar socio-economic area.

Whereas target teachers generally had more favorable attitudes toward concepts such as Negro, Spanish-American People, Minority Groups, non-target respondents had more favorable attitudes toward concepts such as My Job, My Teaching "Rewards", My Students, My School, My Student's Parents, Middle-Class Whites, and Me.

PART ONE

INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

I. Introduction

As the library research summarized in this paper will show, it is known that children from socio-economically depressed areas, and those from racial and ethnic minority groups, generally do not experience the academic success enjoyed by children from more advantaged areas. Although much of this failure is attributed to methods and materials unrelated to the experiential backgrounds of these children, one belief precipitating this study was that one cause of the failure lay in the teachers themselves.

The purposes of this study were twofold: first, to discover if target school teachers differ demographically from non-target school teachers; second, to assess possible attitude differences between these two groups.

Concepts in need of definition are as follows:

- a) Demographic characteristics: vital characteristics relative to the teachers, such as age, sex, and years of teaching experience.
- b) Target schools: for purposes of allocation of federal funds, administrative officials in the school system in which this study was conducted have designated target-area schools as those in which 10 per cent or more of the students come from families receiving Aid to Dependent Children through the Public Welfare Department. Ten per cent was used as the cut-off point because the results of a survey showed that approximately 10 per cent of all children in the city are members of families receiving Aid to Dependent Children.
- c) Non-target schools: these are the schools within the same system in which nine per cent or less of the student enrollment comes from families receiving Aid to Dependent Children.

Although relatively little research has been conducted on demographic characteristics and attitudes of teachers working in disadvantaged areas, the doctoral dissertation of S. E. Thorsten Lund, completed at the University of California in 1966 seems pertinent for review. An abstract received from Science Information Exchange, indicates that his research included sections concerning "attitudes related to the education of the disadvantaged," and "prior exposure to ethnic and social-class groups different from one's own group." However, Lund did not consider the current demographic characteristics of the teachers involved, nor did he review possible biasing of the teachers. His sample did not include teachers working in non-disadvantaged areas. A request for further information relative to his research was not answered.

II. BACKGROUND RESEARCH

The following section is an overview of the special characteristics and educational problems of disadvantaged children. It is presented not only to give the reader a broader understanding of the disadvantaged child, but also to emphasize the need for a thorough investigation of the teachers whose task it is to "enlighten" the disadvantaged child. For, "No factor in education, of course, influences the quality of learning the children receive more directly and forcibly than teachers."¹

An understanding of the conditions of poverty and prejudice and the implications for education might serve to explain some of the demographic and attitudinal differences between target and non-target teachers, as revealed by the present investigation. "It makes a difference who and what these teachers are. Social well-being and social advance depend in marked measure on their excellence."²

This section is an overview of the special characteristics and educational problems of the children so variously described as "poor", "culturally deprived", "educationally deprived", "culturally different", and "culturally disadvantaged". Although most authors use these terms interchangeably, the latter term will be used herein. Note that these children are not without a culture, as illustrated by a summary of findings of a recent study:

"Does membership in a group that has been poor for generations constitute belonging to a separate culture?"

¹Francis Keppel, The Necessary Revolution in American Education, (New York, N.Y.: Harper and Row, 1966), p. 91.

²Teachers For Our Times, (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1944), p. 24.

A study of Puerto Ricans in both Puerto Rico and New York indicates that it does."³

Each aspect of cultural deprivation and its effects upon education has been the object of extensive research. This section is only a general review and summary of the literature.

Who are the poor? In 1964 Badgikian wrote:

"...the poor are everywhere. There are at least 20,000,000 in the United States and, depending on how hungry and unhealthy you call 'poor', perhaps as many as 54,000,000. Every city and every region has them and in a few unfortunate places there is scarcely any-one else... . The poor in the 1960's are largely invisible. They are obscured by The National Average."⁴

Whereas Badgikian's statistics do not differentiate children from adults, another author makes the shocking statement that

"In 1950, approximately one child out of every ten in the fourteen largest cities of the United States was 'culturally deprived.' By 1960 this figure had risen to one in three... . . . By 1970 it is estimated there may be one deprived child for every two enrolled in schools in these large cities."⁵

Obviously, any estimate of the number of people living under disadvantaged conditions depends not only upon one's definition of disadvantaged, but also upon other factors. Before 1960 comparatively little attention was given to the culturally deprived child. Today, by contrast, one is constantly reminded by private and governmental publications, legislative action, and the various mass media that special provisions must be

³Oscar Lewis, "The Culture of Poverty," Scientific American, IV, (October, 1966), p. 19.

⁴Ben H. Bagdikian, In the Midst of Plenty, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1964), p. 7.

⁵Frank Riessman, The Culturally Deprived Child, (New York: Harper and Row, 1962), p. 1.

made for culturally disadvantaged students. However, Kenneth Johnson, writing for the Science Research Associates, says that

"It is difficult to give an accurate number of pupils who cannot achieve in school because of their cultural background, because income is usually the only criterion used for identification. That is, families below a certain income are classified culturally disadvantaged; but the level of income which places families in the classification of the culturally disadvantaged is often determined by legislation, and it fluctuates according to the purpose and content of the legislation or the amount legislative bodies are willing to spend. This method of classification does not support accuracy or consistency. Poverty is a primary contributing cause of cultural deprivation, but there are also some culturally disadvantaged families that earn an adequate income to supply necessary material needs. Thus, there is no accurate count."⁶

Just as it is difficult to give an accurate statement of the number of culturally disadvantaged children in the United States, it is equally difficult to state their ethnic and racial origins. In terms of these two factors, Johnson lists these groups as culturally disadvantaged:

1. Negroes in the rural South and in the black ghettos of our cities and towns. Their problems are particularly acute in Northern cities.
2. Mexican-Americans in the rural Southwest and West and in the cities of these areas. Many have recently migrated from Mexico.
3. Puerto Ricans in a few large Northern cities. Many have recently migrated from Puerto Rico.
4. Caucasians in the rural South and Appalachian Mountains. Some Caucasians from these areas have migrated to Northern industrial cities.
5. American Indians in the Southwest and West on reservations and in the cities in these areas.
6. Other ethnic groups include European immigrants, Cuban immigrants, Eskimos of Alaska."⁷

⁶Kenneth Johnson, Teaching Culturally Disadvantaged Pupils: Unit One (City of publication not given), Science Research Associates, 1966, p. 3.

⁷Ibid., p. 11.

In order to teach our growing population of culturally disadvantaged children, we must know about their special problems and assets; and, more important, we need to accept them as individuals. Although each child, regardless of his environmental circumstances, has problems unique to him there seem to be a few general reasons for the learning difficulties faced by the culturally disadvantaged child.⁸

First, due to a "tradition" of poverty, lack of interest, ignorance or a combination of these factors, there are few books or other instruments of education in the home. It is interesting to note, however, that in many of the poorest homes a television set may be found. And in spite of this seeming incongruity, the value of television as an education device is not to be overlooked. Of course, certain programs are more beneficial than others, and it is the group of "others" that often attracts children. Still, the child hears English spoken with at least partial clarity and accuracy; and he learns the values of cleanliness, good health, and other phases of what we might call "wholesome living."

A second reason for the learning difficulties of culturally disadvantaged children is their lack of sufficient reading and language skills.

A Harlem teacher discusses one of her pupils:

"Why can't he read? He is twelve years old. Some of the reasons are: too much defeat; brings no experience from home; lacks auditory discrimination (he can't hear the difference between said and set); no one speaks to him at home or lets him finish a sentence or a thought. Finally, the school does not motivate him adequately to read. Teachers are often glad, and say so, when children in these schools stay home."⁹

⁸Riessman, op. cit., pp. 4-5.

⁹Frances Green and Orletta Ryan, "A Normal Day in P.S. 200", McCall's, XCIII, (March, 1966), p. 152.

The parents themselves may have neither the interest nor the ability to read; some are unable to put their signatures on forms brought home by their children. This lack of interest and/or ability to read makes it unlikely that there will be reading materials in the home. The lack of reading materials, in turn, makes it difficult for the child to learn the fundamentals of picture-interpretation, left-to-right and top-to-bottom sequence, or knowledge that spoken words can also be represented through written symbols.

Inadequate motivation to secure an education, combined with a poor estimate of the self, is a third reason for the learning difficulties of culturally disadvantaged students. With few exceptions, such as the Banks Street Readers, the textbooks are geared towards the Dick and Jane world of the middle class child. The culturally disadvantaged pupil is an alien in the world of white picket fences and shiny-faced children. The stories in the textbooks do not deal with his experiences, nor do they use his manner of speech and grammar. Likewise, arithmetic texts referring to "counting balls and blocks" are foreign to one who plays with stones and tin cans. Thus, unable to cope with the conventional texts and teaching methods, the disadvantaged child faces frequent failure. His concept of himself is one of failure; and if B. F. Skinner is right, failure does not ordinarily breed motivation to reach more distant goals.

Because of frequent failure and environmental conditions of the family, a fourth barrier to learning arises; antagonism toward the teacher and the school. It is a rare parent who does not take pride in his child's achievements; he resents anyone or anything which "causes" the child to

fail. Also, it seems likely that because the parents are poorly educated themselves, and are unable (or unwilling in a few cases) to take an active role with the school in their children's educational development, they might become defensive and rationalize a false antagonism toward teacher and school.

The fifth cause of learning difficulties is one or a combination of the following: frequent moving from one locality to another; improper diet; poor health; a noisy and unpleasant home environment. A child forced to change schools and teachers frequently does not have the advantage of a continuous sequence of learning experiences, nor does he have the security of "my class" or "my friends". The teacher does not have him long enough to discover his individual problems and to work with him toward their solution. Improper diet and poor health work together to cause frequent absences, and difficulty in paying attention while present. Indeed, some parents send ill children to school and other children are exposed to the illness. A noisy, depressed, bickering environment produces tense, fearful children, who are slow to gain faith in the teacher and in her methods.

The factors enumerated above blame the child's learning failure on the home environment, the parents, and the child himself. The culturally disadvantaged child has further problems imposed by the teacher and school.¹⁰

Unless specifically planned for culturally disadvantaged children, the school and teacher inadvertently discriminate against them. Teachers do not seem to realize that special techniques and materials are needed to

¹⁰Riessman, op. cit., p. 5

effectively teach culturally disadvantaged children. Moreover, special provisions are needed to encourage parents of these children to participate in and cooperate with the school program. (This will again be discussed later in this paper.) As mentioned earlier, textbooks are not based upon the life experiences of disadvantaged children. In like manner, the conventional I.Q. tests are constructed for middle and upper class children; but the culturally disadvantaged children must take these same tests, and are then compared to their classmates on this unequal basis.

Another learning problem arises in culturally disadvantaged children if their teachers do not understand and accept them. Ironically, those teachers faced with the great challenge of working with culturally disadvantaged children are sometimes the lowest-paid and least-skilled teachers employed by particular school districts. For the good of the children and teachers involved, teachers for culturally disadvantaged pupils should be made aware of the educational and emotional problems of these children before attempting to teach them. Certainly, no teacher should be forced to work with disadvantaged students. For, "behind the headlines about special slum schools and ambitious government programs lies the day-to-day reality; harassed teachers, neglected children, and school officials who find it easier to cope with paper work than with human suffering."¹¹

Although culturally disadvantaged children have problems vastly different from other children, "The truth, ironically, is that disadvantaged pupils are more like all other pupils than they are different. The

¹¹Green et al., op. cit., p. 96.

tragedy is that there are differences, and these differences are educationally significant."¹² Our discussion of the characteristics of culturally disadvantaged children can thus be summarized:

- "In general, disadvantaged pupils
- Have an impoverished experiential background
 - Have rural backgrounds
 - Are economically impoverished
 - Are inheritors of poverty
 - Are caught up in 'cycles of poverty' that perpetuate spiritual and moral, aspirational, educational, and economic poverty
 - Feel rejected by society
 - Have a poor self-concept
 - Are aggressive
 - Do not adhere to the values of the dominant culture--
often, they are unaware of these values
 - Live in a negative environment that is ugly, crowded, filthy, noisy, and disorderly
 - Have poor attention spans
 - Have poor conceptual development
 - Are linguistically disadvantaged."¹³

¹² Kenneth Johnson, Teaching Culturally Disadvantaged Pupils: Unit Two, (City of publication not given) (Science Research Associates, 1966), p. 18.

¹³ Ibid., pp. 18-19.

III. Culturally Disadvantaged Children: Their Learning Style Factors In The Educational Environment

In this section, I shall discuss the "learning style" of culturally disadvantaged children and will note implications for the teacher. I shall also examine the salient features of the school environment.

Learning style "refers to the way individuals learn. The learning style of culturally disadvantaged pupils does not complement the orientation of the curriculum. In other words, their learning style places them at a disadvantage in the curriculum."¹⁴ The child's learning style is largely a product of his environment and experiences. Johnson has enumerated seven principle factors that comprise the learning style of culturally disadvantaged children:

"Culturally Disadvantaged Pupils Have A Negative
Attitude Toward Intellectual Tasks"¹⁵

Because culturally disadvantaged children do not see the effects of intellectual development in their environment, they do not value such development. They work to achieve physical, not intellectual, prowess. Culturally disadvantaged children need to see the immediate importance of what they learn; school experiences should be realistic and relate directly to the lives of their disadvantaged pupils. Perhaps more than other children, culturally disadvantaged pupils need warm and sincere praise for their efforts.

"Culturally Disadvantaged Pupils Do Not
Use Adults as Sources of Information"¹⁶

¹⁴ Johnson (Unit Two), op. cit., pp. 18-19.

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 22.

¹⁶ Ibid., p.

Although disadvantaged pupils seem to develop their intellects at a slow rate, they are often superior to their parents in "academic" matters. Because parents are often unable to help their children with schoolwork, or are even unable to sign their own names, the children learn that adults are not sources of information. As Johnson warns, this attitude may even be extended to include the teacher if she persists in teaching lessons which are neither real to the culturally disadvantaged pupils nor based upon their experiences.¹⁷

"Culturally Disadvantaged Pupils Respond
More to Visual and Physical (Kinesthetic)
Stimuli than Verbal and Written Stimuli"¹⁸

Audiovisual materials are more understandable and interesting to the disadvantaged child than are books. The former have the advantage of visual presentations and sound; they reinforce each other. Audiovisual aids "have the double advantage of filling in the experiential void of disadvantaged pupils and teaching them skills and concepts, while being consistent with the learning style of these pupils."¹⁹

Psychologists tell us that children learn better if they can become involved in physical activity that is directly related to the concepts being taught. This points to the value of dramatic role playing, kinesthetic tracing of words, acting out number problems, and other physical techniques.

"Culturally Disadvantaged Pupils
Are Present Oriented"²⁰

¹⁷Johnson, (Unit Two), op. cit., p. 23.

¹⁸Ibid.

¹⁹Ibid.

²⁰Ibid., p. 24.

The past of culturally disadvantaged children is one of sadness, hunger, and hardship--a past which is not pleasant to recall. In addition these children are so involved with their day-to-day existence that they have neither the time nor the desire to examine the past. Thus, it is suggested that in social studies, for example, that basic concepts such as national pride be taught by relating them to current problems, and tracing them back into the past only when necessary.

"Culturally Disadvantaged Pupils Are Slow"²¹

Slowness and dullness are not the same. For various reasons, the bright child who is culturally disadvantaged may not be able to work or think quickly. Speed is not a part of the value system of culturally disadvantaged children. It is vital that teachers provide ample time for the completion of school tasks. Our culture and traditional school curricula value speed. However, the teacher should encourage competence in school tasks, and speed will eventually follow.

"Culturally Disadvantaged Pupils Pursue One Problem at a Time"²²

Any task presented to culturally disadvantaged pupils should be for one working period only; it should not be carried over to another period or another day. In addition, one assignment should be given at a time, and within reason, no assignment should involve multiple tasks.

"Culturally Disadvantaged Pupils Learn Better By Inductive Rather than Deductive Approaches"²³

It is easier for disadvantaged children to comprehend single,

²¹Johnson, (Unit Two), op. cit., p. 25.

²²Ibid., op. cit., p. 26.

²³Ibid.

particular ideas and later to generalize them (sometimes with the teacher's help) than it is to break a generalization into single, specific parts.

These children "...come to school with a severe deficit in ability to abstract, to see relationships... ."24. According to Taba, a program for culturally disadvantaged children

"...is one which emphasizes a number of important concepts and ideas and which judiciously limits the coverage of detail in order to provide time for depth study of these ideas and concepts. If the program is to be productive of learning, these ideas should be both significant generally and capable of being made important to these students. This approach amounts to emphasizing fewer aspects of durable knowledge on behalf of a wider coverage. A clearer understanding of an idea can emerge from studying a few instances in depth than it can from covering many lightly. This way of organizing content and learning experiences should be especially suitable to students with a host of learning difficulties."25

In general the learning style of the culturally disadvantaged pupil, regardless of his age, is the learning style of a child. Curriculum content and methods should be adapted to this learning style, and should gradually help the child to develop a more advanced and efficient learning style which is

"...verbally oriented, problem and content centered, able to deal with abstractions, present, past and future oriented, able to work for future reward and gratification, and speedy. Until disadvantaged pupils acquire this style, instruction should be adapted to their particular style."26

With this brief discussion of the learning style of culturally

²⁴Hilda Taba and Deborah Elkins, Teaching Strategies for the Culturally Disadvantaged, (Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1966), p. 67.

²⁵Ibid., pp. 69-70.

²⁶Johnson, (Unit Two), op. cit., p. 20.

disadvantaged children, let us now examine the educational environment. In their discussions of the ideal classroom environment for disadvantaged children, most authors agree that the teacher is the central entity in this environment.

"The heart of the educational process is found in the skill, dedication, and personality of the teacher. Foremost among the needed qualities of the teacher is respect for the pupil.

"Respect for the pupil is important in all types of education, at any level, anywhere. But children used to a drab life, conflict, and failure--children whose parents and friends often do not expect them to succeed--are particularly responsive to the genuine interest and respect of an adult. And with respect for the child, the teacher can become an effective model and inspiration. He is then in a position to further the cause of learning and cultural change."²⁷

This respect for the children might be either the cause or effect of an ever-present awareness of the circumstances under which the children live and learn. Respect "is the secret of contact between child and school."²⁸

For the most effective interaction between teacher and child,

Riessman suggests that

"The teacher should be straight-forward, direct, and should clearly define what is to be done as much as possible. At the same time she should be informal, warm, down-to-earth. Snobbishness and indirection are major pitfalls. So is cynicism, although naivete is equally dangerous."²⁹

It is vital that the teacher create learning situations which are based on the experiences of her students. Indeed, the teacher of culturally

²⁷ Educational Policies Commission. Education and the Disadvantaged American, (City of publication not given) (National Education Association, 1962), p. 19.

²⁸ Ibid., p. 20.

²⁹ Riessman, op. cit., p. 81.

disadvantaged children ideally should have "a passion for ordering, knowing, and creating reality."³⁰ Such a teacher works with her students to solve not only learning problems, but also social problems, such as those involved in an efficient classroom routine.

"By doing and encouraging this, some of the important needs of disadvantaged children are met--to have clear boundaries and expectations, to feel 'big,' to have a world which in part they 'own.' But there is something more to this than the children's needs. The teacher...does this to satisfy himself as well. He must live in a structure that is clearly defined; he must master a world by knowing and shaping it. By this necessity in him to make things clear (from a simple routine to a complex rule in grammar) and by his faith that all aspects of reality are essentially good to know (the children's interests as well as his own), he provides (and completes...) a model of teaching which alienated children need desperately."³¹

Obviously, teachers need the services of other specialized personnel to help them with the challenges presented by culturally disadvantaged children. There are

"...special needs for remedial teachers, guidance counselors, psychologists, psychiatrists, nurses, and social workers to observe and work with children and to provide specialized advice and help to teachers... "³²

In addition to their professional training, these people should be given information concerning the special circumstances and problems of disadvantaged children. Like teachers, it is necessary that the specialized personnel understand and accept disadvantaged children. The school

³⁰ Harry Passow, (ed.), Education in Depressed Areas, (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963) p. 276.

³¹ Ibid., p. 277.

³² Educational Policies Commission, op. cit., p. 21.

principal is of focal importance, for his role as friend, administrator, and coordinator is "crucial to the success of the entire staff."³³

Teachers and other school personnel need the interest and cooperation of parents in order that the latter might implement certain school objectives, such as promoting interest in learning.

"Wherever teachers were asked to name the priority items in a program for disadvantaged children, almost unanimously they named acceptance of each child as he is as the major requisite, and parent-school cooperation as a close second."³⁴

It is sometimes difficult to secure parental cooperation.³⁵ Some of the parents themselves did poorly in school or did not finish school; they may be fearful and resentful of the school and its representatives. Another problem often confronting parents of culturally disadvantaged children is a fear of venturing out of their familiar "compound" into the unknown neighborhood of the school. Still other parents have long and exhausting work days and they have neither the time, strength, nor will to give a part of the evening to school-related activities. The parents

"...venture out timidly and at great effort, but are basically appreciative of opportunities to talk among themselves and with the teacher about their children. Informality is encouraged, with food to facilitate conversation. Parents sometimes take pride in preparing and contributing food."³⁶

Gradually the conversation turns from food to matters of greater

³³ Educational Policies Commission, op. cit., p. 21.

³⁴ Helen Mackintosh et al., Educating Disadvantaged Children Under Six, (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1965), p. 17.

³⁵ Ibid., pp. 17-18.

³⁶ Ibid.

importance, the child, his family, his educational problems. Teachers attempt to interest parents in school activities by encouraging them to discuss with the child what he has learned each day, and by encouraging parental assistance in such activities as social affairs, field trips, and transportation of neighbor children to and from school. There seems to be a misconception that culturally disadvantaged people are not interested in education. On the contrary,

"These parents, like others, want their children to come to school and succeed.... Occasionally individual parents request instruction for their own development, learning to read and write; for instance."³⁷

Facilities for study and play will naturally vary with the age group of the children. However, the exaggerated problems of the culturally disadvantaged necessitate some facilities, such as small rooms for napping and extensive audio-visual equipment, which are helpful, but usually not necessary for effective functioning in "average" classrooms.

For a general summary of facilities and environment suggested for teaching culturally disadvantaged children, the investigator would like to refer the reader to a series of four booklets available from the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:

- "Educating Disadvantaged Children Under Six"
- "Educating Disadvantaged Children in the Primary Years"
- "Educating Disadvantaged Children in the Middle Grades"
- "Administration of School Programs for Disadvantaged Children"

³⁷ Mackintosh, op. cit., p. 18.

IV. Sources of Data

The name of each school was written on a separate piece of paper and drawn randomly, the target and non-target schools being drawn separately. Because the City School Directory lists the approximate number of teachers in each school the drawing for the two groups continued until each group had no less than 100 teachers. The estimates were not correct in all cases, resulting in inequality in the sizes of the two samples.

After the names of the schools were drawn, the superintendent personally telephoned the principal of each school and explained the purpose of the study. All expressed interest in the project, encouraged their teachers to participate, and allowed the investigator one day to collect data.

The faculty in each school were told only the name of the investigator, the name of the university sponsoring the study, and a general statement about the kind of information to be collected. Teachers did not receive full information about the study until all data for a particular school had been collected. Although teachers were allowed to refuse cooperation, only six did so.

V. Procedures for Collection of Data

A questionnaire and a semantic differential adaptation were used to collect data (see pp. 93-95). These and explanatory printed instructions (see p. 94) were given to each teacher at some time during the work day. Approximately thirty minutes after classes were dismissed, the investigator went to each teacher to collect the completed forms. Since names of teachers did not appear on the forms, a number was assigned to each for coding and classification purposes.

VI. Explanation of Research Instruments

Demographic information was obtained from a questionnaire (see p. 93). The selection of questions was based merely on the interests of the investigator and on the relevance to the research topic.

A form of the semantic differential measuring instrument (see p.) was used to determine teacher attitudes. Although the instrument is fully explained and evaluated with respect to objectivity, reliability, validity, sensitivity, comparability, and utility in Osgood's The Measurement of Meaning, a few comments are in order.

In explaining the developmental history of the semantic differential, Osgood remarks that

"Most social scientists would agree--talking freely on common sense grounds--that how a person behaves in a situation depends upon what that situation means or signifies to him. And most would also agree that one of the most important factors in social activity is meaning and change in meaning--whether it be termed 'attitude' or 'value', or something else again."³⁸

Although Osgood uses the words meaning, attitude, and value interchangeably throughout his book, the investigator will use the word attitude throughout her report.

"Despite a plethora of definitions of 'attitude' in contemporary social science, some consensus and agreement is evident, particularly with respect to the major properties that attitudes are assumed to possess. Most authorities are agreed that attitudes are learned and implicit--they are inferred states of the organism that are presumably acquired in much the same manner that other such internal learned activity is acquired. Further, they are predispositions to respond, but are distinguished from other such states of readiness in that they

³⁸ Charles E. Osgood, George J. Suci, and Percy H. Tannenbaum, The Measurement of Meaning, (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1957), p. 1.

predispose toward an evaluative response. Thus, attitudes are referred to as 'tendencies of approach or avoidance,' or as 'favorable or unfavorable,' and so on. This notion is related to another shared view--that attitudes can be ascribed to some basic bipolar continuum with a neutral or zero reference point, implying that they have both direction and intensity and provide a basis for the quantitative indexing of attitudes."³⁹

As Osgood admits, the measurement of attitudes is complicated when we take the attitudes out of context.⁴⁰ "The pattern of stimulation which is a sign is never identical with the pattern of stimulation which is the significate,"⁴¹ he says. "Nevertheless, the sign ('hammer') does come to elicit behaviors which are in some manner relevant to the significate (HAMMER)..."⁴²

The semantic differential may be defined, then, as "...essentially a combination of controlled association and scaling procedures. We provide the subject with a concept to be differentiated and a set of bipolar adjectival scales against which to do it, his only task being to indicate, for each item (pairing of a concept with a scale,) the direction of his association and its intensity on a seven-step scale."⁴³

With respect to the construction and administration of a semantic differential, Osgood remarks:

"Although we often refer to the semantic differential as if it were some kind of 'test' having some definite set of items and a specific score, this is not the

³⁹ Osgood, op. cit., pp. 189-90.

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 198.

⁴¹ Ibid., p. 13.

⁴² Ibid., p. 7.

⁴³ Ibid., p. 20.

case. To the contrary, it is a very general way of getting at a certain type of information, a highly generalizable technique of measurement which must be adapted to the requirements of each research problem to which it is applied. There are no standard concepts and no standard scales; rather, the concepts and scales used in a particular study depend upon the purposes of the research."⁴⁴

The bipolar adjectival scales used for this particular research were chosen from the extensive list of those tested for universality of meaning by Osgood and his associates; these tests are thoroughly discussed in Osgood's book. It is important to mention here, however, that by using Thurstone's Centroid Factor Method, Osgood has found three principal factors into which the tested bipolar adjectives may be grouped:⁴⁵

Factor	Bipolar adjectives used for the present investigation
EVALUATIVE	good--bad kind--cruel beautiful--ugly important--unimportant intelligent--ignorant pleasant--unpleasant valuable--worthless
POTENCY	strong--weak severe--lenient heavy--light large--small brave--cowardly
ACTIVITY	active--passive excitable--calm fast--slow hot--cold sharp--dull

Concerning the independence of these three factors, Osgood says;

⁴⁴Osgood, op. cit., p. 76.

⁴⁵Ibid., pp. 36-38.

"Our own research has demonstrated repeatedly that, when subjects differentiate the meanings of concepts, variance along certain scales (e.g., activity scales) may be quite independent of variation along other scales (e.g., evaluation)."⁴⁶

Although the direction and intensity of attitudes were referred to earlier in this section, Osgood reports that the semantic differential accomodates "the major properties of attitude that any measurement technique is expected to index..."⁴⁷

"Direction of attitudes, favorable or unfavorable, is simply indicated by the selection of polar terms by the subject; if the score falls more toward the favorable poles, then the attitude is taken to be favorable, and vice versa. A score that falls at the origin, defined by '4' on the scales, is taken as an index of neutrality of attitude. Intensity of attitude is indexed by how far out along the evaluative dimension from the origin the score lies, i.e., the polarization of the attitude score."⁴⁸

The printed instructions given to each subject were taken from Osgood's book. In general, they include:

- "(1) orientation to the general nature of the task,
- (2) the significance of the scale positions and how to mark them, and (3) the attitude to be taken toward the task (speed, first impressions, but true impressions.)"⁴⁹

Each subject was presented with the questionnaire, printed directions for the semantic differential, and the semantic differential form itself. In

⁴⁶ Osgood, op. cit., p. 72.

⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 192.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 82.

the appendix are copies of each of these, preceded by the oral directions given to each subject (see pp.92-95).

VII. Pretest of Research Instruments

In order to test the instruments, the investigator administered them to five teachers in one target school, and five teachers in one non-target school. The schools were selected by the superintendent, the former having the largest population of children from homes receiving Aid to Dependent Children, the latter being one of the "wealthiest" schools in the system. Neither of these schools was included in the research samples. The names of the teachers in the pretest schools were drawn randomly, and administrative procedures were similar to those followed for the final research samples.

Although the questionnaire was not changed after the pretest, certain alterations were made in the semantic differential forms in an effort to utilize more pertinent bipolar adjectives. A copy of the pretest semantic differential is in the appendix, p. 96.

PART TWO

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

I. Demographic Findings

In this section are presented questionnaire findings. In order to determine significant differences, each item was submitted to either the chi square test for independence (see p. 42) or to the t test for two correlated per cents.⁵⁰ With respect to the t test, all items in this research had between 150 and 200 degrees of freedom. For them to be significant at the .05 level, therefore, the t values must be greater than the tabled value of 1.97.⁵¹

Following a summary presentation of significance test findings, tables are presented in order to show more specific results of the questionnaire. Pertinent correlations are given. As the reader will note, certain questions were not amenable to calculations.

Summary of Significance Test Findings

1. Age of teacher
df = 192; t test
t = $\sqrt{.91}$
sig. level = .967

df = 6; chi square test
chi square = 9.74 (9.8)
sig. level = .13333
2. Sex of teacher
df = 1
chi square = .47 (.5)
sig. level = .47950
3. Current salary per year
df = 5

⁵⁰Garrett and Woodworth, Statistics in Psychology and Education, (New York: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1961), pp. 197-237.

⁵¹Ibid., p. 449.

chi square = 16.99 (17)
sig. level = .00450* non-target higher

4. Name of school
107 in target sample
87 in non-target sample

5-7 not included in analysis

8. How many years have you attended college?
df = 4
chi square = 2.42 (2.4)
sig. level = .66263

9. Does the college from which you graduated offer
graduate degrees in education?
df = 1
chi square = 4.1 (4.0)
sig. level = .04550* non-target higher

In other curricula?
df = 1
chi square = 3.71 (3.8)
sig. level = .05125

10. Do you possess a graduate degree?
df = 1
chi square = .76 (.8)
sig. level = .37109

11. How many years have you taught school?
df = 189; t test
t = $\sqrt{15.82}$
sig. level = 3.98* non-target higher

12. How many years have you taught in this socio-
economic area or in an area similar to the
one in which you are now teaching?
df = 183; t test
t = $\sqrt{12.92}$
sig. level = 3.582* non-target higher

13. On the average, how many professional journals
do you read each month?
df = 4
chi square = 7.67 (7.6)
sig. level = .10738

14. Do you now belong to any teachers' associations?
 df = 1
 chi square = 3.04 (3.0)
 sig. level = .08327
- How many?
 df = 4
 chi square = 4.68 (4.6)
 sig. level = .33085
15. Did you belong to any such organization in college?
 df = 1
 chi square = 1.25 (1.3)
 sig. level = .25421
- How many?
 df = 2
 chi square = 0.00
 sig. level = 0.00
16. With how many different students do you have contact each day in a teaching situation?
 df = 185; t test
 t = 1.48
 sig. level = 1.215
17. Have you ever attended any summer institutes or special workshops for teachers?
 df = 1
 chi square = .03
 sig. level = .86249
- How many?
 df = 3
 chi square = 6.34 (6.4)
 sig. level = .09369
18. After school hours, how much time, on the average do you give each day to teaching-related activities?
 df = 180
 t = 2.22
 sig. level = 1.49
19. If you had it to do over again, would you be a teacher?
 df = 1
 chi square = 3.1 (3.0)
 sig. level = .08327
20. Why are you teaching in this particular school (I requested a school such as this: I was assigned this school, etc.)?
 df = 4
 chi square = 2.42 (2.4)
 sig. level = .66263

TABLE I.

Age of Teachers

Age	Target		Non-target		
	#	%	#	%	
21	1	.9	2	2.3	
22	1	.9	5	5.7	
23	8	7.5	3	3.4	
24	8	7.5	7	8.0	
25	6	5.6	3	3.4	
26	6	5.6	4	4.6	
27	2	1.9	3	3.4	
28	6	5.6			
29	1	.9			
30	4	3.7	1	1.1	
31					
32	7	6.5	1	1.1	Summary-target
33	5	4.7	5	5.7	No ans - 2-1.9%
34	4	3.7	3	3.4	
35	6	5.6	3	3.4	Median 33 yrs
36	1	.9			Average 34.5 yrs
37	2	1.9	3	3.4	
38	3	2.8	2	2.3	
39	4	3.7	2	2.3	Summary-non-target
40	3	2.8	6	6.9	No ans - 3-3.4%
41	1	.9	2	2.3	
42	3	2.8	3	3.4	
43	3	2.8	2	2.3	Median 37 yrs
44	5	4.7	1	1.1	Average 36.5 yrs
45	3	2.8	3	3.4	
46	4	3.7	2	2.3	
47			3	3.4	
48	1	.9	2	2.3	No sign. difference
49			2	2.3	
50			4	4.6	
51	1	.9	1	1.1	
52	1	.9	3	3.4	
53					
54					
55			1	1.1	
56			1	1.1	
57	1	.9			
58			1	1.1	
59					
60	1	.9			
61					
62	1	.9			
63					
64	1	.9			
65	1	.9			

TABLE II.

Sex of Teachers

	Target		Non-target		Difference
Male	24	22.4%	16	18.3%	4.1%
Female	83	77.5%	71	81.6%	4.1%

No significant difference

TABLE III.

Current Salary per Year

	Target		Non-target		Difference
No response	2	1.8%	1	1.1%	.7%
\$5,000-5,999	51	47.6%	25	28.8%	18.8%
6,000-6,999	18	16.8%	14	16.0%	.8%
7,000-7,999	13	12.1%	6	6.8%	5.3%
8,000-8,999	8	7.4%	15	17.2%	9.8%
9,000 & over	10	9.3%	22	25.2%	15.9%
Other	5	4.6%	4	4.5%	.1%

Significant at .00450 level.

Non-target teachers earn higher salaries than target teachers

4. What is the name of the school in which you are now teaching?

The purpose of this question was merely to place the teachers into target and non-target groups. During the random drawing of school names, it was necessary to draw five from the target and four from the non-target groups in order to attain a minimum of 100 teachers in each sample.

However, the City School Directory estimates of faculty size were not correct in all cases, resulting in inequality in the size of the two samples. There were 107 teachers in the target sample and 87 teachers in the non-target sample.

5. Where did you go to high school?
6. Approximately how many people lived in that town at that time?
7. Where did you attend college?

Questions five and seven listed above were included in order to determine whether there were differences in the two samples in the number of subjects teaching in an area close to the ones in which they received their education. The purpose of question six was to determine whether there were differences in the two samples in their tendency to teach in a city of approximately the same population as that of the city in which they received their high school education. Because of the great variability in answers, and because many teachers commented that they had no idea about the population of the city in which they received their high school education at the particular time in which they were enrolled in high school, the responses for these items could not be correctly calculated.

TABLE IV.

Number of Years of
College Attendance

	Target	Non-target	Difference
No response	1 - .9%	2 - 2.2%	1.3%
1 year	0 - 0	1 - 1.1%	1.1%
2 years	0 - 0	1 - 1.1%	1.1%
3 years	4 - 3.7%	1 - 1.1%	2.6%
4 years	48 - 44.8%	42 - 48.2%	3.4%
5 years	33 - 30.8%	22 - 25.5%	5.3%
6 years	13 - 12.1%	9 - 10.3%	1.8%
7 years	5 - 4.6%	6 - 6.8%	2.2%
8 years	2 - 1.8%	3 - 3.4%	1.6%
9 years	1 - .9%	0 - 0	.9%

Average; 4.75 yrs Average; 4.64 yrs

No significant difference

TABLE V.

Teachers Graduated From Colleges Offering
Graduate Degrees in Education

	Target	Non-target	Difference
No response	0 - 0	1 - 1.1%	1.1%
Yes	91 - 85.0%	81 - 93.1%	8.1%
No	16 - 14.9%	5 - 5.7%	9.2%

Significant at .04550 level

More non-target than target teachers graduated
from colleges offering graduate degrees in
education.

