THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

AN ANALYSIS OF STUDENT AND TEACHER ATTITUDES TOWARD THE FLEXIBLE PLACEMENT PROGRAM AT SISLER JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

by

FRANK DARCY BRYAN

A Thesis

Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies

In Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree

of Master of Education

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

WINNIPEG, MANITOBA

FALL, 1972

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA
ELIZABETH DAFOE LIBRARY

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to survey the attitudes of students and teachers toward the Flexible Placement Project which was first introduced at Sisler Junior High School in 1970. The study also involved a complete description of the flexible placement concept. The attitudinal survey involved an analysis of: (1) the attitudes of the total student population, (2) the attitudes of students grouped according to grades and general academic categories, (3) the opinions of teachers concerning student attitudes, and (4) the specific attitudes of teachers toward the school's instructional program.

Two questionnaires were developed, one for students and another for teachers, to gather data for this study. These questionnaires were administered to 553 students and thirty-nine teachers. An interview format was also developed and personal interviews were conducted with thirty-six members of the instructional staff.

Using a computer, the researcher subjected student and teacher response to the attitude statements in the questionnaires to statistical analysis. A principal factor analysis was performed on student responses to their questionnaire statements. Twelve factors emerged and were named as follows: (1) student satisfaction with school life, (2) the homeroom teacher, (3) interpersonal relationships,

(4) differentiated levels of instruction, (5) social implications of achievement levels, (6) satisfaction with level placement, (7) understanding of cultural groups, (8) attendance in cultural classes, (9) social aspects of cultural grouping, (10) compatibility in cultural groups, (11) sociometric preferences, and (12) the nature of cultural grouping.

Generally, the staff and students at Sisler Junior High appeared satisfied with the organizational, instructional, and social aspects associated with the Flexible Placement Project. The students appeared enthusiastic about the use of differentiated levels of instruction for each academic subject. They also seemed pleased with the heterogeneous grouping of students for homeroom and cultural subject classes. The teachers expressed the view that the flexible placement scheme provided them with more precise knowledge of the ability levels of their students. Consequently, they felt that their approach to teaching and the instructional methods they used had improved. The teachers also expressed general satisfaction with the practice of heterogeneous grouping for homerooms and cultural subject classes.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer is grateful to Mr. B. Fenton and the instructional staff at Sisler Junior High School for their cooperation in providing information and assistance in gathering data for this study.

Appreciation is also expressed for the help and encouragement given by the writer's advisory committee, Dr. H. May (chairman), Miss E. Motheral and Dr.C. Bjarnason.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	THE PROBLEM, SIGNIFICANCE OF STUDY DEFINITIONS, AND THE ORGANIZATION OF THE FLEXIBLE PLACEMENT PROJECT.	1
	Introduction.	1
	The Problem	5
	Statement of the problem.	5
	Significance of the study	6
	Definition of Terms	9
	Objectives and Organization of the Flexible Placement Project.	16
	Theoretical Assumptions	33
	Limitations	34
	Delimitations	35
II.	REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE.	37
	Introduction.	37
	General Discussion of Grouping, Attitudes and Self-Concept.	38
	Considerations beyond achievement . . .	38
	Support for ability grouping.	40
	Criticism of ability grouping	43
	Grouping: What May Be Needed	47
	Some Selected Grouping Programs	51
	Summary	57

CHAPTER PAGE

III. RESEARCH PROCEDURES. 60

Collecting the Data. 60

The student population 60

The teaching staff 61

The student survey 61

The teacher survey 63

Analysis of Data 66

Factor analysis. 66

Questionnaire tabulation 67

Comparative analysis of student data . . 68

Analysis of teacher questionnaire data . 70

Treatment of data from teacher interviews 72

IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA 74

The Factor Analysis. 75

Description of the Factors 79

Summary. 81

Discussion of the Factors. 82

Section One factors. 82

Section Two factors. 88

Section Three factors. 95

Summary of Factors 104

Analysis of Item Responses 105

General Attitudes of Students, Total Response 106

CHAPTER PAGE

School life in general. 106

The homeroom. 110

Interpersonal relationships 112

Student Attitudes Toward Achievement Levels, Total Response. 114

Acceptance of achievement levels. . . . 115

Social implications 119

Satisfaction with assigned levels . . . 122

Student Attitudes Toward Cultural Grouping, Total Response. 125

Compatibility in cultural groups. . . . 125

Understanding of cultural groups. . . . 127

Attendance in cultural classes. 127

Social implications of cultural grouping. 129

Sociometric preferences 132

The nature of cultural grouping 135

Comparative Analysis of Student Response, By Grades 137

General attitudes 137

Attitudes toward achievement levels . . 143

Attitudes toward cultural grouping. . . 149

Comparative Analysis of Student Response, By Categories 158

CHAPTER PAGE

General attitudes. 159

Attitudes toward achievement levels. . . 165

Attitudes toward cultural grouping . . . 174

Teacher Opinion Concerning Student Attitudes. 184

General attitudes. 185

Achievement levels 195

Cultural grouping. 206

Comparative Analysis of Teacher Response Academic and Cultural. 221

General attitudes. 222

Achievement levels 228

Cultural grouping. 234

Teacher Interviews 236

Academic teachers. 243

Cultural teachers. 250

V. SUMMARY, FINDINGS, AND CONCLUSIONS 253

Summary. 253

Findings 255

Student attitudes. 255

Student attitudes by grade and category. 262

Teacher opinion concerning student attitudes. 268

Specific teacher attitudes 278

CHAPTER PAGE

Conclusions. 283

Further Study. 290

BIBLIOGRAPHY 291

APPENDIX A 296

APPENDIX B 302

APPENDIX C 309

APPENDIX D 319

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	The Flexible Placement Timetable Sisler Junior High 1971-1972.	24
II.	Numbers and Percentages of Total School Enrollment and Total Student Response, By Grades	62
III.	Number and Percentage of Teacher Respondents, By Major Instructional Area.	65
IV.	Student Categories According to Range of Achievement Levels.	69
V.	Number and Percentage of Student Respondents, By Grade and Category. . . .	71
VI.	Student Questionnaire Section I Principal Factor Analysis Varimax Rotation.	76
VII.	Student Questionnaire Section II Principal Factor Analysis Varimax Rotation.	77
VIII.	Student Questionnaire Section III Principal Factor Analysis Varimax Rotation.	78
IX.	Student Attitude Toward Their School Life In General, Total Response.	107

TABLE PAGE

X. Student Attitude Toward the Homeroom and the Homeroom Teacher, Total Response. . . 111

XI. Student Relationships With Other Students and Teachers in the School, Total Response. 113

XII. Student Attitude Toward Differentiated Levels of Instruction in Academic Subjects, Total Response. 116

XIII. Student Attitude Toward the Social Aspects of Placement in Achievement Levels, Total Response. 120

XIV. Student Satisfaction With Assigned Achievement Levels, Total Response. . . . 124

XV. Student Compatibility in Cultural Groups, Total Response. 126

XVI. Student Understanding of Cultural Groups, Total Response. 128

XVII. Student Attitude Toward Attendance in Cultural Classes, Total Response. 130

XVIII. Student Attitude Toward the Social Aspects of Cultural Grouping, Total Response. . . 131

XIX. Sociometric Preferences of Students in Terms of Classmates, Total Response . . . 134

TABLE PAGE

XX. Student Attitude Toward the Apparent "Differences" Inherent in Cultural Grouping, Total Response. 136

XXI. Student Attitude Toward Their School Life in General, By Grades. 139

XXII. Student Attitude Toward the Homeroom and the Homeroom Teacher, By Grades . . 140

XXIII. Student Relationships With Other Students and Teachers in the School, By Grades 142

XXIV. Student Attitude Toward Differentiated Levels of Instruction in Academic Subjects, By Grades 144

XXV. Student Attitude Toward the Social Aspects of Placement in Achievement Levels, By Grades 147

XXVI. Student Satisfaction With Assigned Achievement Levels, By Grades 148

XXVII. Student Compatibility in Cultural Groups, By Grades 151

XXVIII. Student Understanding of Cultural Groups, By Grades 153

XXIX. Student Attitude Toward Attendance in Cultural Classes, By Grades 154

TABLE PAGE

XXX. Student Attitude Toward the Social Aspects of Cultural Grouping, By Grades 155

XXXI. Sociometric Preferences of Students in Terms of Classmates, By Grades 156

XXXII. Student Attitude Toward the Apparent "Differences" Inherent in Cultural Grouping, By Grades 157

XXXIII. Student Attitude Toward Their School Life in General, By Categories 160

XXXIV. Student Attitude Toward the Homeroom and the Homeroom Teacher, By Categories 162

XXXV. Student Relationships With Other Students and Teachers in the School, By Categories. 164

XXXVI. Student Attitude Toward Differentiated Levels of Instruction in Academic Subjects, By Categories. 166

XXXVII. Student Attitude Toward the Social Aspects of Placement in Achievement Levels, By Categories. 170

XXXVIII. Student Satisfaction With Assigned Achievement Levels, By Categories. . . 173

TABLE PAGE

XXXIX. Student Compatibility in Cultural Groups, By Categories. 175

XL. Student Understanding of Cultural Groups, By Categories. 176

XLI. Student Attitude Toward Attendance in Cultural Classes, By Categories. 178

XLII. Student Attitude Toward the Social Aspects of Cultural Grouping, By Categories 180

XLIII. Sociometric Preferences of Students in Terms of Classmates, By Categories . . . 182

XLIV. Student Attitude Toward the Apparent "Differences" Inherent in Cultural Grouping, By Categories. 183

XLV. Teacher Opinion Concerning Student Attitudes Toward School Life in General, Total Response. 186

XLVI. Teacher Opinion Concerning Student Attitudes Toward the Homeroom and the Homeroom Teacher, Total Response . . 191

XLVII. Teacher Opinion Concerning Student Relationship With Other Students and Teachers, Total Response 193

TABLE PAGE

XLVIII. Teacher Opinion Concerning Student Attitudes Toward Differentiated Levels of Instruction, Total Response. 196

XLIX. Teacher Opinion Concerning Student Attitudes Toward the Social Aspects of Placement in Achievement Levels, Total Response. 201

L. Teacher Opinion Concerning Student Satisfaction With Assigned Achievement Levels, Total Response. 205

LI. Teacher Opinion Concerning Student Compatibility in Cultural Groups, Total Response. 207

LII. Teacher Opinion Concerning Student Understanding of Cultural Groups, Total Response. 210

LIII. Teacher Opinion Concerning Student Attitude Towards Attendance in Cultural Classes, Total Response 213

LIV. Teacher Opinion Concerning Student Attitudes Toward the Social Aspects of Cultural Grouping, Total Response. 215

LV. Teacher Opinion Concerning the Sociometric Preferences of Students in Terms of Classmates, Total Response. 218

TABLE PAGE

LVI. Teacher Opinion Concerning Student Attitudes Toward the Apparent "Differences" Inherent in Cultural Grouping, Total Response. 220

LVII. Teacher Opinion Concerning Student Attitude Toward School Life in General, Cultural and Academic Teachers. 223

LVIII. Teacher Opinion Concerning Student Attitude Toward the Homeroom and the Homeroom Teacher, Cultural and Academic Teachers. 225

LIX. Teacher Opinion Concerning Student Relationship With Other Students and Teachers, Cultural and Academic Teachers 227

LX. Teacher Opinion Concerning Student Attitudes Toward Differentiated Levels of Instruction, Cultural and Academic Teachers. 230

LXI. Teacher Opinion Concerning Student Attitudes Toward the Social Aspects of Placement in Achievement Levels, Cultural and Academic Teachers 233

LXII. Teacher Opinion Concerning Student Satisfaction With Assigned Achievement Levels, Cultural and Academic Teachers. . 235

TABLE PAGE

LXIII. Teacher Opinion Concerning Student Compatibility in Cultural Groups, Cultural and Academic Teachers. 237

LXIV. Teacher Opinion Concerning Student Understanding of Cultural Groups, Cultural and Academic Teachers. 238

LXV. Teacher Opinion Concerning Student Attitudes Toward Attendance in Cultural Classes, Cultural and Academic Teachers 239

LXVI. Teacher Opinion Concerning Student Attitudes Toward the Social Aspects of Cultural Grouping, Cultural and Academic Teachers. 240

LXVII. Teacher Opinion Concerning the Sociometric Preferences of Students in Terms of Classmates, Cultural and Academic Teachers. 241

LXVIII. Teacher Opinion Concerning Student Attitudes Toward the Apparent "Differences" Inherent in Cultural Grouping, Cultural and Academic Teachers 242

LXIX. Matrix of Intercorrelations of Attitude Statements in Section I 320

TABLE PAGE

LXX. Matrix of Intercorrelations of Attitude Statements in Section II. 325

LXXI. Matrix of Intercorrelations of Attitude Statements in Section III 330

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM, SIGNIFICANCE OF STUDY, DEFINITIONS, AND THE ORGANIZATION OF THE FLEXIBLE PLACEMENT PROJECT

I. INTRODUCTION

Grouping for purposes of instruction has been one of the most controversial issues in education. Many schools have tended to organize classes by grouping students in terms of apparent homogeneous learning ability. Classes so constructed have then been given the instruction deemed appropriate for the ability or achievement level of the students involved. Usually, the level of instruction would not vary in respect to individual subject areas and would be controlled at all times by the initial grouping.

While this particular grouping practice has been generally accepted, evidence suggests that it may be more detrimental than beneficial. Critics maintain that it is almost impossible to organize students into legitimate homogeneous ability groups. They also contend that attempts to do so result in a form of segregation which places students in restrictive academic and social situations. Evidence is offered that students

may suffer a loss of self-esteem when relegated to "slow" classes and often such classes are typed as "dull" by both teachers and pupils. Mann's research in this area has led her to conclude that ability grouping is "cruel to all but the top students."[1]

However, until the concept of completely individualized instruction is generally accepted within our schools, it is likely some form of grouping by ability will be continued. The administrators at Sisler Junior High School in Winnipeg, Manitoba, have adopted a program they hope will minimize some of the problems associated with ability grouping. The school enrolls pupils in Grades Seven, Eight and Nine with a large section of Occupational Entrance Course students attending in each grade.[2]

In 1970, the organizational practice of ability grouping entire classes for similar instruction in every subject was discontinued at Sisler. There were two basic reasons for this action. First, it was felt that the

---

[1]Loretta Byres, "Ability Grouping: Help or Hindrance to Social and Emotional Growth," School Review V.69 (Winter, 1961) p. 453. Citing Maxine Mann's article "What Does Ability Grouping Do To The Self Concept," Childhood Education, V.36 (April, 1960) pp. 357-360.

[2]Students with records of low achievement and obvious learning difficulties may be assigned to Occupational Entrance classes.

instructional needs of individual students were not being adequately met as a result of traditional grouping methods. Second, it was felt that the rather unfair categorization of students into various well-defined classes on the basis of apparent ability created a socially unacceptable climate in the school.

With the rather large section of Occupational Entrance Course students as an important but not exclusive consideration, the administrators at Sisler introduced the Flexible Placement Project, a program for grouping students and organizing classes. They hoped that such a program would not only provide greater flexibility in instruction, but also would help break down the artificial social stratification that so often developed under the former system.

The flexible placement concept does use ability or achievement grouping but this is done subject by subject. Rather than having all students in a homeroom class take instruction together at the same level for all subjects, provision is made so that an individual student can be in a particular achievement level in one subject and at different levels in other subjects. Seven differentiated levels of instruction are provided for in each grade (7-8-9) for each of English, science, mathematics and social studies. A student is never

permanently placed at one level in a subject and can, corresponding to his achievement, move from level to level at various times during the year. Each student has the opportunity to gain recognition and a certain amount of self-satisfaction by doing well in a particularly favored subject. Conversely, in subjects that may be troublesome, the student may be placed in levels of instruction that attempt to strengthen his skills but do not overwhelm him with material that he cannot handle.

By not organizing homeroom classes in terms of one particular ability level, the flexible placement scheme attempts to integrate low-achieving pupils with the rest of the student body. Although a student may be in the lower levels of instruction for most of his subjects, he is not constantly identified with one particular group. Thus, the heterogeneous grouping of students in homeroom classes is one important step taken to promote a more socially acceptable climate in the school. In addition, classes for art, band, choir, home economics, industrial arts, guidance and physical education are all heterogeneously grouped.

The major objective of this study was to examine thoroughly the concept of flexible placement with

particular emphasis on the attitudes that the students and teachers at Sisler Junior High School have developed toward this program.

II. THE PROBLEM AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Statement of the Problem

The specific purpose of this study was to determine the attitudes of the students and teachers toward the Flexible Placement Project recently instituted at their school. In order that the study would develop fully, a number of specific considerations required a thorough examination:

1. The philosophical and pedagogic principles associated with the flexible placement concept.
2. The organization of the school in relation to the flexible placement concept.
3. The determination of the opinions held by students to ascertain whether the theoretical goals of the flexible concept were being met as perceived by the student body.
4. The determination of the opinions held by teachers to ascertain whether the instructional staff felt that the flexible placement system

provided an improved social and learning climate in the school.

Significance of the Study

It was not the intention of the study to argue for or against various schemes of grouping students for instruction. Yates comments that "in arguments about grouping policies one can usually find any point of view that one wishes to adopt."[3] Also, in terms of the relative effectiveness of any one scheme, Yates claims that research has been "abundant but inconclusive."[4] Consequently, any attempt to cling to one position or another is a rather futile exercise.

However, much of the latest research and literature related to various grouping practices was surveyed in the process of this study. This survey provided a general framework of opinion which demonstrated that most grouping plans have certain merits that cannot be ignored. With this in mind, it may be concluded a compromise view of grouping students for instruction is necessary. Rinehart maintains that if some form of ability grouping is needed, it is essential

---

[3]Alfred Yates, (Ed.) Grouping in Education. (New York; London: John Wiley and Sons, 1966) p.132.

[4]Ibid.

that we improve it to increase each child's "opportunity to reach his potential, both academically and socially."[5]

The prime consideration of this study was the examination of one particular program that attempts to blend the most acceptable features of homogeneous and heterogeneous grouping. The study of an individual school that endeavors to create a more flexible program by coping with the dilemma of grouping for instruction was considered important for two reasons. First, it would provide those educators in Manitoba, who might be interested, with a resume of literature related to various grouping practices as well as a thorough description of the Flexible Placement Project at Sisler Junior High School. Second, the study would provide the administrators at Sisler with information related to the attitudes of teachers and students toward the grouping procedures in operation at the school. This information would conceivably help those involved to evaluate the flexible placement concept.

Too often, the attitudes that develop in students toward new or different programs have been ignored by

---

[5]George Rinehart, "Ability Grouping: Out or In," The Education Digest (Feb. 1971) p.51. condensed from The PTA Magazine, V.65 (Nov. 1970) pp.10-12.

educators setting up innovative practices. Specifically, little consideration has usually been given to student and teacher attitudes toward grouping programs. Passow states that little or no attention has been given in most experiments to "assessing the effects of grouping on other aspects of pupil growth, attitudes, interests or personal development."[6] A research summary prepared by the National Education Association (1968) asserts that "pupils' attitudes toward ability grouping must become the subject of experimental research."[7] Yates believes that research is needed to look at the effects of various grouping practices on the "beliefs, attitudes and interests of the pupils concerned."[8] Byers also suggests that there are "too few studies of the social and emotional effects of ability grouping."[9] Although this study employed a descriptive rather than an experimental approach, it did generate some information that may be considered helpful in the determination of

---

[6] A. Harry Passow, "The Maze of Research on Ability Grouping," Educational Forum, V.26 (March, 1962) p.281.

[7] Ability Grouping. Research Summary (1968) prepared by the Research Division of the National Education Association (Washington: 1968).

[8] Alfred Yates, op.cit., p.134.

[9] Loretta Byres, op.cit., p.454.

general student attitudes toward a specific grouping practice. These observations may be useful when applied to the broader educational scene.

While the attitudes of teachers toward innovative schemes and teaching in general have been fairly well documented, new information relative to these attitudes was considered desirable. Yates emphasizes that "teachers exert a potent influence on the effectiveness of the grouping practices that they are required to operate."[10] He adds that "teachers have the power to ensure or jeopardize the success of any particular form of organization."[11] In these terms, it was considered essential that not only should the attitudes of students toward a particular program be examined, but also those of the teachers involved.

III. DEFINITION OF TERMS

The terms used in this study conform generally to accepted terminology connected with education and grouping practices. However, the program under consideration does employ some unique descriptive terms that require clarification. These special terms

---

[10] Alfred Yates, op.cit., p.83

[11] Ibid.

pertain only to the program in operation at Sisler Junior High School.

Flexible placement. This term refers to the program being used to organize classes and group students for instruction. Using both heterogeneous and academic or achievement grouping, the program attempts to provide for the individual learning differences of students in a socially realistic educational climate. In order to do this, students are grouped according to achievement, subject by subject, in English, mathematics, science, social studies and French. In subjects such as band, art, choral music, guidance, physical education, home economics and industrial arts, students are grouped heterogeneously as is the case for homeroom classes.

Academic areas. English, mathematics, science, social studies, French and a Pilot course referred to as Sociological Survey have been designated as the "academic" subjects at Sisler. English, mathematics, science and social studies are compulsory subjects for all students. However, students may choose between the options of French and Sociological Survey.

Sociological Survey. This is a special course for students who do not wish to take French. These students are generally in the lower levels of instruction

for most of their academic work and may feel that instruction in French may be beyond them. Of course, there are other students, working at higher academic levels, who opt for the Sociological Survey course simply because they do not wish to take French.

The curriculum for this course is not structured and depends upon the skill of the teacher involved to correlate his personal interests and aptitudes with those of the students in a particular group. For example, a teacher having a personal interest in photography may develop a course around this topic. Dependent upon the enthusiasm displayed by the students, the teacher may devote as much time as is deemed necessary to thoroughly develop the topic. When the course in Photography has been completed, a new area is mutually decided on by the teacher and students and a similar procedure is followed.

By using topics that are interesting and immediately relevant to students, the Sociological Survey course strives to develop in students certain skills in oral communication; an area too often neglected in more orthodox classes. Of course, the ingenuity of the teacher involved is a key factor in this program and a high degree of enthusiasm on his part is essential.

Academic levels of achievement. Each academic subject in each grade has levels of instruction corresponding to various achievement or ability levels of students. For English, mathematics, science and social studies, seven levels are provided for in each subject. French and Sociological Survey have four levels each since these subjects are optional and, consequently, they enrol fewer pupils than the other academic courses. Students choosing French are usually in higher academic levels while those opting for Sociological Survey are generally in the lower academic levels.

In terms of level placement, Level I accommodates students of demonstrated high achievement and ability. Levels II, III and IV provide differentiated levels of instruction for those students usually described as "average". Level V instruction is designed to meet the needs of students who may be termed "below average". Levels VI and VII provide instruction for pupils designated as Occupational Entrance Course students. These students receive modified programs adapted to their special learning difficulties.

As a result of this system, a student has the opportunity to work at a level in each subject that is

appropriate to his individual ability and needs. For example, a student could conceivably be in Level VII for instruction in English; Level VI for social studies; Level V for science; and Level IV for mathematics.

Cultural areas. Band, art, choral music, guidance and physical education have been designated as the "cultural" subjects at Sisler. Students must take guidance and physical education and choose one subject from band, art, or choral music. Latin, German and Ukrainian may be described as "cultural" in nature and some students may elect to take one of these; however, the number of students in each grade opting for one of these subjects is limited. All classes for cultural subjects are grouped heterogeneously although there may be some grouping according to sex in certain areas, and, usually, apparent musical ability determines placement in band classes.

Cultural grouping. An organizational method referred to as "cultural grouping" is used at Sisler to place students heterogeneously into classes for cultural subjects. Since students must elect one subject from band, art and choral music, these areas are the determinants for placement in a cultural group.

For example, students who elect band are in the Band Group; those who elect art are in the Art Group; and those who elect choral music are in the Choral Music Groups.

The students in each grade are divided into seven cultural groups. Since band instruction is limited to students demonstrating some musical ability, there is only one Band Group for each grade. Art and choral music accommodate the majority of students and, consequently, each of these subjects has been assigned three groups for each grade. For organizational purposes, each group is assigned a number from one to seven. Thus, for each grade, Cultural Group I consists of students taking band; Cultural Groups II, III, and IV consist of students taking art; and Cultural Groups V, VI and VII consist of students taking choral music. A student's "cultural" timetable is determined by his group designation and he attends cultural classes with that group.

Teaching teams. For organizational and instructional purposes, the teaching staff at Sisler is divided into four major teaching-teams. Teachers are placed on the team that corresponds to their teaching specialty. The four teams are: (1) English (2) Mathematics-

Science (3) Social Studies-French-Sociological Survey (4) Cultural. Individual teams meet regularly to evaluate and discuss the progress of students in their particular instructional area. Decisions may be made at these meetings to move certain students from one academic level to another, or, in the cultural area, from one group to another.

Each teacher instructs in Grades Seven, Eight and Nine. With the exception of English teachers who are assigned more instructional periods each cycle than is the case in other subject areas, each teacher generally is involved with two levels in each grade. For example, a Social Studies teacher may instruct Levels I and III in Grade Seven; Levels II and IV in Grade Eight and Levels I and III in Grade Nine. Teachers of Occupational Entrance Course students confine their instruction to Levels VI and VII in each grade. As mentioned previously, teachers on the Cultural team meet students who are organized heterogeneously into cultural groups. These teachers also instruct in all grade levels.

Although Practical Arts may be considered a "cultural" area, teachers of home economics and industrial arts are not considered to be members of the Cultural

Team. This is due to the special timetabling needed for Practical Arts and also to the certain amount of internal grouping necessary for such classes. As a consequence this part of the school program operates exclusive of the Academic and Cultural areas.

IV. OBJECTIVES AND ORGANIZATION OF THE FLEXIBLE PLACEMENT PROJECT

The specific purpose of this study was to determine the attitudes of the students and teachers at Sisler toward the flexible placement project in operation at their school. To make the analysis of these attitudes more meaningful, it was considered necessary to examine the administrative objectives of flexible placement and the organization of the school in relation to this concept. This section directs itself to these particular considerations.

Objectives. Prior to the introduction of the flexible placement program at Sisler, the basic organizational unit used to group students for instruction was the homeroom class. Each school year, students would be assigned to a homeroom with others who had records of similar past achievement and, as a consequence, were thought to be of comparable academic ability.

This particular method of ability grouping tended to categorize students according to their homeroom placement. An entire class of students would be described as "above-average", "average", or "below average", in terms of their generalized level of academic ability. A further category evolved as the enrolment of students having pronounced learning difficulties increased at Sisler. These students were placed in special classes and received a modified instructional program commonly referred to as the Occupational Entrance Course.

Once assigned to a specific homeroom, students were usually expected to remain with that class for the entire year. The students in each homeroom travelled as a group to their various subject teachers and received instruction at a level thought consistent with the general ability of the class. The only variation to this procedure came about when the boys and girls in a class were separated for instruction in physical education, guidance and practical arts.

The administrative staff at Sisler recognized that the homeroom method used to organize classes and group students had serious weaknesses. The basic problem resulted from the obvious difficulty of pre-

determining the actual range of ability present among students in the homeroom groups. Since each student's ability could vary drastically from subject to subject, any effort to generalize the ability level of an entire class was almost impossible.

Although the problems associated with ability grouping were well known, the organization of the school often precluded any other course of action for teachers but to teach to the so-called "average" level of each class. Unfortunately, the individual differences of most students, in terms of their varying abilities in different subjects, tended to be ignored. A student who was doing well in a particular subject had little opportunity to advance beyond the expected limits of his class. These circumstances especially restricted those students in the Occupational Entrance Course who had the ability and desire to work at higher levels in certain subjects. Also affected were students in the regular stream who were having difficulties in one or more subjects and were unable to move to more appropriate levels of instruction. It was obvious that a more flexible system was needed to accommodate the academic strengths and weaknesses of individual students.

A further weakness of the homeroom grouping system

was the labelling effect that it had on students. A major problem was the stigma attached to the Occupational Entrance Course and the tendency of certain students in the regular program to ridicule those people assigned to these special classes. This activity resulted in feelings of inferiority on the part of many Occupational Entrance students who were often heard to comment that they were in the "dumb room". Their relative isolation from the remainder of the student body due to their "special" rooms, teachers and instructional programs, compounded the problem. Naturally the morale of many Occupational Entrance students tended to be low and their desire to achieve was often minimal. The system was not only psychologically damaging to the students who were down-graded, but also negatively affected certain students in the regular program who developed feelings of superiority. To counteract this rather unhealthy social situation, it was essential that a concerted effort be made to integrate the Occupational Entrance students into the main stream of student life.

After concluding that the traditional methods of organizing classes and grouping students for instruction were not fully meeting the educational and social needs of all students, the administrators at Sisler decided to

implement the flexible placement project. The objectives of this program were:

1. To combine certain aspects of homogeneous and heterogeneous grouping to provide a more beneficial social and instructional climate in the school.
2. To allow students to function at varying levels of instruction in each subject according to their achievement and progress.
3. To organize classes in a manner that would help minimize the course differences of regular and Occupational Entrance students.
4. To provide more opportunity for students to function in the non-academic areas of instruction according to their individual interests.
5. To provide a timetable meeting the following criteria:
   a. It would result in the creation of teaching teams in specific subject areas.
   b. It would allow all members of specific teaching teams to be free from instructional duties at least two periods each day to plan programs and evaluate student progress.

c. It would result in completely paralleled time-tabling and facilitate team-teaching practices.

Organization. Sisler is a combined Junior-Senior High School enrolling six hundred students in the Junior High section. The school is completely departmentalized and operates on a six-day teaching cycle with eight instructional periods each day. There are 180 students in grade seven, 210 students in grade eight and 210 students in grade nine. In each grade level, students are alphabetically divided into homeroom groups. For administrative convenience there are seven homerooms in grade seven, eight homerooms in grade eight and eight homerooms in grade nine. These heterogeneously grouped homerooms are not used in any manner for instructional purposes. Rather, students simply report to their homerooms prior to morning and afternoon classes to have their attendance checked, listen to school notices and, if necessary, attend to any school business that may involve them. For the remainder of the school day, students proceed independently to their various subjects according to their achievement levels in the academic areas and their particular options in the cultural areas.

The instructional staff. The Junior High program at Sisler involves a staff of thirty-nine teachers. However, it should be noted that certain teachers in the practical arts, band and choral music areas are also involved, to varying degrees, with the Senior High program at the school. In order to meet the administrative and instructional objectives of the flexible placement program, most teachers in the Junior High are organized into four teaching teams. This practice facilitates parallel timetabling and, consequently, ensures relative ease of student movement between the various academic levels of achievement in individual subject areas. Following is a brief resume of the four teams and the teaching personnel on each.

1. English Team - composed of six English teachers and one developmental reading teacher
2. Mathematics-Science Team - composed of three mathematics teachers, three science teachers, and one mathematics-science teacher
3. Social Studies-French-Sociological Survey Team - composed of three and one-half social studies teachers, two French teachers, and one and one-half Sociological Survey teachers

4. Cultural Team - composed of two physical education teachers, two guidance counsellors, one band instructor, one choral music teacher, one art teacher, one librarian and one teacher each for German, Latin and Ukrainian.

In addition to the thirty-two members indicated on the above teams, there are three industrial arts and two home economics teachers who instruct in the Junior High section of the school. These teachers also meet certain outside classes from neighboring schools that travel to Sisler for practical arts. The Junior High staff is further complemented by two more teachers. However, their duties in the program are limited as their main responsibilities are in the Senior High division of the school.

Timetabling procedures. During any one instructional period in the school day, three of the four teams are teaching to all grades in the Junior High. The fourth team is timetabled for a preparation and planning period at this particular time. Table I indicates the general timetable used to determine the rotation of the various teaching teams. In reference to this timetable, the abbreviation GAMPE signifies the Cultural team that includes teachers of guidance, art, band, choral music

TABLE I

THE FLEXIBLE PLACEMENT TIMETABLE
SISLER JUNIOR HIGH
1971-1972

	DAY 1	DAY 2	DAY 3	DAY 4	DAY 5	DAY 6
1	GAMPE 7 SC.MA. 8 FR.SS. 9	GAMPE 7 SC.MA. 8 FR.SS. 9	GAMPE 7 ENG. 8 FR.SS. 9	SC.MA.7 GAMPE 8 ENG. 9	ENG. 7 GAMPE 8 SC.MA. 9	FR.SS.7 ENG. 8 GAMPE 9
2	ENG. 7 GAMPE 8 SC.MA. 9	GAMPE 7 SC.MA. 8 FR.SS. 9	GAMPE 7 ENG. 8 FR.SS. 9	SC.MA.7 GAMPE 8 ENG. 9	GAMPE 7 SC.MA. 8 FR.SS. 9	GAMPE 7 SC.MA.8 FR.SS.9
3	FR.SS. 7 ENG. 8 GAMPE 9	FR.SS. 7 ENG. 8 GAMPE 9	ENG. 7 FR.SS. 8 SC.MA. 9	GAMPE 7 ENG. 8 FR.SS.9	FR.SS. 7 ENG. 8 GAMPE 9	ENG. 7 GAMPE 8 SC.MA.9
4	SC.MA. 7 FR.SS. 8 ENG. 9	FR.SS. 7 ENG. 8 GAMPE 9	ENG. 7 FR.SS. 8 SC.MA. 9	GAMPE 7 ENG. 8 FR.SS.9	SC.MA. 7 FR.SS. 8 ENG. 9	SC.MA.7 FR.SS.8 ENG. 9
5	GAMPE 7 SC.MA. 8 FR.SS. 9	ENG. 7 GAMPE 8 SC.MA. 9	FR.SS. 7 SC.MA. 8 GAMPE 9	ENG. 7 FR.SS.8 SC.MA.9	ENG. 7 GAMPE 8 SC.MA. 9	FR.SS.7 ENG. 8 GAMPE 9
6	ENG. 7 GAMPE 8 SC.MA. 9	ENG. 7 GAMPE 8 SC.MA. 9	FR.SS. 7 SC.MA. 8 GAMPE 9	ENG. 7 FR.SS.8 SC.MA.9	GAMPE 7 SC.MA. 8 FR.SS. 9	GAMPE 7 SC.MA.8 FR.SS.9
7	FR.SS. 7 ENG. 8 GAMPE 9	SC.MA. 7 FR.SS. 8 ENG. 9	SC.MA. 7 GAMPE 8 ENG. 9	FR.SS.7 SC.MA.8 GAMPE 9	FR.SS. 7 ENG. 8 GAMPE 9	ENG. 7 GAMPE 8 SC.MA.9
8	SC.MA. 7 FR.SS. 8 ENG. 9	SC.MA. 7 FR.SS. 8 ENG. 9	SC.MA. 7 GAMPE 8 ENG. 9	FR.SS.7 SC.MA.8 GAMPE 9	SC.MA. 7 FR.SS. 8 ENG. 9	SC.MA.7 FR.SS.8 ENG. 9

and physical education; SC.MA. refers to the Science-Mathematics Team; FR.SS. refers to the French-Social Studies-Sociological Survey Team; and ENG. to the English Team. The numbers 7, 8 and 9 refer to the grade level that a particular team is teaching during any given period.

An example may help clarify the operation of this timetable. On Day I, Period 4, all grade seven students take instruction in mathematics or science; all grade 8 students take social studies, French or Sociological Survey; and all grade nine students have English. The teachers on the Cultural Team are free from instructional duties and, unless they have teaching responsibilities in the Senior High division, are available for team planning. In Period 8 of the same day, the same teams instruct the same grades. However, the grade seven students who received instruction in mathematics in the morning now take science; the grade eight students also change about in social studies, French and Sociological Survey and the grade nine students receive a second period of English. The Cultural Team again has a preparation and planning period.

For the other six periods of the day, the four teaching teams are involved with instruction in the three

grade levels in a similar way. As a result of this timetabling procedure, each team receives at least two periods free from instructional duties each day. This time is made available because in grades eight and nine, eight heterogeneously grouped homeroom classes become seven instructional groups in both the academic and cultural areas. Under the former system used at Sisler, the eight homeroom classes in grades eight and nine represented eight instructional groups in each subject and therefore, involved eight teachers. The flexible placement system, by having only seven teachers involved with a particular grade at any one time, frees the equivalent of one teacher per subject each period in grades eight and nine. When distributed among the teaching teams, the time saved by this organizational technique makes it possible for most teachers to have approximately one-quarter of their school time available for team meetings, planning and preparation.

Organization in the academic areas. As stated previously, each of the English, Science-Mathematics and Social Studies-French-Sociological Survey Teams consist of seven teachers. This makes it possible to have seven differentiated levels of instruction in each grade for these subjects. The only variation to the

seven level concept concerns French and Sociological Survey. Since students may opt for the Survey course rather than take French, there are fewer students in each of these subjects as compared to English, science, mathematics and social studies. As a result, there are four levels of instruction in French and four in the Sociological Survey course.

With the exception of French and Sociological Survey, each academic subject has seven descending levels of instruction numbered from one to seven. Students in Level I are those achieving at a relatively high level while students in Level VII are those having pronounced learning difficulties. While the system is designed to provide flexibility for student movement between levels in each subject, there are some restrictive features arising from the nature of the teaching teams. These restrictions are not too serious but they should be noted.

By combining teachers to form the Science-Mathematics and Social Studies-French-Sociological Survey Teams, it becomes impossible to provide seven levels of instruction in each of these subjects during any one specific time period. Consequently, each team meets with all students in each grade for two periods every

day. Thus, students who take classes in one subject during a team's first instructional period alternate to the other subject in the second period. A problem arises when the various levels of instruction provided in each subject area are considered. For example, in any grade, classes in mathematics for the first instructional period may involve students in Levels II, IV and VI. In science, given during the same period, the classes will then involve students in Levels I, III, V and VII. The levels taught in the second instructional period for mathematics and science would be reversed. As a result of this system, a student in Level II mathematics cannot be placed in Levels I, III, IV or VII science since these classes are all taught at the same time. The student must take science in the alternate instructional period in one of Levels II, IV or VI. However, most students are usually in the same levels for mathematics and science thereby easing the problem of continually adjusting individual timetables. The same may be said of students in the social studies, French and Sociological Survey areas. This problem does not concern the English Team because all students must take English twice each day. Therefore, instruction is given at seven achievement levels in both periods of English and student movement between levels is not hindered

in any manner.

Team-teaching. In addition to the concept of differentiated levels of instruction in individual subject areas, the flexible placement project also serves the principles of team-teaching. The main reasons for this observation are:

1. All students in any one grade are always timetabled to a specific teaching team during the same periods each day.
2. All teachers assigned to specific teams are available for team planning and preparation two periods each school day.
3. Small group instruction is encouraged by having each grade fully timetabled for practical arts on one fixed day each cycle. For example, all grade seven students are scheduled for practical arts on Day 1. On this day, one half of the grade seven students take practical arts in the morning and the remaining half receives similar instruction in the afternoon. Thus, during the entire day, classes in the other subjects are reduced by one-half creating relatively small instructional groups.

4. Field trips, movies, excursions and other special groupings are easily planned and, probably more important, create little disruption or timetable adjustments.

Organization in the cultural areas. The organization of classes for instruction in guidance, art, band, choral music, physical education and library is based on a practice referred to as cultural grouping. This grouping technique is generally heterogeneous in character and the students in each grade are divided into seven cultural groups or classes. On the basis of their choice of one option from band, art or choral music, students are assigned in a cultural group numbered from one to seven. Placement in the band group is not completely heterogeneous since it is based on apparent musical ability which is predetermined by means of a music aptitude test.

A student's cultural timetable is determined by the choice made from band, art or choral music. Since the number of students who opt for band and have the necessary ability is comparatively small, there is only one band group in each grade and is referred to as Cultural Group I. Students opting for art are divided into Cultural Groups II, III and IV, and those choosing

choral music are placed in Cultural Groups V, VI and VII. Eleven periods are used each teaching cycle for instruction in the cultural areas with as many as five periods being designated for a student's major option. In addition, students are given three periods of physical education, one period of guidance, and one period in the library. Also, a student with weaknesses in a specific academic subject may be assigned to a remedial class for one or more periods on his cultural timetable or, if necessary, to a developmental reading class.

Initial placement of students. Grade seven students at Sisler are initially placed in the various academic levels of instruction on the basis of their performance in grade six. To help ensure that these students are assigned to the most suitable classes, the elementary schools in the Sisler area are actively involved in the placement process. The flexible placement project has been explained to the grade six teachers in these elementary schools and they must determine at what approximate levels their students will best function in grade seven. An application form is provided for each student planning to enrol at Sisler and the appropriate rating in each subject is indicated by the grade six teachers on this form. All student applications from

the neighboring elementary schools are returned to Sisler well before June and the grade seven classes are organized in preparation for the following school year. Students who enrol at Sisler from outside the general area of the school are placed in classes on the basis of their accompanying records.

The initial academic placement of students in grades eight and nine is determined by recommendations made by the members of the various teaching-teams. In June, each team meets separately to make a final evaluation of students. At these meetings, it is decided at what levels of instruction each student who is promoted to grade eight or nine will be placed in for the following school year.

Regrouping and student evaluation. The periodic regrouping of students in academic subjects is a basic consideration of the flexible placement project. All students are evaluated by each teaching-team every two months. This evaluation involves only the work covered in each particular two-month period and accounts for 20 percent of a student's final grade. On the basis of student progress at the end of these evaluation periods, regrouping takes place and students may be moved to higher or lower levels of academic instruction.

Since each level of instruction varies in terms of difficulty and course content, marks given are based on the following maximums.

Level I	90-100
Level II	80-90
Level III	70-80
Level IV	60-70
Level V	50-60
Level VI O.E.C.	75-100
Level VII O.E.C.	50-75

It should be noted that students in Levels VI or VII have the comment, "Mark based on Occupational Entrance Course," placed on their report cards.

V. THEORETICAL ASSUMPTIONS

This study was based on certain major assumptions which convinced the researcher to pursue an investigation of the Flexible Placement Project at Sisler Junior High School. These assumptions were not taken as testable hypothesis but provided the foundation for the research and inquiry that followed. Following is a summary of the assumptions made:

1. Any new method of organizing and grouping students for instruction merits a thorough examination which may provide relevant information for educators interested in this aspect of education.

2. The opinions of students in terms of the organizational, instructional and social climate of their school may result in certain attitudes which can be used as indicators of the educational effectiveness of that school.

3. The general attitudes of a student body, or any differentiated part of that body, toward certain aspects of school life can be approximately determined by a survey of student opinion.

4. The opinions of teachers in terms of the organizational and instructional climate of a school may result in certain attitudes that may influence their teaching effectiveness.

5. The general attitudes of a teaching staff can be approximately determined by survey and through interview methods to ascertain the relative satisfaction or dissatisfaction of that staff toward the organizational policy of a school.

VI. LIMITATIONS AND DELIMITATIONS

Limitations. The measurement of attitudes in any particular situation is a difficult task since a

person's response to a written or oral statement may be inconsistent with his actions. This fact resulted in an inherent weakness in this study since it was necessary to accept the stated opinions of students and teachers as valid indicators of their attitudes. An additional weakness may have resulted from the survey instruments which had to be especially prepared for this study. Since there was no precedent for their use, the validity of these instruments may be questioned.

Delimitations. This research project was subject to the following delimitations:

1. The study was restricted to a descriptive analysis of a specific program in one particular school. That is, it was a study of the flexible placement program at Sisler Junior High School.
2. There was no attempt made to compare the relative effectiveness of the flexible placement concept with the methods used by any other school to meet the educational needs of students.
3. In terms of Sisler Junior High, the study was delimited to a thorough description of the

flexible placement concept and the determination of certain attitudes held by students and staff toward this program.

4. No attempt was made to determine whether the program may be considered a "success" or "failure".

5. No attempt was made to determine whether student achievement has been affected in terms of apparent "gains" or "losses".

6. This study concentrated on the premise that the attitudes of the students and staff at Sisler were determinable and could be used to partially evaluate the flexible placement project as organized in that particular school.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

I. INTRODUCTION

This chapter surveys literature concerning commonly held opinions relevant to the topic, grouping for instruction. Such a review is necessary to create a suitable criterion against which the flexible placement program at Sisler Junior High School can be measured.

While the major purpose of this study was to ascertain the attitudes of students and teachers toward a particular grouping plan, it was necessary to investigate certain factors that help create such attitudes. Consequently, this survey first discusses some of the 'pros' and 'cons' concerning grouping for instruction and the relationship of these positions to self-concept and the creation of certain attitudes. Next, the opinions held by certain writers, and their recommendations, in terms of what may be needed to create effective grouping programs, are discussed. Finally, five examples are cited of specific schools or districts that are using, or have used, grouping programs similar to the one in operation at Sisler Junior High School.

II. GENERAL DISCUSSION OF GROUPING, ATTITUDES AND SELF-CONCEPT

Considerations beyond achievement. Usually, grouping plans are introduced into schools with a view to the improvement of academic achievement. Too often, the impact of these practices on the attitudes and self-concept of the pupils involved is not really considered. However, these factors may well determine a pupil's success or failure in school.

Dyson, commenting on available research, indicates that "complex interrelationships" exist between such things as achievement, success and failure, peer group associations, school environment and administrative practices, curriculum, personal characteristics, and self-attitudes.[1] Otto emphasizes that grouping practices must recognize such objectives as "social adjustment, mental health, physical and mental maturity, as well as academic attainments."[2] According to Byers, comprehensive research is needed on the effects of grouping related not only to its influence on children's intellectual growth, but also "on their self-concepts, on

---

[1]Ernest Dyson, "A Study of Ability Grouping and the Self Concept", The Journal of Educational Research V.60, no. 9 (May-June, 1967) p.405.

[2]Henry J. Otto, "Grouping Students for Maximum Achievement", School Review, V.67 (Winter, 1959) p.391.

the emotional climate of the school, and on the stratification in peer groups."[3] Eash suggests that the establishment of social climates to encourage the intellectual, social and personal development of every child should be the primary objective of grouping.[4] Finally evidence gathered from a research project administered by the National Education Association is fairly conclusive that grouping practices in a school can assist in developing social situations that influence "the student's perception of self, his sense of dignity and worth, and his attitudes toward other children."[5]

There seems to be a consensus among the writers surveyed that too much emphasis has been placed on the measurement of achievement resulting from various grouping practices. Naturally achievement is of considerable importance but evidence is far from conclusive that any one grouping practice, homogeneous or heterogeneous, produces better results related to achievement

---

[3]Loretta Byers, "Ability Grouping: Help or Hindrance to Social and Emotional Growth", School Review V.69, no.4 (Winter, 1961) p.455.

[4]Maurice J. Eash, "Grouping: What Have We Learned?" Educational Leadership, V.18 (April, 1961) p.431.

[5]Ability Grouping, A Research Summary prepared by the Research Division of the National Education Association (Washington, 1968) p.24.

than the other. Consequently, support for any one position must not only consider achievement but also such variables as self-concept and the attitudes that develop as a result of the organizational and social climate of the school.

Support for ability grouping. A common argument for ability grouping is that it allows pupils to advance at their own rate with pupils of the same ability. It challenges the pupil to do his best in the group to which he is assigned, or to qualify for assignment to a higher group. Methods and materials used with homogeneous ability groups are directly applicable to the entire group of pupils because of pupil similarity. Critics of heterogeneous grouping within a classroom state that individual differences cannot be met because teaching becomes too complex and rather difficult with such a great variation of individual differences. Also, these critics claim that heterogeneous grouping causes teachers to adapt instruction to meet the needs of the average or below average student. As a result, the classroom becomes less of a challenge and educational standards are lowered. However, most of the advocates of ability grouping do concede that this practice has yet to prove itself completely as an administrative

device to meet both effectively and efficiently, the individual needs of all pupils.[6]

In support of ability grouping, Welke and Bragg comment that students assigned work that is always beyond their abilities face continued failure and low grades that might result in personality damage.[7] They add that grouping students in required courses according to ability, achievement and ambition, may result in more learning and should help to take care of individual differences.[8] Ogletree and Ujlaki also found that those favoring ability grouping stated that "children are relieved of many academic pressures by being with others whose learning needs and interests are similar to theirs."[9]

Horner maintains that most students in ability groups will respond to instruction better than with heterogeneous groups as slower individuals are not overshadowed by more capable people. He feels that a student is more at ease in such a group than is the case in

---

[6] Ibid., p.5.

[7] H. C. Welke and D.H. Bragg, "A Study in Ability Grouping", N.A.S.S.P. Bulletin V.42 (Nov., 1958) p.87.

[8] Ibid., p.89.

[9] Earl J. Ogletree and V.E. Ujlaki, "Role Disparities and Homogeneous Ability Grouping, Education V.9, no.3 (Feb.-March, 1971) p.250.

which the range of ability is excessive. Also, he argues that brighter students receive greater "stimulation" when placed in classes with others of equal ability and must do more than just "get by" on their own natural ability.[10] A similar position, taken by other educators, is cited by Rinehart. These educators, Rinehart reports, feel that educational standards are lowered in heterogeneous classes because teachers tend to teach to the average student or below, thereby reducing the challenge to the bright student.[11]

William Van Til, et.al., state that teachers sometimes urge ability grouping because increased enrollments have made classes too large to meet individual differences within the ordinary classroom.[12] A much stronger argument is put forth by Hall. She declares that not only does ability grouping help to meet individual differences but also is a very democratic practice. In her opinion,

---

[10]H.F. Horner, "What Are Current Trends in Grouping Students For Effective Instruction?" N.A.S.S.P. Bulletin V.43 (April, 1959) p.9.

[11]George Rinehart, "Ability Grouping: Out or In?" The Education Digest (Feb. 1971) p.50, condensed from The PTA Magazine V.65 (Nov. 1970) pp.10-12.

[12]William Van Til; Gordon F. Vars; and John H. Lounsbury, Modern Education for the Junior High School Years. (Indianapolis and Kansas City: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1967) p.443.

"lumping students together heterogeneously is socialism, not democracy."[13] Only through some form of ability grouping, she claims, can each individual have an equal opportunity for an education most suitable for him. A further assertion she makes is that the low achieving student needs special help that will not be provided for by placement in a classroom with the "hares who already are far down the path ahead. Like the tortoise, they must go at their own pace."[14]

Criticism of ability grouping. Critics of homogeneous ability grouping state that a stigma may be attached to students placed in slow groups and that snobbishness and an inflated view of worth may develop in brighter students. They contend that heterogeneous classes are more socially realistic and provide students with the opportunity of working with people of different abilities. In such a climate lower ability students may benefit from learning experiences in association with those of more ability. A strong argument for heterogeneous classes is that a truly homogeneous group can never be formed due to the greater number of learning

---

[13]Alice Hall, "Ability Grouping Is Democratic," Contemporary Issues In Educational Psychology. edited by H.F. Clarizio, et.al., (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1970) pp. 515-516.

[14]Ibid.

differences found in each student. Also, teachers of classes that have the appearance of homogeneity may assume their students are similar and neglect individual differences.[15]

In criticism of ability grouping, Urevick states that such practice "fills the student in the fast section with a false sense of knowledge: and often results in a superiority complex.[16] Reinforcing this premise, Rinehart comments that ability grouping gives the above average students an exaggerated sense of their own importance while making low ability students feel inferior.[17] Oleson, citing a study made by Luchins and Luchins, reports these researchers found that top students admitted they felt "snobbish and superior" to students in the lower ability classes.[18]

Mueller and Frerichs contend that a school with 'across-the-board' ability grouping creates a climate

---

[15]N.E.A. Research Summary, op.cit., p.5.

[16]Stanley J. Urevick, "Ability Grouping: Why Is It Undemocratic," Contemporary Issues in Educational Psychology. edited by H.F. Clarizio, et.al. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1970) p.512.

[17]George Rinehart, op.cit., p.51.

[18]Jim Oleson, "Should We Group by Ability?" The Journal of Teacher Education, V.18, no. 2 (Summer, 1967) p. 202.

in which the "alienation of the low ability student is almost total."[19] The student who has been placed in a slow class quickly learns that he is in the 'stupid' class.[20] Attwell and Linton agree; it is their feeling that children in the lower groups are well aware of their placement, and tend to feel some resentment toward the higher ability groups.[21] Also, self-doubts related to personal worth may develop in these students resulting in feelings of inferiority and a defeatist attitude.[22] The general consensus of those opposed to ability grouping because of its effect on the low ability student may be expressed through the observations of Ogletree and Ujlaki. Citing research, they conclude that ability grouping results in "declining morale and progress, a sense of failure, a reputation for inferiority, and a decline in effort and attainment."[23]

---

[19] R.J. Mueller and A.H. Frerichs, "Alienation in the Low Ability Classroom" School And Society, V.95 (April, 1967). p.254.

[20] Jim Oleson, op.cit., p.201.

[21] A. A. Attwell and T.E. Linton, "Problems Inherent In Ability Grouping," Alberta Journal of Educational Research, V.10, no. 1 (March, 1964) p.41.

[22] Stanley J. Urevick, op.cit., p.512.

[23] Earl J. Ogletree and V.E. Ujlaki, op.cit., p.255.

Nor are teachers left untouched by the effects of ability grouping. Wrightstone considers ability grouping dangerous when it leads teachers to "underestimate the learning capacities of pupils at the average ability levels."[24] Heathers adds that teachers "often expect less from students who are assigned to low groups and teach them correspondingly less."[25] Also, since lower ability classes are often considered 'non-favored' parts of a school's program, a "socially negative value is attached to the teaching of the lower groups by the teachers in the upper groups."[26] Thus, according to critics, the cycle is complete; not only does homogeneous ability grouping interfere with the academic and social development of low ability students, but also it may have a 'demoralizing' effect on the teachers who instruct them.

It is apparent, from the survey of related literature, that valid criticism can be levelled at any grouping practice involving either homogeneous or heter-

---

[24] J. Wayne Wrightstone, "Ability Grouping and the Average Child," Contemporary Issues in Educational Psychology. edited by H.F. Clarizio, et.al. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1970) p.510.

[25] Glen Heathers, "Grouping" Encyclopedia of Educational Research. 4th Edition. Robert L. Ebel (ed) (London: Collier-Macmillan Ltd., 1969) p.566.

[26] A. A. Attwell and T.E. Linton, op.cit., p.43.

ogeneous methods. Conversely, it is fairly obvious that each practice has certain aspects that are very worthwhile and totally acceptable. Moreover, "until a way of completely individualizing instruction is devised, grouping schemes of some sort are needed."[27] Green states "that at some point diversity of achievement levels can become too diverse for a teacher to tolerate."[28]

Generally accepting the above stated premise, many educators have endeavoured to develop or promote various grouping schemes that utilize some of the more acceptable aspects of both ability and heterogeneous grouping.

III. GROUPING: WHAT MAY BE NEEDED

Dorothy Westby-Gibson cites James B. Conant's recommendation that students in required subjects and in subjects elected by students with a wide range of ability should be grouped "according to ability subject by subject."[29] Each subject would have three types

---

[27]Donald R. Green, Educational Psychology. (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964) p.38.

[28]Ibid.

[29]Dorothy-Westby Gibson, Grouping Students for Improved Instruction (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966) p.35.

of classes: one for the more able, one for the average, and another for the slow. The middle group could be further sub-divided.[30]

Wrightstone feels that any ability grouping scheme should provide flexibility that allows children to move from average to higher groups and back, either from "subject to subject or within any one subject" as their performance indicates.[31]

Guignard warns against forming homogeneous classes which would place students on the same level for all subjects.[32] He states that only the student's performance in a given subject should count. In this way, 'achievement groups' would apply to "individual subjects and not to the whole class level."[33] Also, he adds that heterogeneous groups should be used for those activities "for which a diversity of aptitudes can be enriching."[34]

Otto recommends that starting in the seventh grade,

---

[30] Ibid.

[31] J. Wayne Wrightstone, op.cit., p.510.

[32] Jacques Guignard, "Teaching By Achievement-Level Grouping," Western European Education, V.111, no. 2-3 (Summer-Fall, 1971) p.122.

[33] Ibid.

[34] Ibid. p.124.

achievement grouping should be used in the required content and skill subjects and heterogeneous grouping in exploratory courses, elective courses, and physical education.[35] Using this plan, the same student could be in the "lowest achievement group in mathematics and in the average or accelerated group in English or social studies."[36]

Certain educators, attending a conference held at Wisconsin State College in 1962, discussed prevailing practices in ability grouping. They concluded that there should be some type of homogeneous grouping in the basic studies and science and that students should be "grouped at various levels" in these subjects.[37] The majority favored heterogeneous grouping in art, music, physical education, industrial arts, home economics and typing.[38]

A research summary prepared by the National Education Association in 1968 mentions various grouping

---

[35] Henry J. Otto, op.cit., p.395.

[36] Ibid.

[37] M.E. Hemenway (recorder), "New Developments in Instruction" The N.A.S.S.P. Bulletin, V.47, no. 280 (Feb. 1963) p.62 from Proceedings of the Second Upper Midwest Regional Conference on Junior High School Education: Wisconsin State College, La Crosse, Wisconsin, 1962.

[38] Ibid.

plans. It states that 'intra-subject' grouping is a plan generally used in junior and senior high schools. Using this concept, a school may place a pupil in an advanced ability group in English, a middle group in mathematics and a low group in science. There are reports of certain schools using as many as "five levels for such groupings."[39] It may be noted here that Welke and Bragg found that one of the reasons ability grouping fell into disfavor during the 1930's and 1940's resulted from "not grouping separately for each subject."[40]

Van Til, et.al., recommended the following criteria to be applied if sectioning students by ability is likely to be beneficial. First, they emphasize that "student enrollment, staff and facilities must be sufficient to group subject by subject."[41] Their description of this grouping scheme is similar to those given by the writers previously cited. They feel that the esteem a student might derive from "successes in one area may keep him from feeling defeated by his

---

[39] Ability Grouping, N.E.A. Research Summary (1968) op.cit., p.19.

[40] H. C. Welke and D.H. Bragg, op.cit., p.19.

[41] William Van Til, et.al., op.cit., p.443.

deficiencies in another."[42] Second, they stress the idea that there "must be ample opportunity for all types of students to work together in school activities."[43] Homerooms, art, music, physical education, home economics and industrial arts are given as examples of areas where heterogeneous grouping should be used. In conclusion, Van Til and his associates state that by using such methods "the undemocratic cleavage that may attend permanent homogeneous grouping may be overcome."[44]

Many of the recommendations and ideas mentioned in the preceding discussions relate directly to the present methods of grouping as used by the "flexible placement" program at Sisler Junior High School. Further understanding of the organizational methods used in conjunction with this placement concept may be gained by a survey of other programs similar to the one at Sisler.

IV. SOME SELECTED GROUPING PROGRAMS

In 1959, a "flexible grouping" program was adopted by the Board of Education of Kalamazoo, Michigan, in an attempt to provide for the individual differences

---

[42] Ibid. p.444.

[43] Ibid.

[44] Ibid.

among all students.[45] Three group levels were established in English and mathematics and two group levels in science. Students could be placed at one group level in one subject and at a different level in another subject. If a student's needs changed during the year, he could be shifted from one group level to another. The curriculum, materials and teaching procedures were different for and adapted to each group level.

Approximately six months after this program had been in operation, a questionnaire was administered to 144 junior high school teachers. Eighty-six percent believed that the plan should be continued. They listed as some of their reasons: "It is easier to teach." "It is a more effective manner of teaching." "All students have a chance to succeed." "Less able students feel more secure." "There is more challenge for the able students."[46]

However, although the majority of teachers favored the plan, there was little unanimity concerning improvement in student achievement. Teachers of more capable groups and teachers of all levels in the seventh grade

---

[45] John R. Cochran, Grouping Students in Junior High School," Educational Leadership, V.18, no. 7 (April, 1961) p. 414.

[46] Ibid.

felt that their pupils did show improved interest and achievement. Teachers of all other groups felt that little improvement in achievement or interest was apparent. Some teachers felt that the students in more capable groups had improved attitudes toward themselves but the majority of teachers did not concur. There was a consensus that grouping did little to improve "the behavior of students or to improve students' attitudes toward others."[47]

In summary, the teachers surveyed believed that flexible grouping did not make much difference but they approved of the program. Also they noted that parents of the children involved felt the plan helped their children and approved of the program. All concerned emphasized that efforts be continued to create flexibility that would help "less capable students feel worthwhile as individuals and help more capable students respect the worth of all individuals."[48]

In 1958, Deer Path School in Lake Forest, Illinois, introduced a grouping scheme that closely parallels the "flexible placement" program in operation at Sisler Junior High. The principal of Deer Path, J. C. Pearson,

---

[47] Ibid. p.419.

[48] Ibid.

reports that his school is completely departmentalized and has "four groups in each grade ingenuously numbered from one to four, number one being the top group."[49] In English, science, mathematics and social studies students are grouped according to achievement. In the non-academic areas of homeroom, related arts, music, drama and physical education, the groups are heterogeneous in ability and achievement, although they may be grouped by sex.

Pearson states that the program is "flexible and the personnel mobile; no assignment to any group is a permanent one."[50] Students can advance to a more rapidly moving group by applying themselves and, correspondingly, are moved down a group if their achievement warrants it. "Reaction to the program has been favorable and no harmful results that would suggest going back to heterogeneous grouping have been witnessed."[51]

In 1962, a "three-rail" program for grouping students was instituted at Thomas A. Edison Junior High School in San Angelo, Texas. W. Eilers, principal of the school, reports that this program provides three

---

[49] J.C. Pearson, "Certainly We Group Our Students," Phi Delta Kappan, V.39 (May, 1958) p.358.

[50] Ibid.

[51] Ibid.

levels of instruction: one for slower students, one for average students and another for gifted students.[52] The program "strives for early identification and evaluation of a student's performance level, but at no time is a student permanently assigned to a given performance level or rail."[53] There is flexibility so that whenever a student's performance level in a given subject changes, the student can move up or down to another performance level.

Eilers feels that it is difficult to evaluate the overall results of the program but claims that "students seem to like the program and that it has the confidence of the faculty and of the general public."[54]

In 1956, Setauket Junior High School in Setauket, New York, adopted a form of ability grouping to meet the needs of individual students.[55] The program has five class sections for each academic subject in each grade (7-8-9). When a student enters the seventh grade he is placed in appropriate levels on the basis

---

[52]William Eilers, Jr., "San Angelo's Three Rail Program", The American School Board Journal V.149 (Sept. 1964) p.12.

[53]Ibid.

[54]Ibid.

[55]Paul J. Gelinas and Aime Lacoste, "Setauket Junior High School," The N.A.S.S.P. Bulletin V.49 (Sept.1965) p.69.

of standardized tests and achievement data from his sixth grade records. He may be placed in the top step in mathematics, a middle step in science and social studies and a low step in English. However, placement in one level is never permanent and students can readily move upward or downward based on evidence indicating a need for change. Reaction to this program has been favorable and it is reported that the opportunity for success and recognition provided by such a scheme of placement "motivated students in a positive manner noticeable to teachers and parents."[56]

H.F. Horner, principal of David Douglas Union High School in Portland, Oregon, states that assignment for instruction should be by individual subject, and each student placed in the class group most suitable for him.[57] In his school, a student "may be in an advanced section for subjects in which he has unusual ability, and in regular or slow sections for other subjects."[58] This type of grouping is used for such offerings as language arts, mathematics, science and

---

[56] Ibid.

[57] H. F. Horner, "What Are Current Trends In Grouping Students for Effective Instruction" The N.A.S.S.P. Bulletin V.43 (April, 1959) p.9.

[58] Ibid.

social studies. The other areas, art, business education, foreign language, homemaking, industrial arts, health and physical education, are taught in heterogeneously grouped classes.

Although the schools cited above may have since altered their grouping procedures, they nonetheless provide ample evidence that certain forms of ability grouping can be used to provide flexibility in instruction. This evidence also supports the argument that ability grouping and heterogeneous grouping can be used in conjunction to create a school climate in which the individual needs of students are met in a socially acceptable environment.

V. SUMMARY

The review of literature in Chapter II revealed certain commonly held opinions of various educators related to grouping and grouping procedures. From this the following generalizations emerge:

1. When any form of grouping practice is considered, educators must take into consideration such factors as peer group associations, self-concepts, school environment, social adjustment, mental health and maturity, student attitudes toward others, and a student's

sense of worth as well as academic achievement before the practice is put into effect.

2. Homogeneous grouping by ability is supported on the grounds that it relieves pressure on slower students; it reduces the threat of constant failure; it stimulates brighter students by creating challenges; and it is a good method of meeting individual differences in students.

3. Critics of homogeneous ability grouping claim that it is impossible to arrange such a class. They also state that it is an undemocratic practice; it creates superiority complexes in bright students; it makes slower students feel inferior; it alienates students into special groups and often results in a loss of morale for slow students. Teachers may also be affected by ability grouping and may underestimate the potential of students grouped by this technique.

4. It appears obvious that a compromise view must be taken by educators when contemplating changes in grouping procedures. There seems to be a consensus that such subjects as English,

> mathematics, science and social studies should maintain some form of ability grouping. Therefore, students should be grouped by individual subject in these areas and each subject should have various levels of instruction. A student would be able to change levels when the need became apparent. In order to maintain a socially acceptable climate in the school, homerooms and subjects such as art, band, choir, home economics, industrial arts and physical education should have students grouped heterogeneously.

This survey of literature focused on various aspects associated with grouping students for instruction. Since this rather comprehensive topic is related to the flexible placement scheme at Sisler, it was essential that the problems inherent in both homogeneous and heterogeneous grouping practices be examined. Evidence produced by the literature suggests that a compromise position between the two practices is necessary. Apparently, this compromise view has been taken by the administrators at Sisler and, as a result, they may have a fairly sound philosophical or pedagogic base for implementing the flexible placement concept.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH PROCEDURES

The major objective of this study was to discover the attitudes of the students and teaching staff at Sisler Junior High toward the flexible placement program at their school. These attitudes were determined by an analysis of the stated opinions given by the total student body and all teachers involved in the program. In this chapter, the research procedures that were used to achieve the objective of this study are described.

I. COLLECTING THE DATA

To collect the data necessary for the study, separate questionnaires were administered to the students and teachers at the school. The questionnaires were similar in nature so that a comparative analysis could be made between the responses of students and teachers. A further expression of teacher opinion was obtained through personal interviews.

The student population. This study was conducted during the 1971-72 school year and, at that time, 600 students were enrolled at Sisler Junior High School. There were 180 students attending in grade seven, 210 students in grade eight and 210 students in grade nine.

Of the total student population, 114 pupils were generally classified as Occupational Entrance Course students. The aim of the study was to survey the entire student body.

The teaching staff. At the time of the study, thirty-nine teachers were involved in the flexible placement program. However, Sisler is a combined Junior-Senior High and some of these teachers also taught in the senior division of the school. Nonetheless, it was considered imperative that every teacher connected with the flexible placement project be surveyed. Of the thirty-nine staff members who participated in the survey, fifteen taught regular academic classes; eight taught exclusively in the Occupational Entrance Course; eleven were teachers of cultural subjects; and five were practical arts instructors. For the survey, the practical arts people were grouped with the cultural teachers. Consequently, for the analytical purposes of this study, the instructional staff was composed of twenty-three academic teachers and sixteen cultural teachers.

The student survey. A questionnaire was developed by the researcher to gather the data needed to determine certain student attitudes. A copy of this instrument may be found in the appendix and the number and percentage

of student respondents, by grade, may be seen in Table II. Part A of the questionnaire solicited information concerning the respondent's grade, his academic subject levels at the beginning of the school year and his academic subject levels at the time the questionnaire was administered.

TABLE II

NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF TOTAL SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND TOTAL STUDENT RESPONDENTS, BY GRADES

Grade	Student Enrollment No.	%	Student Respondents No.	%
Seven	180	30.0	167	30.1
Eight	210	35.0	192	34.9
Nine	210	35.0	194	35.0
Total	600	100.0	553	100.0

Part B of the questionnaire contained three sections, each composed of a series of statements that could be responded to on a Likert-type scale. The instrument was constructed in this manner to enable students to express the strength of their opinions. Thus, a respondent reacted to an item by choosing his response from the following alternatives: "Strongly Agree", "Agree",

"No Opinion", "Disagree", and "Strongly Disagree". Section I contained thirty-five statements designed to gather data about attitudes students had toward their school in general. Section II contained thirty-eight statements designed to gather data concerning attitudes toward the concept of differentiated levels of instruction in each academic subject. Finally, Section III of the questionnaire contained twenty-six statements designed to gather data about student attitudes toward grouping and instruction in the cultural areas.

The teacher survey. The survey of teacher opinion to determine their attitudes toward the flexible placement program was conducted using both questionnaire and interview methods. Both survey techniques were used for a number of reasons. While the staff questionnaire was designed to reveal certain attitudes held by teachers, its main purpose was to determine whether teachers and students had comparable opinions about their school. Related to this idea, the questionnaire sought to ascertain how well teachers could gauge the general attitudes of their students. However, to obtain a full expression of teacher opinion about the flexible placement program, the researcher deemed it necessary to conduct a personal interview with all staff members involved in the project.

The teacher questionnaire that was developed to collect the necessary data consisted of two parts. Part A was designed to provide information concerning the respondent's teaching experience, major instructional area, and, where the academic teachers were concerned, the levels of instruction taught in each grade. Part B of the questionnaire was composed of three sections each consisting of a series of statements that corresponded closely to the items used in the student instrument. Section I contained thirty-five statements related to the way in which teachers thought students reacted to the school in general. Section II contained thirty-eight statements to determine how teachers perceived student reaction to the concept of differentiated levels of instruction in each academic subject. Section III, designed in the same manner as the first two sections, contained twenty-six items concerning instruction in the cultural subjects. The teacher questionnaire was constructed so that responses could be made on the Likert-type scale described above. A copy of the teacher questionnaire may be found in the appendix and the number and percentage of teacher respondents by major area of instruction can be seen in Table III.

TABLE III

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF TEACHER RESPONDENTS, BY MAJOR INSTRUCTIONAL AREA

Major Instructional Area	No.	%
Regular Academic	15	38.5
Occupational Entrance Course	8	20.5
Cultural	16	41.0
Total	39	100.0

As previously indicated, the researcher considered it necessary to conduct interviews with all teachers who were associated with the flexible placement program. The personal interview approach was decided on to discover whether teachers in different disciplines varied in their attitudes toward the program. Also, this particular survey technique was the only feasible method to obtain information related to the use of varied instructional approaches and curricula in the academic areas. To maintain consistency in the responses given, an interview format sheet was developed for both the academic and cultural teachers. Copies of these format sheets may be found in the appendix.

II. ANALYSIS OF DATA

The methods used to statistically analyze the data gathered from the student and teacher questionnaires are described in this section. Also dealt with is the treatment of information gathered through teacher interviews. It should be noted here that all data gathered by questionnaire was transferred to computer cards to facilitate statistical computation.

Factor Analysis. This is a "method of analysing a set of observations from their intercorrelations to determine whether the variations represented can be accounted for adequately by a number of basic categories smaller than that with which the investigation was started."[1] In terms of this study, a multiple factor analysis was performed on the responses made to the questionnaires administered to the students and teachers. However, since the student and teacher questionnaires were comparable in terms of format and the variables (items) used, it was decided to use the factors isolated by the analysis of student responses as the basis for the study. The fact that the student population was considerably larger than that of the teachers resulted

---

[1]Benjamin Fruchter, Introduction to Factor Analysis (Princeton, N.J.: D.Van Nostrand Co.Inc., 1954) p.1.

in less variance of opinion on the students' part thus reducing the number of factors. Also, the grouping of the teacher items according to the student factors appeared to be the most logical method of comparing student and teacher opinions.

By using the factor analysis method, the researcher avoided making arbitrary selections of certain items from the attitude scale for use as descriptors of specific attitudes. Also, by applying this technique, the responses to statements on the attitude scale were not treated as if each item were independent of all others since the factor analytic method determined both the degree of association between the variables and the essential factors that were being sought. The degree of correlation between various items and the strength of response determined the "loading" assigned to each item. By examining the loadings for all items placed on a matrix, the researcher was able to discover clusters of items that reflected a consensus related to specific areas of concern. That is, items that correlated closely had heavy loadings that indicated major attitudes.

Questionnaire tabulation. The multiple factor analysis described above provided results that reflected definite opinions in specific areas of concern. The

statements in these areas were the factors used to identify student attitudes and, correspondingly, to group the items on the teacher questionnaire. All questionnaires were processed to determine the percentage of response that agreed with, disagreed with, or showed no opinion about each statement on the survey instruments. The initial tabulation of the questionnaires produced a general "over-view" of strengths of opinion expressed by the respondents. Moreover, it provided the basis for the comparative analysis that was undertaken by the researcher.

Comparative analysis of student data. A comparison of the attitudes of students in different grades and at varying levels of academic achievement was one of the most important concerns of this study. The premise that the flexible placement concept provides a program which allows students to learn at their own particular levels in a socially realistic environment can only be justified if a majority of students perceive this as being a fact. To determine the variance of opinion within the student body, the researcher used two basic grouping procedures. The first of these divided students by grade level and compared the opinions of those pupils in each of grades seven, eight and nine.

The second procedure grouped the total student

population according to categories that corresponded to the various levels of academic achievement. Although the organization of the flexible placement program does provide seven levels of instruction in each academic subject, the researcher employed four basic categories to group students. This modification was necessary because most students in the program were at various levels of achievement in different subjects and, as a result, classification of these students in terms of one specific level, was difficult. The four categories decided on and the range of achievement levels related to each are indicated in Table IV. In order to differentiate these categories and accommodate all students, it was necessary to overlap the levels of achievement.

TABLE IV

STUDENT CATEGORIES ACCORDING TO RANGE OF ACHIEVEMENT LEVELS

Category	Classification	Range of Levels
I	Above-Average	1-2
II	Average	2-3-4
III	Low-Average	3-4-5
IV	Occupational Entrance	5-6-7

The procedures described in this section necessitated the tabulation of student data according to the predetermined groupings. Table V indicates the number and percentage of student respondents by grade and category. Replies made by the students in each group were calculated to determine the percentage of response that agreed with, disagreed with, or showed no opinion about the related items on the attitude scale.

Analysis of teacher questionnaire data. As indicated previously, the student and teacher questionnaires were almost identical in character. Except for variations in terminology, the items on each instrument corresponded closely and were constructed to gather opinions pertaining to the same matters of concern. However, the factor analysis performed on the teacher data isolated factors that were not comparable to those retained in the student analysis. This probably was due to the limited teacher sample and the wider variation of teacher opinion. Consequently, since the questionnaires themselves were highly comparable, it was decided to group the teacher variables according to the student factors for purposes of comparison.

To further prepare for the comparative analysis of teacher and student opinion, a tabulation of teacher response to the questionnaire items was performed. These

TABLE V

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF STUDENT RESPONDENTS,
BY GRADE AND CATEGORY

Grade	Category I		Category II		Category III		Category IV		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Seven	41	7.5	44	7.9	50	9.0	32	5.7	167	30.1
Eight	47	8.5	54	9.8	49	8.9	42	7.7	192	34.9
Nine	47	8.5	61	11.0	51	9.2	35	6.3	194	35.0
Total	135	24.5	159	28.7	150	27.1	109	19.7	553	100.0

calculations provided data that indicated the percentage of teachers agreeing with, disagreeing with, or having no opinion about each item on the attitude scale. The response of the total teacher population was first calculated to provide a general "over-view" of the opinions expressed. To ascertain differences of opinion, the teachers were then grouped into the following categories: (1) Academic teachers of levels one through five; (2) Academic teachers of levels six and seven; and (3) teachers in the cultural areas of instruction. The data from each category was tabulated separately and calculated in percentages.

Treatment of data from teacher interviews. Personal interviews were conducted with every available member of the teaching staff. Two interview formats were used, one for academic teachers and another for cultural teachers. Consistency of response was maintained by asking the same questions of each particular teacher group. An analysis of the information gathered was performed by examining the response of each teacher to each question. In this manner, a consensus on each item generally developed that indicated the basic areas of teacher concern. While the questionnaire analysis provided results that reflected the general opinions of teachers, the interviews generated information

that was more specific in nature and more indicative of the attitudes that prevailed among teachers toward the flexible placement program.

While there were aspects of this study that reflected the unique concerns of teachers and students, there were certain areas of mutual concern that warranted examination to determine differences of opinion. Since the items on the teacher questionnaire were grouped according to the factors retained in analysis of student responses, a comparison between the "factors" in each questionnaire was made possible. In the first comparative procedure the total response of teachers and students was examined to determine general differences of opinion. The next approach determined whether there were any radical differences in the reaction of the various staff and student groups. By these methods of analysis, the researcher was able to arrive at certain conclusions in terms of the general acceptance or rejection of the flexible placement program as perceived by the student body and staff at Sisler Junior High School.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The statistical procedures used to satisfy the objectives of this study were described in Chapter III. A principal factor analysis was performed on the data gathered from student questionnaires. The factors retained by this analysis were used as indicators of specific student attitudes. For comparative purposes, the items on the teacher questionnaire were grouped according to the student factors.

A further statistical procedure involved an item analysis of the questionnaire statements that were grouped according to factors. The total response of students and teachers was calculated in percentage figures to indicate the number of respondents agreeing with, disagreeing with, or having no opinion about each attitude statement. Further tabulation of response was made with students grouped according to grade and general levels of instruction, and teachers grouped according to major instructional area and levels of instruction taught. The results of these procedures and the information gathered through teacher interviews are described in this chapter.

I. THE FACTOR ANALYSIS

The student questionnaire was composed of three sections each designed to collect data measuring attitudes related to a generalized area of concern. Section I dealt with the students' school life in general; Section II dealt with instruction in the academic areas; and Section III dealt with instruction in the cultural areas. Responses to the attitude statements, gathered on a Likert-type scale, were subjected to a principal factor analysis. This particular statistical method determined the important aspects of each section as seen in the responses of the students.

The factors isolated were extracted from matrices of intercorrelations developed from the responses to the attitude statements. (The matrix for each section may be found in the appendix). By using the factor analysis method, it was possible to group the attitude statements to obtain a clearer description of student opinion concerning their school life and the flexible placement program. Thus the rotated factor matrices presented in Tables VI, VII and VIII are a description of student attitudes in terms of the thirty-five statements in Section I, the thirty-eight statements in Section II and the twenty-six statements in Section III.

TABLE VI

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE SECTION I
PRINCIPAL FACTOR ANALYSIS VARIMAX ROTATION*

Item	Factor I	Factor II	Factor III	Communality
23	-61	12	27	46
7	61	-24	16	46
34	-60	14	26	46
27	-59	26	15	44
31	58	08	-09	35
13	56	03	03	32
35	56	-07	07	32
1	55	11	13	33
21	-47	11	08	24
6	-47	-04	05	22
15	40	-02	-27	23
29	39	08	-18	19
16	-39	31	-01	25
14	-34	09	32	23
20	30	29	-01	17
30	-25	71	06	58
19	-22	66	02	48
32	-30	59	00	43
4	00	59	-08	36
22	-15	58	12	37
10	-12	43	16	23
12	20	35	09	17
3	12	31	-12	13
25	27	28	-07	15
24	-10	-14	-06	03
5	-17	06	66	47
17	-07	20	60	40
2	05	-07	56	32
8	-17	-09	55	34
33	-35	04	46	34
28	02	14	-36	15
18	-15	04	34	14
11	02	09	25	07
9	00	-06	-21	05
26	05	01	09	01
Cumulative percent of variability				
	15.2	22.6	28.4	

*Decimal points have been omitted.

TABLE VII

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE SECTION II
PRINCIPAL FACTOR ANALYSIS VARIMAX ROTATION*

Item	Factor I	Factor II	Factor III	Communality
4	65	20	-11	49
2	60	25	-08	43
18	60	-05	04	36
20	59	09	-06	37
1	54	-16	16	34
9	50	-07	05	26
21	50	-13	23	32
12	48	-10	17	28
37	45	25	08	27
16	-41	32	-09	28
10	39	-14	32	27
5	37	-10	22	20
13	35	08	05	13
35	33	01	-02	11
23	-15	09	01	04
25	-02	73	-06	53
3	-02	71	-05	51
19	-19	59	12	40
8	10	53	02	29
26	-05	43	-16	22
38	-02	43	-05	18
33	-34	41	21	33
27	29	38	-16	26
30	-11	36	07	15
31	-07	30	01	10
15	-02	30	-03	09
6	-16	23	02	08
22	06	20	16	07
28	08	16	04	04
7	27	-21	64	53
36	19	-24	64	51
11	-40	-06	55	47
32	-30	05	54	38
14	04	-03	49	24
34	06	22	30	14
29	14	13	30	13
24	-26	22	30	21
17	13	04	21	07
Cumulative percent of variability	12.1	20.4	26.4	

*Decimal points have been omitted.

TABLE VIII

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE SECTION III
PRINCIPAL FACTOR ANALYSIS VARIMAX ROTATION*

Item	Factor I	Factor II	Factor III	Factor IV	Factor V	Factor VI	Communality
2	74	-02	-13	08	05	-19	61
14	63	-14	05	09	-03	00	43
20	53	-35	13	-23	-08	-14	50
18	45	00	-06	17	13	06	26
8	02	-68	-05	06	-13	04	48
4	-12	66	00	-09	-11	15	49
26	-20	48	02	13	-23	18	37
23	39	-44	01	-03	07	31	45
10	01	-27	16	24	13	18	21
3	00	12	72	14	-03	08	56
6	07	13	-67	06	-04	07	49
15	-07	03	-60	10	02	25	44
9	-07	06	52	16	03	23	36
12	08	12	24	64	00	-03	49
1	14	-04	-04	55	00	10	34
25	18	-29	-14	44	-10	23	39
19	29	-34	-03	-42	-06	23	44
22	04	11	00	-32	06	19	15
24	-12	-03	-08	00	-77	06	62
13	-06	-07	-06	18	-74	00	59
11	07	21	12	-13	-52	14	37
5	42	32	06	-09	-45	-20	55
16	11	48	-01	-11	10	52	54
21	-11	05	04	06	-23	49	31
7	37	-20	-18	02	06	44	40
17	-27	05	01	-04	03	43	27
Cumulative percent of variability							
	11.5	19.5	26.3	32.3	37.7	42.7	

*Decimal points have been omitted.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE FACTORS

The factor analysis performed on the questionnaire variables isolated a number of factors that may be used as descriptors of student attitudes. Following is a brief description of the factors retained in each section of the survey instrument.

Section One. The factor analysis caused three factors to emerge in this section, each one accounting for at least five percent of the total variability, with all three factors accounting for a total of 28.390 percent of the total variability.

> Factor I. Student satisfaction - The statements which load on this factor deal with student satisfaction related to their school work, their teachers, attending school at Sisler and discipline.

> Factor II. The homeroom teacher - The statements loading on this factor deal with the role of the homeroom teacher, concern about the size of the school and worry about "failing" in school.

> Factor III. Interpersonal relationships - This factor isolated statements dealing with the relationship between students in homeroom classes, the relative ease of developing friendships in the school and the general accord existing between students and teachers.

Section Two. The factor analysis caused three factors to emerge in this section, each one accounting for at least five percent of the total variability with all three factors accounting for 26.432 percent of the total variability.

> Factor I. Differentiated levels of instruction - The statements which load on this factor deal with the acceptance of differentiated levels of instruction in each academic subject. These statements relate to learning differences, motivation, opportunity to progress at varying rates, movement between levels and placement in levels.

> Factor II. Social implications - The statements loading on this factor deal with the social implications of the achievement level system. Items dealing with stigma, snobbishness, feelings of superiority and general resentment toward the system are associated in this factor.

> Factor III. Satisfaction with level placement - This factor isolated statements dealing with student satisfaction and acceptance of placement in particular levels of instruction.

Section Three. The factor analysis caused six factors to emerge in this section, each one accounting for at least five percent of the total variability with all three factors accounting for 42.696 percent of the total variability.

> Factor I. Compatibility in cultural groups - The statements which load on this factor deal

with the relationships that develop between students assigned to the various cultural groups.

Factor II. Understanding of cultural groups - This factor isolated statements dealing with student comprehension of the cultural grouping system and why it is being used.

Factor III. Attendance in cultural classes - The statements loading on this factor deal with absenteeism or "skipping" in cultural classes and the efforts made by cultural teachers to control this problem.

Factor IV. Social aspects of cultural grouping - This factor retained statements dealing with the school as a place where students should be able to meet and make friends with as many people as possible.

Factor V. Sociometric preferences - The statements isolated in this factor deal with the classmates students prefer to be with in cultural and academic classes.

Factor VI. Nature of cultural grouping - The statements which load on this factor relate to student understanding of cultural grouping and whether students recognize appreciable differences in their classmates in cultural classes as compared with those in their academic classes.

Summary. A total of twelve factors emerged as a result of the principal factor analysis. The factors represent certain aspects of the flexible placement program as viewed by the respondents. Through a descriptive analysis of the statements in each factor, a general

portrayal of student attitudes may be developed. The discussion of the factors is presented in the following section.

III. DISCUSSION OF THE FACTORS

Before a descriptive study of the factors takes place, it must be noted that only statements with loadings above .30 will be discussed. Statements with loadings of .30 or less have only minimal value as descriptors of a factor. The elimination of "weak" statements is a major function of factor analysis and the statements that remain may be taken as valid descriptors of a particular factor. Therefore, in the following discussions, and for the item analysis to follow in later sections of this chapter, only statements with "strong" loadings will be considered.

Section One Factors. The factors in the first section are associated with the general satisfaction experienced by students attending school at Sisler, the homeroom teacher and the interpersonal relationships that develop in the school.

Student satisfaction. This factor accounts for 15.219 percent of the total variability and involves fourteen statements. These statements have loadings

which range from .61 to .34 and generally relate to the reasons students might have for being satisfied with their school life at Sisler. The two statements having the highest loadings on this factor are inversely related and indicate: (1) that students enjoy attending Sisler and (2) that students might prefer to stay away from school at every opportunity. These two statements will be used as a frame of reference for the discussion of the remaining items in the factor.

In terms of enjoying school, two statements have very high loadings (.60 and .59) indicating their importance as seen by the respondents. These refer to students "liking" their teachers and the "interest" their school work has for them. Related to these aspects, two further statements with identical but lower loadings (.47) indicate that "liking to do school work" is closely associated with the "understanding" of the work and may contribute to the enjoyment of school. A final statement in this area, having the lowest loading in the factor, refers to teacher interest in helping students who have problems with school work. Apparently, this aspect is not as important as the others when students consider their satisfaction with school.

In terms of students staying away from school, six statements appear related. The item, "I am often

unhappy at school", received a very high loading (.58). This statement is closely related to three others that refer to the strictness of teachers, the difficulty of school work and the "freedom" students feel they should have at school. Another statement having less emphasis in this area refers to the after school detention of students who misbehave. Two final statements, each having substantial loadings, appear to be significant indicators of student satisfaction. The first of these refers to the desire on the part of students to attend another school and the second deals with the extent to which students know their teachers.

In summary, it appears that students who enjoy attending Sisler will not be inclined to stay away from school. Also, if students like most of their teachers and find their school work interesting, they will be relatively happy at school. However, if students consider the school too restrictive, their work too demanding and their teachers too strict or unapproachable, they might feel that another school would be better for them.

The homeroom teacher. This factor accounts for 7.412 of the total variability and consists of seven statements. These statements have loadings which range from .71 to .31 and deal with the apparent relationships that develop between homeroom teachers and their students.

The highest loading on this factor was assigned to a statement referring to the predilection of students to accept the same homeroom teacher for the following school year. Closely related to this statement are two others dealing with how well students feel they know their homeroom teachers and whether students would like to know these teachers better. A further statement, also given a very high loading (.58) indicating its relative importance, refers to the inclination on the part of students to seek out the advice of their homeroom teachers when problems at school arise. This statement relates to another item dealing with the apparent interest homeroom teachers display concerning the progress of their students.

The weakest loadings on this factor (.35 and .31) were assigned to two statements which, at first, do not appear associated with the other aspects of the factor. These statements deal with student views on "failing" and "feeling lost in the crowd". Although relatively little emphasis is placed on these items in terms of the other statements, they possibly indicate the following: (1) that, to some extent, students associate the role of the homeroom teacher with success in school and (2) that students may feel the homeroom class provides a certain amount of "security" in a

relatively large school. The latter assumption is given some support by one other statement in this factor. This statement, "Reporting to a homeroom class is a good way to start the day", received the third highest loading on the factor.

To summarize, it appears that one of the most important aspects related to the homeroom teacher is the personal relationship that develops between the teacher and students. If students feel that the homeroom teacher is interested in their progress and concerned about their problems, it is likely the relationship will be sound. However, if students feel that little interest or concern is shown, they may indicate that they do not know their homeroom teachers very well; do not wish to know them any better; and, consequently, are not interested in continuing the relationship any further.

Interpersonal relationships. This factor accounts for 5.759 percent of the total variability and consists of seven statements. The factor loadings range from .66 to .34 and the component statements are primarily concerned with the personal interaction and relationships between students in the school. The three strongest items in the factor relate to the general compatibility of students in homeroom classes. This is significant

because students in homerooms are grouped heterogeneously. The statement, "I like most of the kids in my homeroom", has the highest loading on the factor which indicates that students considered it to be very important. Closely related to this statement are two others which have the second and third highest loadings (.60 and .56) on the factor. One of these refers to the inclination of students to continue in the following school year with the same classmates. The second item deals directly with an estimation of apparent student compatibility in homeroom classes.

Further aspects of this factor are expressed in four other statements. The first of these received a very high loading (.55) and refers to the relative ease with which students can "make friends with other kids" in the school. A lower loading (.46) was assigned to another statement referring to the general accord between students and teachers at the school. The fact that this statement is included in the factor may indicate that students feel their relationship with teachers is a significant aspect in the prevailing social atmosphere of the school. Another statement that appears directly related to the social aspect received a very low loading on the factor. The statement, "Most students seem to like coming to this school", may have received less

emphasis because students were asked to express a judgement about how others felt. One final statement has a low negative loading (-.36) on the factor and refers to students not caring about being late for classes. This does not appear directly related to the general tone of the factor but may indicate that poor relationships with others may influence students to disregard the basic rules of the school.

In summary, it appears that students have relatively strong opinions about their relationships with other students and the teachers in the school. Personal interaction within homeroom classes seems to be the most important aspect of this factor and the response of students to the attitude statements may possibly reveal their reaction to the use of heterogeneous grouping in this area. In addition, it seems apparent that students are concerned with the general social atmosphere of the school and their ability to "make friends" with other students.

Section Two Factors. The statements in the second section of the questionnaire were specifically concerned with the methods used to group students for instruction in their academic subjects. The reaction of students to this aspect of the school's instructional program is an important consideration in the general evaluation of

the flexible placement project.

Differentiated levels of instruction. This factor accounts for 12.144 percent of the total variability and contains fourteen statements which load from .65 to .33 on the factor. Generally, the factor deals with the use of differentiated levels of instruction for each academic subject. The statements in the factor are concerned with the following aspects: (1) whether students accept the achievement-level concept and (2) whether there are any motivating influences associated with this particular concept. Seven of the fourteen statements have very high loadings (.65 to .50) indicating that students consider these items to be highly significant in the factor. The seven remaining statements have weaker loadings (.48 to .33) and, apparently, these items are less important when the aspects of acceptance and motivation are considered by the students.

In reference to the seven most significant statements in the factor, five items are concerned with student acceptance of the achievement level concept and two others are directly related to motivation. The statement with the highest loading refers to students "liking" the opportunity to advance to higher levels of instruction when their academic achievement warrants

this movement. This statement may indicate student acceptance of the grouping methods used at the school. Correspondingly, a further statement refers to the efforts made by the school to provide the best possible opportunity for students to succeed in their academic studies. Closely related, two other items consider the appropriateness of different levels of instruction for each subject and whether "slow learners" are given an opportunity to do their best at school. Also significant, one other statement alludes to the general acceptability of the achievement level system and whether students consider the concept to be sound. As stated above, there appears to be a strong relationship between acceptance and motivation in this factor. Two statements directly reflect the aspect of motivation. One of these items deals with the idea that successful movement in one subject may influence students to achieve at higher levels in other subjects. The other statement is concerned with the motivational impact on students when they are moved to a lower level in a subject.

As indicated previously, seven statements in the factor do not appear as important as those discussed in the above paragraph. However, these statements do have some bearing on the acceptance and motivational influence of the achievement level system. The first of these

statements does have a substantial loading (.48) and refers to the fairness of teachers when they consider the movement of pupils to different levels of instruction. This may indicate that students associate a fair evaluation of their progress with their propensity to accept the system. A second statement in this group deals with parental understanding of the achievement level concept. Apparently, students relate acceptance of the program with their ability to express the basic concepts underlying its use. The five final statements in the factor involve a general expression of student opinion. Having the only negative loading on the factor one of these statements reflects the idea that students might prefer to have only one level of instruction for all subjects. The negative loading (-.41) on this item indicates that students recognize the idea expressed as being in direct opposition to the other statements in the factor. Confirming this assumption, three further statements indicate: (1) that students who learn "faster" should be in higher levels of instruction, (2) that most students feel they are in appropriate levels and (3) that students do not mind moving to different levels during the year. One final statement refers to students knowing how well they are progressing at any given time during the school year and this generally

relates to the acceptance aspect concerning the achievement level system.

In summary, it is apparent from the above discussions that students recognize and relate many of the concepts which serve as the philosophical basis of the flexible placement project. The creation of a more realistic system of grouping students for instruction was one of the major administrative objectives set for this project. If students understand and accept the achievement level concept, and if they feel that the system does provide some incentive for them to improve or at least attempts to meet their individual needs, then it is possible that the objectives of the program are being fulfilled to a certain extent.

Social implications. This factor accounts for 8.265 of the total variability and contains nine statements which load from .73 to .36 on the factor. Generally, the factor deals with the social implications associated with grouping students for instruction on the basis of achievement and apparent academic ability. Students assigned to higher levels of instruction may develop feelings of superiority while those working at lower levels may feel resentment about their placement. Four statements deal directly with these social aspects and, as indicated by the loadings assigned (.73 to .53), are the

most significant items in the factor. Two of these statements comment that students who are in higher levels may often "make fun" or say cruel things about students who are in lower levels. Conversely, the following two statements refer to the fact that students who are in higher levels may be snobs or "smart alecs".

The five remaining items in the factor do not expressly refer to snobbishness or resentment but they do reflect certain aspects of student concern related to level placement. The statements have relatively low loadings (.43 to .36) and this indicates that students do not strongly associate these items with the first four in the factor. However, a degree of resentment may be indicated in one statement referring to student complaints about their level placement. A further indication of this aspect may be inferred in another statement that comments students should not be separated into "bright" and "slow" classes. Also included in this particular segment of the factor are three statements that appear more concerned with student anxiety. Two of these items refer directly to student concern about "failing" the school year and apprehension about being moved to lower levels of instruction. The final statement alludes to student confusion when movement between levels occurs at various times during the school

year. This may indicate some dissatisfaction with the level placement system.

In summary, this factor retained statements that reflect the more negative aspects generally associated with grouping students for instruction by ability or achievement level. If unhealthy social attitudes are predominate in a school, one possible cause may be the grouping procedures in use. Also, if these procedures result in student confusion, anxiety, or worry about failing, it may be reasonable to assume that the system is unacceptable.

Satisfaction with level placement. This factor accounts for 6.023 percent of the total variability and contains five statements which load from .64 to .49 on the factor. Student satisfaction with their assigned levels of instruction and the influence of inter-class friendships on student performance are the two concerns of the factor. In terms of satisfaction with assigned levels, two statements are directly related and have identical .64 loadings. The first of these items refers to students "liking" their present placement in levels for instruction and the second attempts to determine whether students feel they are in the most appropriate levels. While the remaining three statements involve the extent to which students are influenced by their

friends in class, these items have only slightly lower loadings than the first two statements. This indicates these statements were closely associated with the aspects of acceptance and appropriateness of level placement. The first of the three statements refers to students preferring to remain with their friends in a particular class rather than advance to a higher level of instruction. Closely related, the second item infers that students might deliberately produce inferior work in order to remain in the same classes with their friends. The final statement intimates that friendships at school develop almost exclusively among students who are comparable in terms of academic ability and achievement.

Section Three Factors. Six factors were retained in the analysis of the twenty-six attitude statements contained in the third section of the questionnaire. This indicates that students expressed a greater variance of opinion concerning cultural grouping than was the case in their response to the items in the first two sections.

Compatibility in cultural groups. This factor accounts for 11.481 percent of the total variability and contains four statements which load from .74 to .45

on the factor. The apparent compatibility of students assigned to heterogeneously grouped cultural classes is the basic consideration of the factor. As indicated by its extremely high loading (.74), the most significant item in the factor was the statement, "I like most of the kids that are in my cultural group." Closely related but with a lower loading (.63), a second statement alludes to students "getting along quite well together" in cultural groups. Student satisfaction with their placement in particular cultural groups is the concern of a third item allotted a substantial loading (.53) on the factor. Assigned the lowest loading (.45), the final statement is nevertheless highly relevant to the factor in that it refers to the apparent enjoyment experienced by students in cultural groups when they participate in physical education classes.

This factor may be an important indicator of the relative success of grouping students heterogeneously for instruction in non-academic subjects. Since the students in cultural groups have diverse academic backgrounds, it seems essential to determine whether these "academic differences" have any effect on the relationships between students in cultural classes. If there

does not appear to be general harmony among students in cultural groups, it may be that the grouping system employed is at fault.

Understanding of cultural groups. This factor accounts for 7.704 percent of the total variability and contains four statements which load from .68 to .44 on the factor. An examination of the statements in the factor indicates that students relate their general understanding of cultural grouping with their acceptance of the system. The most significant item received a strong negative loading (-.68) on the factor. This statement makes direct reference to the comprehension students have concerning the use of cultural groups at the school. Having an almost perfect inverse relationship (.66), a second statement intimates that the whole concept of cultural grouping may confuse students. Directly related to the second item, a further statement having a relatively lower loading (.48) indicates that the school should "get rid of the idea of cultural groups." In opposition to this and assigned the lowest loading (-.44) on the factor, the final statement refers to students "liking" the idea of cultural group instruction.

Apparently, students will strongly indicate whether they understand the cultural group concept or, conversely,

whether the concept confuses them. If there is little understanding or much confusion associated with the system, the students may prefer other methods of grouping for cultural classes. However, if students appear to like and accept the idea of cultural groups, it may be an indication of their general understanding of the concept.

Attendance in cultural classes. This factor contains four statements and accounts for 7.068 percent of the total variability. The statements in the factor load from .72 to .52 and refer to the ease with which students can "skip" or absent themselves from cultural classes. Assigned the highest loading (.72) and, consequently, the most significant item as seen by the students, is the statement, "It is easy to skip cultural classes without being caught." Also given a high loading (-.67) and inversely related to the first statement is another item which refers to teachers checking attendance every period. A third statement which loaded strongly (.60) on this factor makes the inference that cultural teachers "track down" students who miss too many classes. Closely related but having the lowest loading (.52), a final statement contends that some students can stay away from cultural classes without ever being missed by the teachers.

The loadings assigned to the statements in this factor indicate that the students reacted strongly to the question of attendance in cultural classes. Since cultural grouping is an essential part of the flexible placement project, problems that may affect the operation of cultural classes must be identified. Presumably, an attendance problem might exist if students feel they can habitually absent themselves from classes without ever being missed or checked upon. Conversely, the problem may be minimal or not exist if students feel a close check is being maintained on their attendance in classes.

Social aspects of cultural grouping. This factor accounts for 6.059 percent of the total variability and contains five statements which load from .64 to .32 on the factor. Generally, the statements are associated with the social functions of the school as perceived by students and the related influence of cultural grouping on these social aspects of school life. Specifically, the most significant statement (.64) refers to an increase in the number of instructional periods for the cultural subjects that the students like best. While this may be a rather obvious statement, it becomes far more significant when the remaining items are examined. A high loading (.55) was assigned to the second most important statement

in the factor and this item comments that a school should be a place where students can make as many friends as possible. It is important to note that students relate this aspect with the cultural grouping system. A lower but substantial loading (.44) was given to a third statement that also has social implications. The statement alludes to students "getting along with all sorts of kids at school" and infers that this may be as important as making good grades. A rather low negative loading (-.42) was assigned to a fourth item which states that students should take instruction in at least one subject from band, art or choral music. While the loading on this item does indicate a rather weak inverse relationship with the first statement, it is probably more important that the students do relate instruction in the cultural areas with the social aspects of school life. Showing a weak negative loading (-.32), the final statement in the factor infers that students really do not care about what other students are in classes with them.

This factor is significant because it demonstrates that students do relate certain social aspects of their school life with the cultural grouping concept. A prime objective of the flexible placement project is the creation of a more socially realistic atmosphere in the

school. Apparently, this effort has been recognized by the students since they do associate statements referring to instruction in the cultural areas with others that have social implications. Conceivably, heterogeneous grouping for cultural subjects does create a social situation in which students can develop more friendships in the school than was the case under the former system.

Sociometric preferences. This factor accounts for 5.375 percent of the total variability and contains four statements which load from .77 to .45 on the factor. The basic theme of the factor is the preference students may have concerning their choice of classmates in both the cultural and academic areas of instruction. All statements in the factor received negative loadings that indicates the respondents directly related each item and were consistent in their response. The first statement received a very high loading (-.77) and infers that students would rather take instruction in the cultural areas with their academic peers. Closely related, an almost identical statement receiving a highly comparable loading (-.74) comments, "I would rather take my cultural subjects with the same kids that are in my academic classes". A third item having a lower but substantial loading (-.52) refers to the idea that students who have

academic difficulties should take their cultural classes together. The final statement in the factor simply reverses the wording used for the second item and comments, "I would rather take my academic subjects with the same kids that are in my cultural classes." The second and fourth statements may appear repetitious but it must be noted that different grouping procedures are used for instruction in each of the cultural and academic areas and, consequently, a different response may be given to these two items.

This factor reveals that students are definitely aware of the different procedures used to group them for instruction in academic and cultural subjects. The preferences that students have of classmates in each of these areas may indicate their attitudes toward the use of ability or achievement grouping for academic subjects and the use of heterogeneous grouping for cultural subjects.

Nature of cultural grouping. This factor accounts for 5.009 percent of the total variability and contains four statements which have relatively low loadings ranging from .52 to .43 on the factor. The low loadings indicate that the students were less emphatic in their response to these items than they were to statements isolated in the other factors. This may imply that this factor is

less significant as an indicator of student attitudes toward cultural grouping. Nevertheless, four statements were retained in the factor and they appear associated with the rather unique nature of cultural grouping. That is, the students apparently recognize the "different" nature of cultural grouping as it relates to the general instructional program. Assigned the highest loading (.52), the most significant statement in the factor refers to the difficulty students may experience when they attempt to explain the idea of cultural groups to their parents. A second statement given a comparable loading (.49) intimates that students may feel their classmates in cultural classes are "different" from those in their academic classes. Both statements may indicate student recognition of the different grouping procedures used for each instructional area. A third statement, allotted a slightly lower loading (.44) comments that students can meet others in their cultural classes that they wouldn't see in their academic classes. This statement again reflects the "different" nature of cultural grouping as seen by students. The lowest loading (.43) on the factor was given to a final statement that refers to students often complaining about the cultural groups to which they have been assigned. This statement appears to have only an indirect bearing on the general theme of

the factor but it may indicate a negative reaction to the apparent "differences" that are inherent in the cultural grouping system.

IV. SUMMARY OF FACTORS

The principal factor analysis of student responses to the attitude statements resulted in significant loadings on 81 of the 99 items in the survey instrument. These statements may be used to portray student attitudes toward their school life and the flexible placement program at Sisler. A summary of these aspects follows:

1. The general satisfaction experienced by students in terms of their school life at Sisler
2. The influence of the homeroom and the homeroom teacher
3. The interpersonal relationships that develop in the school setting
4. The general acceptance by students of the concept of differentiated levels of instruction in each subject
5. The social implications of the achievement level system
6. The general satisfaction experienced by students in terms of their placement in various achievement levels
7. The general compatibility of students grouped heterogeneously in cultural groups
8. The general understanding that students have in terms of the cultural grouping concept
9. The aspect of attendance in cultural classes

10. The social implications of the cultural grouping system

11. The sociometric preferences as displayed by students in academic and cultural classes

12. The general nature of cultural grouping in terms of the "differences" associated with this concept.

V. ANALYSIS OF ITEM RESPONSES

In the previous sections of this chapter the results of the factor analysis of the responses to the attitude statements in the student questionnaire were reported. The following sections will present an analysis of the responses to each of the attitude statements. In order to maintain greater unity, the statements are grouped into the factors that emerged from the factor analysis.

As noted in Chapter III, the items in the teacher questionnaire were grouped according to the student factors. This procedure was followed because the student and teacher questionnaires were highly comparable and most statements in each were identical in nature. The analysis of student items include the total response given; the response given by students in each grade; and the response given by students grouped according to their general levels of achievement. The analysis of teacher items include the total response given; the total response given by teachers

of academic subjects; the response given by academic teachers grouped according to the levels of instruction taught; and the response given by teachers of cultural subjects. While the questionnaires were constructed so that the respondents could reply on a five point Likert-type scale, the responses were tabulated to indicate simple agreement with, disagreement with, or no opinion about each item in the survey instruments.

VI. GENERAL ATTITUDES OF STUDENTS, TOTAL RESPONSE

The factor analysis of the responses to the attitude statements in Section I of the student questionnaire indicated that the respondents were concerned with three major aspects. These were: (1) their school life in general, (2) the homeroom and the homeroom teacher, and (3) their relationships with others in the school.

School life in general. How do students feel about attending school at Sisler Junior High? Of the students responding, 72.4 percent agreed with Statement 23, "I enjoy coming to this school" (Table IX), with only 10.3 percent disagreeing. A similar strong response (74.3 percent agreement) was given to Statement 34, "I like most of my teachers." In terms of actual school work, 69.3 percent of the respondents disagreed that their

TABLE IX

STUDENT ATTITUDE TOWARD THEIR SCHOOL LIFE IN GENERAL,
TOTAL RESPONSE

Statements*	Agree		No Opinion		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
23. I enjoy coming to this school.	400	72.4	96	17.4	57	10.3
7. I like to stay away from school every chance that I can get.	134	24.2	111	20.1	308	55.6
34. I like most of my teachers.	411	74.3	75	13.6	67	12.1
27. Most subjects that I take at school are interesting.	314	56.8	92	16.6	147	26.6
31. I am often unhappy when I am at school.	132	23.9	129	23.3	292	52.8
13. Teachers are too strict at this school.	108	19.5	151	27.3	294	53.2
35. Students should be allowed to do exactly what they want at this school.	104	18.8	103	18.6	346	62.6

*Section I of student questionnaire.

(Concluded on next page)

TABLE IX Concluded

Statements*	Agree No.	Agree %	No Opinion No.	No Opinion %	Disagree No.	Disagree %
1. The work that I have to do at this school is too hard.	38	6.9	132	23.9	383	69.3
21. I like doing most of my school work.	381	68.9	72	13.0	100	18.0
6. I understand most of the work that is given to me at this school.	448	81.1	41	7.4	64	11.6
15. I would rather be going to another school.	53	9.6	57	10.3	443	80.1
29. I don't know any of my teachers very well.	172	31.1	83	15.0	298	53.9
16. Students who misbehave at school should be made to "stay in" after 3:30.	202	36.5	114	20.6	237	42.8
14. Most of my teachers seem very interested in helping students who have trouble with their school work.	409	74.0	66	11.9	78	14.1

*Section I of student questionnaire.

school work was "too hard" (Statement 1) and 68.9 percent indicated that they liked doing most of their work (Statement 21). While only 56.8 percent of the students thought that most of their subjects were interesting (Statement 27), a very strong response (81.1 percent agreement) was given to Statement 6 indicating that students feel they understand most of the work given to them. In response to a final statement in this area, 74.0 percent of the students indicated that most teachers appear "very interested in helping students who have trouble with their school work" (Statement 14).

In reference to the more negative items in this factor, 55.6 percent of the students disagreed that they prefer to stay away from school at every opportunity (Statement 7). A rather substantial number (24.2 percent) indicated that they do like to stay away while a similar response (23.9 percent agreement) was given to Statement 31, "I am often unhappy at school." In response to Statement 13, "Teachers are too strict at this school", 53.2 percent of the students disagreed while 27.3 held no opinion. Should students "be allowed to do exactly what they want at school?" Responding to this item (Statement 35), only 18.8 percent of the students agreed while 62.6 percent disagreed. A rather substantial number of students (31.1 percent) indicated that they do not know "any of their teachers

very well" (Statement 29). However, emphatic disagreement (80.1 percent) was given to Statement 15, "I would rather be going to another school."

The homeroom. How do students react to the homeroom and the homeroom teacher? In response to the item, "Reporting to a homeroom class is a good way to start the day" (Statement 32), 57.5 percent of the students agreed while 22.0 percent disagreed (Table X). In terms of the homeroom teacher, the associated statements elicited a rather scattered response from the students. Perhaps indicative of the changing role of the homeroom teacher, only 20.4 percent of the respondents agreed that they knew their homeroom teacher better than any of their other teachers (Statement 4). Also significant, 74.3 percent of the students disagreed with Statement 22, "I go to my homeroom teacher for advice when I have a problem at school." Only 19.2 percent of the students were in agreement with the idea that homeroom teachers appear interested in the progress of their homeroom classes (Statement 10). When asked whether they would like to know their homeroom teachers better (Statement 19), students registered a 41.0 percent "No Opinion" response with only 30.3 percent in agreement. A similar response resulted for Statement 30, "I would

TABLE X

STUDENT ATTITUDE TOWARD THE HOMEROOM AND THE HOMEROOM TEACHER, TOTAL RESPONSE

Statements*	Agree No.	Agree %	No Opinion No.	No Opinion %	Disagree No.	Disagree %
30. I would like to have the same homeroom teacher again next year.	201	36.3	140	25.3	212	38.3
19. I would like to know my homeroom teacher better than I do now.	168	30.3	227	41.0	158	28.6
32. Reporting to a homeroom class is a good way to start the day.	318	57.5	113	20.4	122	22.0
4. I know my homeroom teacher better than I know any of my other teachers.	113	20.4	93	16.8	347	62.8
22. I go to my homeroom teacher for advice when I have a problem at school.	44	8.0	98	17.7	411	74.3
10. My homeroom teacher seems interested in how well I am doing in my school work.	106	19.2	198	35.8	249	45.0
12. I often worry about "failing" in my school work.	384	69.4	47	8.5	122	22.1
3. Because of the size of the school, I often feel "lost in the crowd."	80	14.4	51	9.2	422	76.4

*Section I of student questionnaire.

like to have the same homeroom teacher again next year." To this item, 36.3 percent of the students agreed, 38.3 percent disagreed and 25.3 percent had no opinion.

Two further statements were associated with the items in this factor. Apparently, students related certain aspects associated with the homeroom to their general success in school. In response to Statement 12, 69.4 percent of the students indicated that they "often worry about failing at school." However, the size of the school does not appear to affect students since 76.4 percent disagreed with Statement 3, "Because of the size of this school, I often feel lost in the crowd."

Interpersonal relationships. To what extent do students "get along" with each other at Sisler and what general accord exists between the teaching staff and student body? Three statements in this factor deal exclusively with the apparent compatibility of students in heterogeneously grouped homerooms. In response to Statement 5, "I like most of the kids in my homeroom," 72.0 percent of the students were in agreement while only 11.8 percent disagreed with the statement (Table XI). Another item (Statement 17) referred to students having the same classmates in their homerooms for the following school year. This statement did not receive a strong response although 47.5 percent of the students indicated

TABLE XI

STUDENT RELATIONSHIPS WITH OTHER STUDENTS AND TEACHERS IN THE SCHOOL, TOTAL RESPONSE

Statements*	Agree No.	Agree %	No Opinion No.	No Opinion %	Disagree No.	Disagree %
5. I like most of the kids in my homeroom.	398	72.0	90	16.3	65	11.8
17. I wouldn't mind having the same kids in my homeroom class next year.	263	47.5	130	23.5	160	28.9
2. Most students in my homeroom class get along quite well together.	413	74.7	64	11.6	76	13.7
8. It is quite easy to make friends with the other kids at this school.	383	69.2	93	16.8	77	13.9
33. Teachers and students seem to get along quite well together at this school.	279	50.5	14.5	26.2	129	23.3
28. Most kids really do not care if they are late for classes at this school.	387	70.0	102	18.4	64	11.6
18. Most kids seem to like coming to this school.	342	61.8	140	25.3	71	12.8

*Section I of student questionnaire.

they wouldn't mind having the same classmates. A much stronger reaction (74.7 percent agreement) resulted from Statement 2, "Most students in my homeroom class get along quite well together."

In terms of the school in general, the majority of students (69.2 percent) indicated that "it is quite easy to make friends with the other kids at the school" (Statement 8). While only 50.5 percent of the students agreed that students and teachers seem to get along well together at the school (Statement 33), a significant number (26.2 percent) had no opinion about this comment. Students appeared to relate the social aspects of school life with Statement 18, "Most kids seem to like coming to this school." While 25.3 percent of the students registered a "No Opinion" response, a substantial number (61.8 percent) agreed with the statement.

VII. STUDENT ATTITUDES TOWARD ACHIEVEMENT LEVELS, TOTAL RESPONSE

The factor analysis of student response to the attitude statements in Section II of the student questionnaire resulted in three major factors. These were:
(1) student acceptance of the achievement level concept,
(2) the social implications of level placement, and
(3) student satisfaction with assigned levels.

Acceptance of achievement levels. Do students really approve of and accept the concept of differentiated levels of instruction for each academic subject? The response to Statement 4 which asks students directly whether they like advancing to higher levels in a subject was strongly affirmative with 83.3 percent of the respondents agreeing (Table XII). Asked whether the school gives "kids a chance to do the best they can" (Statement 18), 74.0 percent of the students agreed with only 10.2 percent in disagreement. Students were almost unanimous (93.0 percent agreement) in their response to Statement 1 which refers to the appropriateness of different levels of instruction for "kids who learn at different speeds." A further item, "Students who learn faster should be in higher levels of work" (Statement 13) was agreed to by 77.9 percent of the respondents. When asked whether they "like the way that they can work at different levels in different subjects" (Statement 21), 68.3 percent of the students agreed.

Does the achievement level concept have a motivational impact on students? Three statements relate directly to this aspect. Strong agreement (76.0 percent) was given to Statement 2 which infers that students may "want to do better in other subjects" when they are advanced to a higher level in any particular subject. Also, students

TABLE XII

STUDENT ATTITUDE TOWARD DIFFERENTIATED LEVELS
OF INSTRUCTION IN ACADEMIC SUBJECTS, TOTAL RESPONSE

Statements*	Agree No.	Agree %	No Opinion No.	No Opinion %	Disagree No.	Disagree %
4. I like the idea of being able to move to a higher level if I am doing well in a subject.	461	83.3	48	8.7	44	8.0
2. Being moved to a higher level in one subject makes a student want to do better in his other subjects.	420	76.0	63	11.4	70	12.6
18. I feel that this school really tries to give kids a chance to do the best they can.	409	74.0	88	15.9	56	10.2
20. If I were moved to a lower level in a subject, I would work very hard to be moved back up again.	400	72.3	87	15.7	66	12.0
1. It is a good idea to have different levels of work for students who learn at different speeds.	514	93.0	13	2.4	26	4.7
9. Students who learn slower are given a chance to do their best at this school.	411	74.4	93	16.8	49	8.9
21. I think that students at this school like the way that they can work at different levels in different subjects.	378	68.3	132	23.9	43	7.8

* Section II of student questionnaire.

(Concluded on next page)

TABLE XII Concluded

Statements*	Agree No.	Agree %	No Opinion No.	No Opinion %	Disagree No.	Disagree %
12. Most teachers are very fair when they move kids to other levels of work.	349	63.1	102	18.4	102	18.5
37. My parents understand when I tell them about the different levels for each academic subject at this school.	299	54.1	132	23.9	122	22.0
16. This school should have only one level of work for all subjects and all students should be in this level.	33	6.0	59	10.7	461	83.4
10. Most of my friends at school think they are in about the right levels of work.	322	58.3	139	25.1	92	16.6
5. I always know how well I am doing with my work at this school.	280	50.6	126	22.8	147	26.6
13. Students who learn faster should be in higher levels of work.	431	77.9	76	13.7	46	8.3
35. Students don't mind being moved to different levels of work during the school year.	253	45.8	172	31.1	128	23.1

*Section II of student questionnaire.

agreed (72.3 percent) that they would "work very hard to be moved back up again" if they were moved to a lower level in a subject (Statement 20). A final statement dealing with this particular aspect revealed that 74.4 percent of the respondents feel that "students who learn slower are given a chance to do their best" at the school.

Do students feel that they are being fairly evaluated when they are moved to different levels of instruction? In response to Statement 12, "Most teachers are very fair when they move kids to other levels of work," 63.1 percent of the students agreed, 18.5 percent disagreed, and 18.4 percent held no opinion about the statement. Asked whether most of their friends considered themselves to be in "about the right levels of work" (Statement 10), 58.3 percent of the respondents indicated that they felt this was the case but a large number (25.1 percent) had no opinion. Only 50.6 percent of the students replied that they always know how well they are doing with their school work (Statement 5). A substantial number of students (26.6 percent) stated that they do not always know how well they are progressing.

Do students understand the general nature and purpose of achievement levels? Statement 16 suggests that there

should be only one level of achievement for all subjects and for all students. The students emphatically rejected this idea with 83.4 percent disagreeing with the statement. When asked whether their parents understood the achievement level concept (Statement 23), 54.1 percent of the students indicated that their parents did have an understanding of the program while 22.0 percent disagreed with the statement. Of course, the reaction to this statement may not be truly indicative of the actual understanding students have of the program. A final statement in this area received a rather weak response from the students. A 31.1 percent "No Opinion" response was given to Statement 35, "Students don't mind being moved to different levels of work during the school year." Only 45.8 percent of the respondents agreed to this statement but the high percentage having no opinion may indicate that students simply accept movement between levels as a matter of course.

Social implications. What attitudes prevail among students toward others who may be in different levels of achievement? Four items refer directly to this question but student response was such that few strong opinions were observable. For example, Statement 25 comments that students who are in higher levels of instruction may

TABLE XIII

STUDENT ATTITUDE TOWARD THE SOCIAL ASPECTS OF PLACEMENT IN ACHIEVEMENT LEVELS, TOTAL RESPONSE

Statements*	Agree		No Opinion		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
25. Students who are in higher levels for most of their subjects often say cruel things about the kids who are in lower levels.	187	33.8	137	24.8	229	41.5
3. Students who are in higher levels of work often "make fun" of kids who are in lower levels.	297	53.7	68	12.3	188	34.0
19. Most kids in higher levels are snobs.	153	27.7	138	25.0	262	47.4
8. Students in lower levels think that the students in higher levels are "smart alecs."	221	40.0	145	26.2	187	33.9
26. My friends sometime complain about the levels of work they are placed in.	290	52.4	140	25.3	123	22.2
38. I am worried about passing this year.	270	48.9	86	15.6	197	35.7
33. Students moving from level to level in their subjects causes a great deal of confusion in this school.	216	39.1	160	28.9	177	32.0
27. I worry about being moved to lower levels in my academic subjects.	295	53.4	91	16.5	167	30.2
30. Students should not be separated into "bright" and "slow" classes for their academic subjects.	143	25.8	150	27.1	260	47.1

*Section II of student questionnaire.

say "cruel things about the kids who are in lower levels." In response to this statement, 33.8 percent of the students agreed, 41.5 percent disagreed and 24.8 percent had no opinion (Table XIII). Students were slightly more positive in their reaction to Statement 3, "Students who are in higher levels of work often make fun of kids who are in lower levels." The response to this statement showed 53.7 percent of the students in agreement while 34.0 percent disagreed. A third item comments that "most kids in higher levels are snobs" (Statement 19). Again, a rather indefinite stand was taken by the student body with 47.4 percent of the respondents disagreeing with the statement, 27.0 percent agreeing and 25 percent having no opinion. Asked whether students assigned to lower levels believe that students in higher levels are "smart alecs" (Statement 8), 40.0 percent of the respondents agreed while 33.9 percent disagreed.

While the remaining items in this factor do not refer to specific feelings of superiority or resentment that students may have, they may be indicative of certain criticisms students have concerning the achievement level concept. Should students be separated into "bright" and "slow" classes for their academic subjects? In response to this question (Statement 30), 47.1 percent of the

students indicated that they believe there should be a separation of "bright" and "slow" students while 25.8 percent opposed this idea. In reference to Statement 26, "My friends sometime complain about the levels of work they are placed in," 52.4 percent of the students agreed, 22.2 percent disagreed, and 25.3 percent had no opinion. Statement 33 infers that student movement between levels in each subject at various times in the school year causes much confusion. Responding to this inference, 39.1 percent of the students agreed that there was confusion while 32.0 percent disagreed and 28.9 percent registered no opinion. In response to Statement 27, "I worry about being moved to lower levels in my academic subjects," 53.4 percent of the students agreed while 30.2 percent disagreed. A final item in the factor showed that 48.9 percent of the students appear "worried about not passing this year" (Statement 38) while 35.7 percent did not feel concerned about this problem.

Satisfaction with assigned levels. How satisfied are students with their assigned levels of instruction and what are their preferences in terms of the friends they have in these levels? Statement 7 comments, "I am pleased with the levels that I am in for most of my

subjects." Response to this statement revealed that 65.0 percent of the students appear pleased with their assigned levels while a rather substantial number (26.8 percent) are not satisfied (Table XIV). A similar proportion, 62.9 percent of the respondents agreeing and 24.1 percent disagreeing, replied to Statement 36, "I think that I am in about the right levels of work for most of my subjects."

When asked whether they would prefer to stay in the same levels with their friends rather than move to higher levels (Statement 11), students split their response with 40.6 in agreement and 41.6 percent in disagreement. The students took only a slightly more positive stand when they responded to Statement 32 which refers to students being able to do better work but preferring to remain in the same levels with their friends. Reaction to this statement indicated that 46.3 percent of the respondents disagreed with this idea, 29.7 percent agreed and 24.1 percent had no opinion. A final item (Statement 14) revealed that 58.9 percent of the students feel that they are in the same levels as most of their friends at school while 31.6 percent disagreed that this was the case.

TABLE XIV

STUDENT SATISFACTION WITH ASSIGNED ACHIEVEMENT LEVELS, TOTAL RESPONSE

Statements*	Agree		No Opinion		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
7. I am pleased with the levels that I am in for most of my subjects.	359	65.0	46	8.3	148	26.8
36. I think that I am in about the right levels of work for most of my subjects.	348	62.9	72	13.0	133	24.1
11. I would rather stay in the same levels with my friends than move to higher levels.	225	40.6	98	17.7	230	41.6
32. I can do better work at school but I would rather stay in the same levels with my friends.	164	29.7	133	24.1	256	46.3
14. Most of my friends at this school are in about the same levels of work that I am in.	326	58.9	52	9.4	175	31.6

*Section II of student questionnaire.

VIII. STUDENT ATTITUDES TOWARD CULTURAL GROUPING, TOTAL RESPONSE

The factor analysis performed on student response to the attitude statements in Section III of the questionnaire resulted in six major factors. These were: (1) the general compatibility of students in cultural groups, (2) the understanding students have of the cultural grouping concept, (3) attendance in cultural classes, (4) the social implications of cultural grouping, (5) sociometric preferences of students in cultural and academic classes and (6) the apparent "different" nature of cultural grouping.

Compatibility in cultural groups. How compatible are students in classes grouped heterogeneously for instruction in cultural subjects? Students appear to have taken a relatively strong stand on this issue. In response to Statement 3, "I like most of the kids who are in my cultural group," 76.5 percent of the students agreed while only 13.5 percent disagreed (Table XV). When asked whether students in cultural groups seem to get along well together (Statement 14), the respondents indicated that they generally agreed (75.2 percent) with only 11.4 disagreeing. In specific reference to physical education, 75.0 percent of the students agreed that their cultural group enjoyed taking such classes together while

TABLE XV

STUDENT COMPATIBILITY IN CULTURAL GROUPS,
TOTAL RESPONSE

Statements*	Agree		No Opinion		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
2. I like most of the kids that are in my cultural group.	423	76.5	56	10.1	74	13.4
14. The kids in my cultural group seem to get along quite well together.	416	75.2	74	13.4	63	11.4
20. I am in the cultural group that I really want to be in.	296	53.4	94	17.0	163	29.5
18. My cultural group seems to enjoy taking physical education together.	415	75.0	84	15.2	54	9.8

*Section III of student questionnaire.

9.8 percent disagreed (Statement 18). A final statement had a less positive reaction. This item (Statement 20), "I am in the cultural group that I really want to be in," received a 53.4 percent affirmative response with 29.5 percent of the students disagreeing and 17.0 percent having no opinion.

Understanding of cultural groups. Do students generally understand and accept the cultural grouping concept? In response to Statement 8, "I understand why students are divided into cultural groups at this school," 53.9 percent of the students agreed while approximately one quarter (25.3 percent) indicated that they did not have this understanding (Table XVI). However, when asked whether the idea of cultural groups "confuses" them (Statement 4), 73.1 percent of the students indicated that this was not the case. Statement 26 infers that the school "should get rid of the idea of cultural groups." Only 13.7 percent of the students agreed with this suggestion while 59.1 percent disagreed and a significant number (27.2 percent) had no opinion. Responding to the final statement in this factor, 67.9 percent of the students agreed that "most kids at this school like the idea of cultural groups" (Statement 23).

Attendance in cultural classes. What attitudes do

TABLE XVI

STUDENT UNDERSTANDING OF CULTURAL GROUPS,
TOTAL RESPONSE

Statements*	Agree		No Opinion		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
8. I understand why students are divided into cultural groups at this school.	298	53.9	115	20.8	140	25.3
4. The whole idea of cultural groups confuses me.	71	12.9	78	14.1	404	73.1
26. This school should get rid of the idea of cultural groups and use some other way to put students in classes for art, band, choral music and physical education.	76	13.7	150	27.2	327	59.1
23. I think that most kids at this school like the idea of taking band or art or choral music and their physical education classes in cultural groups.	375	67.9	112	20.1	66	11.9

*Section III of student questionnaire.

students have toward regular attendance in cultural classes. The students did not take a strong stand on this issue. In response to Statement 3, "It is easy to skip cultural classes without being caught," 37.6 percent of the students had no opinion, 36.5 percent agreed and 25.8 percent disagreed (Table XVII). When asked whether their cultural subject teachers "checked attendance each period" (Statement 6), 58.7 percent of the students agreed that this procedure took place but 24.2 percent indicated they felt attendance was not being regularly checked. Statement 15 suggests that teachers "track down kids who miss too many classes." A high percentage of students (31.2 percent) had no opinion about this statement while 42.6 percent agreed and 26.3 percent disagreed. Slightly over one half of the students (53.5 percent) agreed with the final item in the factor. This item refers to students being able to "stay away from their cultural classes without ever being missed by the teachers" (Statement 9).

Social implications of cultural grouping. What are the feelings of students concerning the social aspects of school life? In response to Statement 1, "A school should be a place where you can make as many friends as possible," the students reacted strongly with 73.4 percent of the respondents agreeing to the statement (Table XVIII).

TABLE XVII

STUDENT ATTITUDE TOWARD ATTENDANCE IN CULTURAL CLASSES, TOTAL RESPONSE

Statements*	Agree		No Opinion		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
3. It is easy to "skip" cultural classes without being caught.	202	36.5	208	37.6	143	25.8
6. My cultural subject teachers check attendance almost every period.	325	58.7	94	17.0	134	24.2
15. My cultural subject teachers "track down" kids who miss too many classes.	235	42.6	172	31.2	146	26.3
9. Some kids stay away from their cultural classes without ever being missed by the teachers.	296	53.5	139	25.1	118	21.4

*Section III of student questionnaire.

TABLE XVIII

STUDENT ATTITUDE TOWARD THE SOCIAL ASPECTS OF CULTURAL GROUPING, TOTAL RESPONSE

Statements*	Agree		No Opinion		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
12. Students should be allowed to take more periods in the cultural subjects they like the best.	418	75.8	83	15.0	52	9.2
1. A school should be a place where you can make as many friends as possible.	406	73.4	86	15.6	61	11.0
25. Getting along with all sorts of kids at school is just as important as getting good marks.	373	67.4	102	18.5	78	14.1
19. It is a good idea to have students take one subject from band, art or choral music.	328	59.2	96	17.4	129	23.4
22. I really don't care what other kids are with me in the same classes that I am in.	197	35.5	157	28.4	199	36.0

*Section III of student questionnaire.

A slightly weaker stand was taken when students were asked whether "getting along with all sorts of kids at school is just as important as getting good marks" (Statement 25). The response to this statement showed that 67.4 percent of the students agreed, 14.1 percent disagreed and 18.1 percent had no opinion.

When the items in this section were factor analyzed, the students related the above mentioned social aspects of school life with cultural grouping. When asked whether "students should be allowed to take more periods in the cultural subjects that they like the best" (Statement 12), the respondents registered strong agreement (75.8 percent) with this idea. However, fewer students agreed (59.2 percent) that they should be required to take at least one subject from band, art or choral music (Statement 19). Little consensus developed among students in terms of the final item in the factor (Statement 22). Response to this statement, "I really don't care what other kids are with me in the same classes that I am in," showed that 36.0 percent of the students disagreed, 35.5 percent agreed and 28.4 percent had no opinion.

Sociometric preferences. What preferences do students have in terms of their classmates in both the academic and cultural areas? Reaction to the attitude

statements in this factor revealed that the students took only moderately strong positions regarding their classmate preferences. While 51.6 percent of the respondents disagreed with Statement 24, "It would be better if kids who are in about the same levels for their academic subjects took their cultural subjects together," a large percentage (27.4 percent) had no opinion while 20.6 percent agreed with the statement (Table XIX). When asked whether they would rather take their cultural subjects with the same students that are in their academic classes (Statement 13), the respondents again registered a strong "No Opinion" response with 45.6 percent of the students disagreeing and 27.4 percent agreeing. Statement 11 refers to students assigned to the lower academic levels and suggests that these students should take all academic and cultural subjects together. In response to this statement the students again reacted with a very strong "No Opinion" (32.4 percent) while 50.2 percent disagreed that students in lower academic levels should be forced to take <u>all</u> subjects together. The strongest stand was taken in regard to Statement 5, "I would rather take my academic subjects with the same kids that are in my cultural group." Only 20.1 percent of the students agreed with this statement, 24.8 expressed no opinion and 55.2 percent disagreed.

TABLE XIX

SOCIOMETRIC PREFERENCES OF STUDENTS IN TERMS OF CLASSMATES, TOTAL RESPONSE

Statements*	Agree No.	Agree %	No opinion No.	No opinion %	Disagree No.	Disagree %
24. It would be better if kids who are in about the same levels for their academic subjects took their cultural subjects together.	114	20.6	153	27.7	286	51.6
13. I would rather take my cultural classes with the same kids that are in my academic classes.	151	27.4	149	27.0	253	45.6
11. Students who have trouble doing school work should take all their academic and cultural subjects together.	96	17.4	179	32.4	278	50.2
5. I would rather take my academic subjects with the same kids that are in my cultural group.	111	20.1	137	24.8	305	55.2

*Section III of student questionnaire.

The "differences" associated with cultural grouping. Four statements were isolated in this factor but were assigned relatively weak loadings. This may indicate that the factor is not an exceptionally strong descriptor of attitudes. However, certain opinions may be expressed by the respondents that have some relevance to the question; Do students perceive certain "differences" inherent in cultural grouping relative to other aspects of the school's instructional program?

The statement assigned the highest loading on the factor refers to the difficulty students may have when attempting to explain the concept of cultural grouping to their parents (Statement 16). Students did not take a strong position when they responded to this statement with 26.1 percent having no opinion, 28.5 percent agreeing and 45.5 percent disagreeing (Table XX). In response to Statement 16, "The kids in my cultural group seem different than the kids who are in my academic classes," 47.1 percent of the students agreed, 26.3 percent had no opinion and 26.6 percent disagreed. Students reacted most strongly to Statement 7 which states, "Being in a cultural group gives me a chance to meet kids I don't usually see in my academic classes." Response to this statement showed that 79.2 percent of the students agreed with it while only 10.1 percent disagreed. A final statement,

TABLE XX

STUDENT ATTITUDE TOWARD THE APPARENT "DIFFERENCES" INHERENT IN CULTURAL GROUPING, TOTAL RESPONSE

Statements*	Agree No.	Agree %	No Opinion No.	No Opinion %	Disagree No.	Disagree %
16. It is difficult to explain to my parents exactly what cultural groups are.	157	28.5	144	26.1	252	45.5
21. The kids in my cultural group seem "different" than the kids that are in my academic classes.	260	47.1	145	26.3	148	26.6
7. Being in a cultural group gives me a chance to meet kids I don't usually see in my academic classes.	438	79.2	59	10.7	56	10.1
17. My friends often complain about the cultural groups that they are in.	259	46.8	131	23.7	163	29.5

*Section III of student questionnaire.

having the weakest association with this factor, comments that some students often complain about their placement in particular cultural groups (Statement 17). Response to this statement indicated that 46.8 percent of the students agreed, 29.5 percent disagreed and 29.5 percent had no opinion.

IX. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF STUDENT RESPONSE, BY GRADES

The analysis of the total student response to the attitude statements was discussed in the preceding sections of this chapter. To provide further understanding of student attitudes, a comparative analysis by grades was also performed on the student response. The results of this analysis will be discussed in this section. For convenience, the discussions will be grouped in three general areas, each corresponding to the three major sections of the student questionnaire. Only those statements which indicate significant differences will receive specific mention since all data can be observed in the accompanying tables.

General attitudes. Section I of the questionnaire was concerned with the attitudes of students in terms of (1) their school life in general, (2) the homeroom and

the homeroom teacher, and (3) their relationships with others in the school. The response to the statements in this section, by grades, can be seen in Tables XXI, XXII and XXIII.

The reaction of students in grades seven, eight and nine to the statements dealing with school life in general was fairly consistent (Table XXI). Only one item, Statement 27, "Most subjects that I take at school are interesting," received a significant difference in response. Although 67.1 percent of grade seven students agreed with this statement, only 56.7 percent of grade eight students and 46.9 percent of grade nine students indicated agreement. Almost one-third (33.0 percent) of the grade nine respondents rejected the idea that most of their subjects are interesting.

Apparently, grade seven students attach more importance to the homeroom and the homeroom teacher than do students in grades eight and nine (Table XXII). In response to Statement 30, "I would like to have the same homeroom teacher again next year", 54.4 percent of the grade seven students agreed. However, only 32.9 percent of the grade eight students and 24.3 percent of the grade nine students thought that having the same homeroom teacher would be a suitable arrangement. Responding to Statement 32, "Reporting to a homeroom is a good way to start the day,"

TABLE XXI

STUDENT ATTITUDE TOWARD THEIR SCHOOL
LIFE IN GENERAL, BY GRADES

Statements	GRADE 7 N = 167*			GRADE 8 N = 192*			GRADE 9 N = 194*		
	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %
23. I enjoy coming to this school.	70.6	19.2	10.2	70.9	17.7	11.4	75.2	15.5	9.3
7. I like to stay away from school every chance that I can get.	23.4	18.0	58.7	23.4	17.7	58.9	25.8	24.2	50.0
34. I like most of my teachers.	75.5	11.4	13.2	73.5	15.6	11.0	74.2	13.4	12.4
27. Most subjects that I take at school are interesting.	67.1	15.0	18.0	56.7	15.6	27.6	47.9	19.1	33.0
31. I am often unhappy when I am at school.	23.4	24.0	52.7	24.0	19.8	56.2	24.2	26.3	49.5
13. Teachers are too strict at this school.	19.8	25.7	54.5	23.5	28.1	48.4	15.5	27.8	56.7
35. Students should be allowed to do exactly what they want at this school.	23.4	9.6	67.1	17.7	25.0	57.3	16.0	20.1	63.9
1. The work that I have to do at this school is too hard.	6.0	23.4	70.7	9.9	22.9	67.2	4.6	25.3	70.1
21. I like doing most of my school work.	74.3	9.6	16.2	66.2	15.1	18.8	67.0	13.9	19.1
6. I understand most of the work that is given to me at this school.	77.3	10.2	12.6	81.8	5.7	12.5	83.5	6.7	9.7
15. I would rather be going to another school.	8.4	9.0	82.6	8.4	11.5	79.2	10.8	10.3	78.8
29. I don't know any of my teachers very well.	28.8	15.0	56.3	30.8	17.7	51.5	33.5	12.4	54.1
16. Students who misbehave at school should be made to "stay in" after 3:30.	46.8	22.2	31.2	36.4	18.2	45.3	27.8	21.6	50.6
14. Most of my teachers seem very interested in helping students who have trouble with their school work.	75.4	10.2	14.4	73.4	12.0	14.6	73.2	13.4	13.4

*N = Number of respondents

TABLE XXII

STUDENT ATTITUDE TOWARD THE HOMEROOM
AND THE HOMEROOM TEACHER, BY GRADES

Statements	GRADE 7 N = 167*			GRADE 8 N = 192*			GRADE 9 N = 194*		
	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %
30. I would like to have the same homeroom teacher again next year.	54.4	24.6	21.0	32.9	25.0	42.2	24.3	26.3	49.5
19. I would like to know my homeroom teacher better than I do now.	43.1	39.5	17.4	31.8	38.0	30.2	18.0	45.4	36.6
32. Reporting to a homeroom class is a good way to start the day.	69.4	15.6	15.0	57.3	19.8	22.9	47.4	25.3	27.3
4. I know my homeroom teacher better than I know any of my other teachers.	32.4	24.0	43.7	18.8	15.1	66.1	11.8	12.4	75.8
22. I go to my homeroom teacher for advice when I have a problem at school.	13.8	21.0	65.3	6.7	19.8	73.4	4.1	12.9	83.0
10. My homeroom teacher seems interested in how well I am doing in my school work.	21.6	37.1	41.4	19.3	37.5	43.3	17.0	33.0	50.0
12. I often worry about "failing" in my school work.	74.8	7.2	18.0	68.2	10.9	20.9	66.0	7.2	26.8
3. Because of the size of the school, I often feel "lost in the crowd."	20.4	10.2	69.4	12.0	8.9	79.1	12.0	8.8	79.4

*N = Number of respondents

69.4 percent of students in grade seven agreed; 57.3 percent of students in grade eight agreed; but only 47.4 percent of the grade nine students agreed with the statement. Grades eight and nine students disagreed strongly (66.1 and 75.8 percent respectively) with Statement 4, "I know my homeroom teacher better than I know any of my other teachers." The reaction by grade seven students to this statement showed less disagreement (43.7 percent) but a rather high "No Opinion" response (24.0 percent).

Grade eight students expressed the strongest agreement (78.1 percent) with Statement 5, "I like most of the kids in my homeroom." Agreement to this statement by students in grades seven and nine was also high (69.5 and 68.0 percent respectively) but not as strong as the reaction of the grade eight students (Table XXIII). In addition, 57.8 percent of the grade eight students indicated that they wouldn't mind having the same classmates in their homerooms next year (Statement 17). However, only 37.1 percent of the grade nine students and 47.9 percent of the grade seven students expressed agreement with this statement. While grade eight and nine students indicated strong agreement with Statement 2 (78.7 and 78.9 percent respectively), this response dropped to 65.3 percent agreement by grade seven students. This particular

TABLE XXIII

STUDENT RELATIONSHIPS WITH OTHER STUDENTS
AND TEACHERS IN THE SCHOOL, BY GRADES

Statements	GRADE 7 N = 167*			GRADE 8 N = 192*			GRADE 9 N = 194*		
	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %
5. I like most of the kids in my homeroom.	69.5	13.2	17.4	78.1	15.1	6.7	68.0	20.1	11.8
17. I wouldn't mind having the same kids in my homeroom class next year.	47.9	23.4	28.8	57.8	18.8	23.4	37.1	28.4	34.5
2. Most students in my homeroom class get along quite well together.	65.3	15.0	19.8	78.7	9.4	12.0	78.9	10.8	10.3
8. It is quite easy to make friends with the other kids at this school.	67.1	17.4	15.6	70.8	14.6	14.6	69.6	18.6	11.9
33. Teachers and students seem to get along quite well together at this school.	44.3	27.5	28.2	50.5	26.0	23.4	55.6	25.3	19.0
28. Most kids really do not care if they are late for classes at this school.	68.3	21.0	10.8	69.8	20.3	9.9	71.6	14.4	13.9
18. Most kids seem to like coming to this school.	56.9	27.5	15.6	63.1	25.0	12.0	65.0	23.7	11.3

*N = Number of respondents

statement refers to students in homeroom classes "getting along quite well together."

Attitudes toward achievement levels. Section II of the questionnaire was concerned with attitudes of students in terms of: (1) their acceptance of the achievement level concept, (2) the social implications of level placement, and (3) student satisfaction with assigned levels. The response to the statements in this section, by grades, can be seen in Tables XXIV, XXV, and XXVI.

The response by students throughout the three grades was remarkably consistent for the statements dealing with acceptance of the achievement level concept (Table XXIV). Only three statements received significant differences in response. The first of these, Statement 20, refers to students "wanting to work very hard to move back up again" when they are dropped to lower levels of instruction. In response to this statement, grade seven students reacted most strongly (80.2 percent agreement), while 67.7 percent of grade eight students and 70.1 percent of grade nine students indicated that they would work harder. The response to Statement 5, "I always know how well I am doing with my work at this school" revealed that 58.2 percent of grade nine students feel they are aware of their relative progress at school. Only 45.5

TABLE XXIV

STUDENT ATTITUDE TOWARD DIFFERENTIATED LEVELS OF INSTRUCTION IN ACADEMIC SUBJECTS, BY GRADE

Statements	GRADE 7 N = 167*			GRADE 8 N = 192*			GRADE 9 N = 194*		
	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %
4. I like the idea of being able to move to a higher level if I am doing well in a subject.	86.8	8.4	4.8	84.9	6.8	8.3	78.8	10.8	10.3
2. Being moved to a higher level in one subject makes a student want to do better in his other subjects.	80.8	12.6	6.6	75.1	11.5	13.6	72.7	10.3	17.0
18. I feel that this school really gives kids a chance to do the best they can.	76.0	15.6	8.4	71.3	16.1	12.5	74.8	16.0	9.2
20. If I were moved to a lower level in a subject, I would work very hard to be moved back up again.	80.2	10.8	9.0	67.7	19.8	12.5	70.1	16.0	13.9
1. It is a good idea to have different levels of work for students who learn at different speeds.	92.2	3.6	4.2	92.7	1.6	5.7	93.9	2.1	4.1
9. Students who learn slower are given a chance to do their best at this school.	76.0	16.2	7.8	75.0	16.1	8.8	72.1	18.0	9.8
21. I think that students at this school like the way they can work at different levels in different subjects.	64.7	26.9	8.4	66.1	26.6	7.3	73.7	18.6	7.8

* N = Number of respondents

(Concluded on next page)

TABLE XXIV Concluded

Statements	GRADE 7 N = 167*			GRADE 8 N = 192*			GRADE 9 N = 194*		
	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %
12. Most teachers are very fair when they move kids to other levels of work.	65.3	18.0	16.8	58.4	22.9	18.7	66.0	14.4	19.6
37. My parents understand when I tell them about the different levels for each academic subject at this school.	58.1	19.2	22.8	52.1	24.5	23.5	52.6	27.3	20.1
16. This school should have only one level of work for all subjects and all students should be in this level.	5.4	11.4	83.3	6.8	8.3	84.9	5.7	12.4	82.0
10. Most of my friends at school think they are in about the right levels of work.	55.7	27.5	16.8	57.9	24.5	17.7	60.8	23.7	15.5
5. I always know how well I am doing with my work at this school.	45.5	26.9	27.6	47.4	22.4	30.3	58.2	19.6	22.2
13. Students who learn faster should be in higher levels of work.	71.2	19.8	9.0	79.2	12.5	8.4	82.5	9.8	7.8
35. Students don't mind being moved to different levels of work during the school year.	44.9	37.7	17.4	45.3	31.3	23.4	46.9	25.3	27.8

*N = Number of respondents

percent of the grade seven students and 47.4 percent of the grade eight students agreed with Statement 5. The grade eight and nine students were more emphatic than students in grade seven in response to Statement 13, "Students who learn faster should be in higher levels of work." While 71.2 percent of the grade seven students did agree with this statement, the grade eight and nine students reacted more strongly with 79.2 and 82.5 percent of these students agreeing respectively in each grade.

Students in grade seven appear more concerned about the social implications of level placement than do students in grade nine (Table XXV). Two statements are especially indicative of this concern. In response to Statement 25, "Students in higher levels of work often say cruel things about the kids who are in lower levels," 40.2 percent of the grade seven students agreed as compared to 25.8 percent in grade nine. When asked whether students in higher levels "often make fun of kids who are in lower levels" (Statement 3), 59.8 percent of the grade seven students as opposed to 45.3 percent of those in grade nine agreed with the statement.

In terms of satisfaction with assigned levels of instruction, two statements indicated apparent differences of opinion as expressed by students in the various grades (Table XXVI). While only 21.0 percent of grade seven

TABLE XXV

STUDENT ATTITUDE TOWARD THE SOCIAL
ASPECTS OF PLACEMENT IN ACHIEVEMENT LEVELS, BY GRADES

Statements	GRADE 7 N = 167*			GRADE 8 N = 192*			GRADE 9 N = 194*		
	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %
25. Students who are in higher levels for most of their subjects often say cruel things about the kids who are in lower levels.	40.2	23.4	36.6	36.4	23.4	40.2	25.8	27.3	46.9
3. Students who are in higher levels of work often "make fun" of the kids who are in lower levels.	59.8	12.6	27.6	56.8	12.0	31.2	45.3	12.4	42.3
19. Most kids in higher levels are snobs.	30.0	25.1	44.9	27.1	27.6	45.4	26.3	22.2	51.5
8. Students in lower levels think that the students in higher levels are "smart alecs."	43.8	30.5	25.8	40.7	25.5	33.8	36.1	23.2	40.7
26. My friends sometime complain about the levels of work they are placed in.	47.9	29.9	22.2	51.6	27.1	21.3	57.2	19.6	23.2
38. I am worried about passing this year.	58.0	15.0	27.0	52.6	14.6	32.8	37.1	17.0	45.9
33. Students moving from level to level in their subjects causes a great deal of confusion in the school.	43.1	29.9	27.0	34.4	31.8	33.9	40.2	25.3	34.6
27. I worry about being moved to lower levels in my academic subjects.	57.5	16.2	26.4	57.3	17.2	25.6	45.9	16.0	38.2
30. Students should not be separated into "bright" and "slow" classes for their academic subjects.	25.8	30.5	43.8	27.1	26.6	46.4	24.8	24.7	50.5

*N = Number of respondents

TABLE XXVI

STUDENT SATISFACTION WITH ASSIGNED ACHIEVEMENT LEVELS, BY GRADES

Statements	GRADE 7 N = 167*			GRADE 8 N = 192*			GRADE 9 N = 194*		
	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %
7. I am pleased with the levels that I am in for most of my subjects.	68.2	7.2	24.6	64.1	8.3	27.6	62.9	9.3	27.8
36. I think that I am in about the right levels of work for most of my subjects.	61.1	18.0	21.0	55.7	13.0	31.3	71.6	8.8	19.6
11. I would rather stay in the same levels with my friends than move to higher levels.	31.8	17.4	50.9	43.2	16.7	40.1	45.9	19.1	35.1
32. I can do better work at school but I would rather stay in the same levels with my friends.	27.8	29.9	44.3	28.6	22.4	49.0	34.0	20.6	45.4
14. Most of my friends at this school are in about the same levels of work that I am in.	56.9	8.4	34.7	60.4	12.0	27.6	59.3	7.7	32.9

*N = Number of respondents

students and 19.6 percent of grade nine students disagreed with Statement 36, "I think that I am in about the right levels of work for most of my subjects," 31.3 percent of the grade eight respondents expressed disagreement. Apparently, the grade seven students are less willing to remain in the "same levels with their friends rather than be moved to higher levels" (Statement 11). Over one-half of these students (50.9 percent) rejected this idea while grades eight and nine students were noticeably less emphatic in that only 40.1 and 35.1 percent respectively disagreed with the statement.

Attitudes toward cultural grouping. Section III of the questionnaire was concerned with attitudes of students in terms of: (1) the general compatibility of students in cultural groups, (2) student understanding of cultural grouping, (3) attendance in cultural classes, (4) the social implications of cultural grouping, (5) the sociometric preferences of students in both cultural and academic classes and (6) the apparent "differences" associated with cultural grouping. The response to the statements can be seen in Tables XXVII through XXXII.

Because student response to the twenty-six attitude statements in Section III caused six factors to emerge, fewer statements were isolated in each of these factors than was the case in the factors that developed in Sections

I and II of the questionnaire. As a result, the percentage response to the items in Section III, when examined by grades, was generally more uniform and only five of the twenty-six statements had responses that were significantly different. To maintain consistency, the tables indicating student response, by grades, to all items in this section will be placed in the order corresponding to the factors that developed. However, only the five statements which received significant differences in response will be mentioned in the following discussions.

In response to Statement 14, "The kids in my cultural group seem to get along well together," 68.9 percent of grade seven students agreed. However, students in grades eight and nine reacted more affirmatively with 76.0 percent in grade eight and 79.8 percent in grade nine signifying agreement (Table XXVII). While 46.9 percent of students in grade nine agreed with Statement 3, "It is easy to skip cultural classes without being caught," the grade seven and eight students were relatively non-committal and their strongest response was "No Opinion" (43.7 and 44.3 percent respectively). Also, a high percentage of grade nine students (60.3 percent) feel that "some kids can stay away from their cultural classes without ever being missed by the teachers" (Statement 9).

TABLE XXVII

STUDENT COMPATIBILITY IN CULTURAL GROUPS,
BY GRADES

Statements	GRADE 7 N = 167*			GRADE 8 N = 192*			GRADE 9 N = 194*		
	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %
2. I like most of the kids that are in my cultural group.	75.5	10.2	14.4	76.1	9.4	14.5	77.8	10.8	11.3
14. The kids in my cultural group seem to get along quite well together.	68.9	15.0	16.2	76.0	12.5	11.5	79.8	13.0	7.3
20. I am in the cultural group that I really want to be in.	49.7	21.0	29.4	55.8	12.5	31.7	54.4	18.1	27.5
18. My cultural group seems to enjoy taking physical education together.	71.2	18.6	10.2	77.1	13.5	9.4	76.2	14.0	9.9

*N = Number of respondents

Grade seven response to this statement showed that 47.3 percent of these students also agreed as did 52.0 percent of the grade eight respondents (Table XXIX).

In reference to the social implications of cultural grouping, two statements received substantially different responses from the students grouped according to grades (Table XXX). The grade nine students reacted strongly to Statement 1, "A school should be a place where you can make as many friends as possible", as indicated by their affirmative response (78.4 percent). However, the students in grades eight and nine were slightly less positive in their reaction to the statement with 66.5 percent agreeing in grade seven and 74.4 percent agreeing in grade eight. A wider divergence of opinion resulted when the students considered Statement 25, "Getting along with all sorts of people is just as important as getting good marks." The response to this statement showed that grade nine students agreed emphatically (79.3 percent); the grade eight students agreed quite strongly (65.1 percent); and the grade seven students agreed only moderately (56.3 percent).

The students, grouped by grades, gave comparable responses to the statements dealing with understanding of cultural groups, sociometric preferences and the "different" aspects of cultural grouping. The responses to these items may be seen in Tables XXVIII, XXXI and XXXII.

TABLE XXVIII

STUDENT UNDERSTANDING OF CULTURAL GROUPS, BY GRADES

Statements	GRADE 7 N = 167*			GRADE 8 N = 192*			GRADE 9 N = 194*		
	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %
8. I understand why students are divided into cultural groups at this school.	56.3	23.4	20.4	55.2	20.3	24.5	50.6	19.1	30.4
4. The whole idea of cultural groups confuses me.	12.0	13.2	74.9	11.5	14.1	74.5	14.9	14.9	70.1
26. This school should get rid of the idea of cultural groups and use some other way to put students in classes for art, band, choral music and physical education.	16.2	21.6	62.2	12.0	28.6	59.3	13.5	30.6	55.9
23. I think that most kids at this school like the idea of taking band or art or choral music and their physical education classes in cultural groups.	68.3	22.8	9.0	68.8	17.2	14.1	66.8	20.7	12.4

*N = Number of respondents

TABLE XXIX

STUDENT ATTITUDE TOWARD ATTENDANCE
IN CULTURAL CLASSES, BY GRADES

Statements	GRADE 7 N = 167*			GRADE 8 N = 192*			GRADE 9 N = 194*		
	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %
3. It is easy to "skip" cultural classes without being caught.	31.2	43.7	25.2	30.7	44.3	25.0	46.9	25.8	27.3
6. My cultural teachers check attendance almost every period.	59.3	19.8	21.0	62.0	15.1	23.0	55.2	16.5	28.3
15. My cultural teachers "track down" kids who miss too many classes.	45.5	32.3	22.2	42.1	34.4	23.4	40.4	26.9	32.7
9. Some kids stay away from their cultural classes without ever being missed by the teachers.	47.3	29.9	22.8	52.0	28.6	19.3	60.3	17.5	22.2

*N = Number of respondents

TABLE XXX

STUDENT ATTITUDE TOWARD THE SOCIAL ASPECTS
OF CULTURAL GROUPING, BY GRADES

Statements	GRADE 7 N = 167*			GRADE 8 N = 192*			GRADE 9 N = 194*		
	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %
12. Students should be allowed to take more periods in the cultural subjects they like the best.	73.0	16.8	10.2	70.9	18.2	11.0	82.9	10.4	6.7
1. A school should be a place where you can make as many friends as possible.	66.5	18.6	15.0	74.4	14.6	10.9	78.4	13.9	7.7
25. Getting along with all sorts of kids is just as important as getting good marks.	56.3	25.1	18.6	65.1	20.8	14.1	79.3	10.4	10.4
19. It is a good idea to have students take one subject from band, art or choral music.	58.1	18.6	23.4	58.3	19.3	22.4	61.2	14.5	24.4
22. I really don't care what other kids are with me in the same classes that I am in.	37.2	31.7	30.5	31.8	29.2	39.0	37.3	24.9	37.8

*N = Number of respondents

TABLE XXXI

SOCIOMETRIC PREFERENCES OF STUDENTS
IN TERMS OF CLASSMATES, BY GRADES

Statements	GRADE 7 N = 167*			GRADE 8 N = 192*			GRADE 9 N = 194*		
	Agree %	No opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No opinion %	Dis-agree %
14. It would be better if kids who are in about the same levels of work for their academic subjects took their cultural subjects together.	22.2	32.9	44.9	18.2	28.6	53.1	21.7	22.3	55.9
13. I would rather take my cultural classes with the same kids that are in my academic classes.	31.8	25.7	42.5	28.1	27.1	44.8	22.8	28.0	49.2
11. Students who have trouble doing school work should take all their academic and cultural subjects together.	19.2	37.7	43.1	18.7	30.2	51.1	14.5	30.1	55.4
5. I would rather take my academic subjects with the same kids that are in my cultural group.	16.8	26.3	56.9	24.0	22.4	53.7	19.0	25.8	55.2

*N = Number of respondents

TABLE XXXII

STUDENT ATTITUDE TOWARD THE APPARENT "DIFFERENCE" INHERENT IN CULTURAL GROUPING, BY GRADES

Statements	GRADE 7 N = 167*			GRADE 8 N = 192*			GRADE 9 N = 194*		
	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %
16. It is difficult to explain to my parents exactly what cultural groups are.	28.8	25.7	45.5	31.7	26.0	42.2	24.9	26.4	48.7
21. The kids in my cultural group seem "different" than the kids that are in my academic classes.	47.9	25.7	26.4	49.0	27.6	23.4	44.6	25.4	30.1
7. Being in a cultural group gives me a chance to meet kids I don't usually see in my academic classes.	80.3	12.6	7.2	77.1	10.9	12.0	80.4	8.8	10.8
17. My friends often complain about the cultural groups that they are in.	49.7	25.7	24.6	49.5	24.5	26.0	41.4	21.2	37.4

*N = Number of respondents

X. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF STUDENT RESPONSE, BY CATEGORIES

The responses made by students to the attitude statements were tabulated to ascertain whether there were differences in attitudes as expressed in the stated opinions of students grouped according to their general levels of achievement. Since the flexible placement concept is based on the assumption that most students progress at varying rates in different subjects, seven levels of instruction are used in the program. Consequently, it is rather difficult to classify any one student in terms of one particular instructional or achievement level. Thus, for the purposes of this study, all students were classified into categories which corresponded to their general levels of achievement. As a result, students who received instruction exclusively in Levels I and II were placed in Category One; students in Levels II, III and IV were placed in Category Two; students in Levels III, IV and V were placed in Category Three; and students in Levels V, VI and VII were placed in Category IV. The overlapping of levels to create the various categories was necessary to accommodate all students receiving instruction at different levels. Generally, the students in Category One may be considered "above-average"; the students in Category Two "average"; the students in

Category Three "low-average"; and the students in Category Four "below-average". The majority of students in Category IV are generally referred to as Occupational Entrance Course students.

The comparative analysis of the responses made by students grouped according to the above categories will follow the procedures used in the discussion of student responses by grades (Section IX). That is, only statements which indicate specific differences in response will be mentioned since all data can be observed in the accompanying tables.

General attitudes. Table XXXIII contains fourteen statements dealing with student attitudes toward their school life in general. Of these, four have significant differences in response. In reaction to Statement 23, "I enjoy coming to this school," the students in Categories One and Two expressed strong agreement (77.8 and 78.0 percent respectively). However, the low-average and below average students were far less positive and only 67.4 percent in Category Three and 64.2 percent in Category Four agreed that they enjoy attending school at Sisler. The response to Statement 34, "I like most of my teachers," also showed a difference in opinion. The above-average and average students reacted almost identically to this

TABLE XXXIII

STUDENT ATTITUDE TOWARD THEIR SCHOOL
LIFE IN GENERAL, BY CATEGORIES

Statements	CATEGORY I N = 135*			CATEGORY II N = 159*			CATEGORY III N = 150*			CATEGORY IV N = 109*		
	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %
23. I enjoy coming to this school.	77.8	14.8	7.4	78.0	17.6	4.4	67.4	18.0	14.7	64.2	19.3	16.5
7. I like to stay away from school every chance that I can get.	19.3	16.3	64.4	23.2	19.5	57.2	25.3	22.7	52.0	30.3	22.0	47.7
34. I like most of my teachers.	81.5	7.4	11.1	81.1	9.4	9.4	72.0	18.0	10.0	58.8	21.1	20.1
27. Most subjects that I take at school are interesting.	62.3	14.1	23.7	56.6	17.6	25.8	52.7	18.0	29.3	56.0	16.5	27.5
31. I am often unhappy when I am at school.	16.3	18.5	65.2	13.9	25.2	61.0	37.4	20.7	42.0	29.4	30.3	40.4
13. Teachers are too strict at this school.	14.0	31.9	54.1	18.3	26.4	55.4	22.6	26.0	51.4	23.9	24.8	51.3
35. Students should be allowed to do exactly what they want at this school.	11.8	18.5	69.6	13.2	15.7	71.0	25.3	18.0	56.7	26.6	23.9	49.5
1. The work that I have to do at this school is too hard.	5.9	23.0	71.2	6.3	22.0	71.7	6.0	24.7	69.4	10.1	26.6	63.3
21. I like doing most of my school work.	65.2	14.1	20.8	71.1	12.6	16.3	69.4	14.0	16.7	69.7	11.0	19.3
6. I understand most of the work that is given to me at this school.	84.5	6.7	8.8	86.2	5.7	8.2	79.3	8.0	12.7	71.5	10.1	18.4
15. I would rather be going to another school.	7.4	9.6	83.0	6.2	8.2	85.5	13.3	12.0	74.6	11.9	11.9	76.1
29. I don't know any of my teachers very well.	26.7	13.3	60.0	28.3	15.1	56.6	32.7	16.0	51.3	38.5	15.6	45.9
16. Students who misbehave at school should be made to "stay in" after 3:30.	33.3	24.4	42.2	36.5	24.5	39.0	40.0	14.7	45.4	35.8	18.3	45.9
14. Most of my teachers seem very interested in helping students who have trouble with their school work.	73.3	11.9	14.8	76.7	13.8	9.4	74.0	11.3	14.6	70.6	10.1	19.2

*N = Number of respondents

item (81.5 and 81.1 percent agreement). However, the Category Three response dropped to 72.0 percent agreement and only 58.8 percent of Category Four students agreed with the statement. The low-average or Category Three students appear to be the "unhappiest" pupils at Sisler. In response to Statement 31, "I am often unhappy when I am at school," 37.4 percent of these students agreed. This compares to 16.3 percent in Category One; 13.9 percent in Category Two; and 29.4 percent in Category Four. While the above-average and average students indicated fairly strong disagreement (69.6 and 71.0 percent respectively) with Statement 35, "Students should be allowed to do exactly what they want at this school," the low-average and below-average students disagreed to a lesser extent (56.7 and 49.5 percent respectively).

Table XXXIV contains eight statements dealing with student attitudes toward the homeroom and the homeroom teacher. Three of these statements indicate differences in student opinion. While all categories registered a strong "No Opinion" response to Statement 19, "I would like to know my homeroom teacher better than I do now," the below-average students expressed the most agreement (37.6 percent) with the statement. The students in the other categories were consistently less affirmative to this item; 28.2 percent in Category One, 29.5 percent in

TABLE XXXIV

STUDENT ATTITUDE TOWARD THE HOMEROOM
AND THE HOMEROOM TEACHER, BY CATEGORIES

Statements	CATEGORY I N = 135*			CATEGORY II N = 159*			CATEGORY III N = 150*			CATEGORY IV N = 109*		
	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %
30. I would like to have the same homeroom teacher again next year.	38.5	22.2	39.3	35.3	28.9	35.9	35.4	25.3	39.4	36.7	23.9	39.5
19. I would like to know my homeroom teacher better than I do now.	28.2	38.5	33.4	29.5	42.1	28.3	28.0	43.3	28.7	37.6	39.4	23.0
32. Reporting to a homeroom is a good way to start the day.	57.1	17.8	25.2	57.3	21.4	21.4	58.7	20.0	21.3	56.8	22.9	20.2
4. I know my homeroom teacher better than I know any of my other teachers.	19.2	14.8	65.9	21.4	20.1	58.5	24.0	15.3	60.6	15.6	16.5	67.9
22. I go to my homeroom teacher for advice when I have a problem at school.	6.6	14.8	78.5	8.2	18.2	73.6	10.0	19.3	70.7	6.4	18.3	75.2
10. My homeroom teacher seems interested in how well I am doing in my school work.	16.3	38.5	45.2	17.0	39.0	44.0	18.6	31.3	50.0	26.6	33.9	39.5
12. I often worry about "failing" in my school work.	50.4	10.4	39.2	71.7	8.8	19.4	79.4	6.0	14.7	76.2	9.2	14.7
3. Because of the size of the school, I often feel "lost in the crowd."	11.9	7.4	80.7	17.0	10.1	73.0	12.6	10.7	76.7	16.5	8.3	75.2

*N = Number of respondents

Category Two and 28.0 percent in Category Three. Also, the students in Category Four agreed more strongly with Statement 10 than did the other students. In response to Statement 10, "My homeroom teacher seems interested in how well I am doing at school," 26.6 percent of the below-average students agreed as compared to 16.3 percent, 17.0 percent and 18.6 percent of students in Categories One, Two and Three respectively. As might be expected, only 50.4 percent of Category One students appear worried about "failing" the school year (Statement 12). In contrast, a substantial number (71.7 percent) of students classified as average, 79.4 percent of students rated as low-average and 76.2 percent of the below-average students indicated that they do worry about failing.

Table XXXV contains seven statements dealing with the opinions students have about their relationships with others in the school. Of these statements, three indicate apparent differences in opinion. In response to Statement 2, "Most students in my homeroom class get along quite well together," the average students agreed most strongly (78.6 percent) closely followed by the low-average pupils (76.0 percent) and the below-average people at 73.4 percent. The lowest agreement to Statement 2 was expressed by the "top" or above-average students (69.6 percent).

TABLE XXXV

STUDENT RELATIONSHIPS WITH OTHER STUDENTS
AND TEACHERS IN THE SCHOOL, BY CATEGORIES

Statements	CATEGORY I N = 135*			CATEGORY II N = 159*			CATEGORY III N = 150*			CATEGORY IV N = 109*		
	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %
5. I like most of the kids in my homeroom	73.4	16.3	10.3	74.2	14.5	11.3	70.7	19.3	10.0	68.8	14.7	16.5
17. I wouldn't mind having the same kids in my homeroom class next year.	43.7	24.4	31.8	50.9	23.9	25.1	48.0	22.7	29.3	46.8	22.9	30.3
2. Most students in my homeroom class get along quite well together.	69.6	15.6	14.8	78.6	10.1	11.3	76.0	7.3	16.6	73.4	14.7	12.0
8. It is quite easy to make friends with the other kids at this school.	71.9	17.8	10.4	73.0	17.0	10.1	69.3	14.0	16.7	60.6	19.3	20.1
33. Teachers and students seem to get along quite well together at this school.	49.7	31.9	18.5	52.2	27.7	20.1	50.7	18.7	30.7	48.6	27.5	23.8
28. Most kids really do not care if they are late for classes at this school.	63.7	23.7	12.6	67.3	18.9	13.8	78.7	13.3	8.0	69.8	18.3	11.9
18. Most kids seem to like coming to this school.	54.0	29.6	16.2	67.3	25.2	7.5	64.0	22.7	13.3	60.5	23.9	15.6

*N = Number of respondents

A more dramatic difference in opinion resulted when students replied to Statement 8, "It is quite easy to make friends with the other kids at this school." Whereas only 60.6 percent of the students in Category Four agreed with this statement, 71.9 percent in Category One, 73.0 percent in Category Two and 69.3 percent in Category Three indicated agreement. Above-average students appear less convinced than other pupils that "most kids seem to like coming to this school" (Statement 18). Only 54.0 percent of Category One students agreed with this statement while the pupils in the other categories were more affirmative in their response; 67.3 percent in Category Two, 64.0 percent in Category Three and 60.5 percent in Category Four.

Attitudes toward achievement levels. Table XXXVI contains fourteen statements dealing with student acceptance of the achievement level concept. Significant differences in response were apparent in six statements. The first of these, Statement 4, refers to the motivation students may have to achieve at higher levels in other areas when they are advanced a level in one particular subject. Students in Category Four appear to be the most motivated as 80.7 percent of these students agreed with the statement. Strong agreement was also expressed by students in Categories

TABLE XXXVI

STUDENT ATTITUDE TOWARD DIFFERENTIATED
LEVELS OF INSTRUCTION IN ACADEMIC SUBJECTS
BY CATEGORIES

Statements	CATEGORY I N = 135*			CATEGORY II N = 159*			CATEGORY III N = 150*			CATEGORY IV N = 109*		
	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %
4. I like the idea of being able to move to a higher level if I am doing well in a subject.	77.1	9.6	13.3	86.2	7.5	6.3	88.0	7.3	4.7	80.8	11.0	8.3
2. Being moved to a higher level in one subject makes a student want to do better in his other subjects.	66.0	14.8	19.3	79.9	10.1	10.1	77.4	11.3	11.3	80.7	9.2	10.1
18. I feel that this school really tries to give kids a chance to do the best they can.	74.1	17.0	8.9	79.3	12.6	8.2	70.0	18.0	12.0	71.6	16.5	12.0
20. If I were moved to a lower level in a subject, I would work very hard to be moved back up again.	66.6	17.8	15.5	76.1	15.1	8.8	75.4	15.3	9.4	69.7	14.7	15.6
1. It is a good idea to have different levels of work for students who learn at different speeds.	96.3	3.0	0.7	96.2	0.0	3.8	90.7	2.0	7.3	87.1	5.5	7.3
9. Students who learn slower are given a chance to do their best at this school.	71.9	20.7	7.4	78.6	14.5	6.9	74.7	14.7	10.7	70.6	18.3	11.0
21. I think that students at this school like the way that they can work at different levels in different subjects.	68.9	24.4	6.6	71.1	24.5	4.4	70.6	20.0	9.4	60.6	27.5	11.9

*N = Number of respondents

(Concluded on next page)

TABLE XXXVI Concluded

Statements	CATEGORY I N = 135*			CATEGORY II N = 159*			CATEGORY III N = 150*			CATEGORY IV N = 109*		
	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No opinion %	Dis-agree %
12. Most teachers are very fair when they move kids to other levels of work.	61.5	18.5	20.0	66.0	22.6	11.3	68.0	14.7	17.4	54.2	17.4	28.5
37. My parents understand when I tell them about the different levels for each academic subject at this school.	68.9	17.8	13.3	61.6	20.8	17.6	42.7	25.3	32.0	40.4	33.9	25.7
16. This school should have only one level of work for all subjects and all students should be in this level.	2.2	8.1	89.6	3.8	10.1	86.1	8.0	10.7	81.4	11.0	14.7	74.3
10. Most of my friends at school think they are in about the right levels of work.	57.7	25.2	17.1	68.6	20.1	11.3	58.0	23.3	18.7	44.0	34.9	21.1
5. I always know how well I am doing with my work at this school.	62.2	14.1	23.7	56.6	21.4	22.0	39.3	25.3	35.4	43.1	32.1	24.8
13. Students who learn faster should be in higher levels of work.	81.5	11.1	7.4	80.5	13.8	5.7	80.0	12.0	8.0	67.0	19.3	13.8
35. Students don't mind being moved to different levels of work during the school year.	39.3	42.2	18.5	40.8	32.1	27.0	50.0	26.0	24.0	55.1	22.9	22.0

*N = Number of respondents

Two and Three (79.9 and 77.4 percent respectively). The above-average students, already achieving at the highest levels, also agreed with the statement (66.0 percent) but less emphatically. When asked whether teachers are "fair when they move kids to other levels of work" (Statement 12), the students in Categories Two and Three expressed the strongest agreement (66.0 and 68.0 percent respectively). The students rated as below-average were less convinced that teachers were fair (54.2 percent agreement), as were those students in Category One (61.5 percent agreement).

Statement 37 comments, "My parents understand when I tell them about the different levels for each academic subject at this school." In response to this item, only 40.4 percent of the below-average students and 42.4 percent of the low-average students agreed. This response contrasted sharply with that given by students in Categories One and Two who registered fairly strong agreement (68.9 and 61.6 percent respectively). When asked whether "they always know how well they are doing with their work at school (Statement 5), the students in Categories Three and Four expressed rather weak agreement (39.3 and 43.1 percent respectively). Above-average students agreed most strongly with the statement (62.2 percent) followed by the average students (56.6 percent).

The response to Statement 10, "Most of my friends at school think that they are in the right levels of work," showed that Category Two students were the most affirmative (68.6 percent) while only 44.0 percent of Category Four students agreed with the statement. In reply to Statement 35, "Students don't mind being moved to different levels of work during the school year," 50.0 percent and 55.1 percent of students in Categories Three and Four agreed respectively. Only 39.1 percent in Category One and 40.8 percent in Category Two agreed with this statement although a relatively high "No Opinion" response (42.2 percent and 32.1 percent respectively) was registered by students in these categories.

Table XXXVII contains nine statements dealing with the social implications of placing students at various levels for instructional purposes. Six of these statements received differences in response from students grouped according to categories. As might be expected, only 11.9 percent of students in Category One agreed with Statement 25 which states, "Students in higher levels for most of their subjects often say cruel things about the kids who are in lower levels." In contrast, 44.7 percent and 57.8 percent of students in Categories Three and Four respectively agreed with this statement. Response to a similar item, "Students who are in higher levels of work often make fun

TABLE XXXVII

STUDENT ATTITUDE TOWARD THE SOCIAL ASPECTS
OF PLACEMENT IN ACHIEVEMENT LEVELS, BY CATEGORIES

Statements	CATEGORY I N = 135*			CATEGORY II N = 159*			CATEGORY III N = 150*			CATEGORY IV N = 109*		
	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %
25. Students who are in higher levels for most of their subjects often say cruel things about the kids who are in lower levels.	11.9	20.0	68.1	25.8	27.0	47.1	44.7	24.0	31.3	57.8	28.4	13.8
3. Students who are in higher levels of work often "make fun" of kids who are in lower levels.	26.7	14.1	59.3	54.7	12.6	32.7	63.3	10.7	26.0	72.5	11.9	15.6
19. Most kids in higher levels are snobs.	15.5	17.8	66.6	30.8	25.8	43.4	26.7	24.0	49.3	39.4	33.9	26.6
8. Students in lower levels think that the students in higher levels are "smart alecs."	36.3	24.4	39.3	39.7	27.0	33.4	43.3	22.7	34.0	40.4	32.1	27.5
26. My friends sometime complain about the levels of work they are placed in.	50.3	20.7	28.9	45.2	31.4	23.2	59.3	19.3	21.3	56.0	30.3	13.8
38. I am worried about passing this year.	24.5	14.1	61.5	45.3	16.4	38.4	66.7	12.0	21.3	59.7	21.1	19.3
33. Students moving from level to level in their subjects causes a great deal of confusion in this school.	28.9	28.9	42.3	33.9	28.3	37.7	45.4	30.0	24.6	50.5	28.4	21.1
27. I worry about being moved to lower levels in my academic subjects.	48.2	10.4	41.5	52.9	15.7	31.5	62.6	15.3	22.0	47.7	26.6	25.7
30. Students should not be separated into "bright" and "slow" classes for their academic subjects.	19.3	21.5	59.3	23.2	25.8	50.9	28.0	27.3	44.6	34.9	35.8	29.4

*N = Number of respondents

of kids who are in lower levels" (Statement 3), showed that 59.3 percent of above-average students disagreed. However, 54.7 percent of students in Category Two, 63.3 percent in Category Three and 72.5 percent in Category Four did agree with the statement. Also, when asked whether "most kids in higher levels are snobs" (Statement 19), Category One students disagreed strongly (66.6 percent). The students in the remaining categories registered fairly strong "No Opinion" responses, but a substantial number (39.4 percent) of Category Four students did agree with the statement.

Students in Category Three (low-average) appear to be the most concerned about successful completion of the school year as 66.7 percent of these students agreed with Statement 38, "I am worried about passing this year." Most students in Category One disagreed with this statement (61.5 percent) with 45.3 percent in Category Two and 59.7 percent in Category Four agreeing. Also, 62.6 percent of Category Three students agreed with Statement 27, I worry about being moved to lower levels in my academic subjects." The remaining categories appear to be less concerned about moving to lower levels with 47.9 percent of students in Category One, 52.9 percent in Category Two and 47.7 percent in Category Four agreeing with the statement. When asked whether movement between levels causes confusion in the

school (Statement 33), 50.5 percent of Category Four students agreed as did 33.9 percent of those in Category Two and 45.4 percent in Category Three. The response registered by the above-average students showed 28.9 percent agreement with the statement.

Table XXXVIII contains five statements concerning student satisfaction with assigned levels of achievement. Three statements have significant differences in response. The first of these states, "I am pleased with the levels that I am in for most of my subjects" (Statement 7). In response to this item, 83.0 percent of Category One students agreed as did 71.7 percent in Category Two. However, only 41.3 percent of students in Category Four and 58.6 percent in Category Three indicated that they were pleased with their level placement. Response to Statement 36, "I think that I am in about the right levels of work for most of my subjects," showed Category Two students agreeing the most strongly (73.6 percent) closely followed by students in Category One (69.6 percent). In contrast, only 45.8 percent of the students in Category Four and 58.0 percent of those in Category Three agreed with this statement. When asked whether most of their friends at school were in approximately the same levels as they were (Statement 14), 69.4 percent of those students rated as above-average agreed. This agreement dropped to 59.7 percent for students

TABLE XXXVIII

STUDENT SATISFACTION WITH ASSIGNED ACHIEVEMENT LEVELS, BY CATEGORIES

Statements	CATEGORY I N = 135*			CATEGORY II N = 159*			CATEGORY III N = 150*			CATEGORY IV N = 109*		
	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %
7. I am pleased with the levels that I am in for most of my subjects.	83.0	1.5	15.6	71.7	7.5	20.8	58.6	9.3	32.0	41.3	16.5	42.2
36. I think that I am in about the right levels of work for most of my subjects.	69.6	14.1	16.3	73.6	9.4	17.0	58.0	12.7	29.3	45.8	17.4	36.7
11. I would rather stay in the same levels with my friends than move to higher levels.	39.3	23.7	37.0	44.7	17.0	38.3	38.7	12.0	49.3	39.4	19.3	41.2
32. I can do better work at school but I would rather stay in the same levels with my friends.	24.4	28.9	46.7	35.2	23.9	40.9	26.0	19.3	54.6	33.0	24.8	42.2
14. Most of my friends at this school are in about the same levels of work that I am in.	69.6	4.4	25.9	59.7	8.8	31.4	53.4	11.3	35.4	52.3	13.8	33.9

*N = Number of respondents

in Category Two, 53.4 percent in Category Three and 52.3 percent in Category Four.

Attitudes toward cultural grouping. Table XXXIX contains four statements dealing with the compatibility of students in heterogeneously grouped cultural classes. Student response by categories was comparable for three statements. However, reaction to Statement 20, "I am in the cultural group that I really want to be in," showed that the students in Categories One and Two agreed more strongly (58.5 and 60.3 percent) than did those students in Categories Three and Four who expressed 48.7 and 43.5 percent agreement respectively.

Table XL contains four statements dealing with student understanding of the cultural group concept and each of these statements received significant differences in response. While most students in the first three categories appear to understand "why students are divided into cultural groups" (Statement 8), only 42.2 percent of those students in Category Four registered agreement. When asked whether the whole idea of cultural grouping was confusing (Statement 4), students in Categories One and Two disagreed emphatically (88.9 and 78.0 percent respectively). The remaining students also disagreed but to a lesser extent, 66.6 percent in Category Three and

TABLE XXXIX

STUDENT COMPATIBILITY IN CULTURAL GROUPS, BY CATEGORIES

Statements	CATEGORY I N = 135*			CATEGORY II N = 159*			CATEGORY III N = 150*			CATEGORY IV N = 109*		
	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %
2. I like most of the kids that are in my cultural group.	75.5	10.4	14.1	78.6	9.4	11.9	78.0	8.7	13.3	72.5	12.8	14.7
14. The kids in my cultural group seem to get along quite well together.	80.0	11.9	8.1	77.3	11.3	11.3	71.4	14.7	14.0	71.3	16.7	12.0
20. I am in the cultural group that I really want to be in.	58.5	14.8	26.7	60.3	12.6	27.0	48.7	19.3	32.0	43.5	23.1	33.4
18. My cultural group seems to enjoy taking physical education together.	76.3	17.0	6.7	76.8	13.2	10.0	76.0	12.0	12.0	69.4	20.4	10.2

*N = Number of respondents

TABLE XL

STUDENT UNDERSTANDING OF CULTURAL GROUPS, BY CATEGORIES

Statements	CATEGORY I N = 135*			CATEGORY II N = 159*			CATEGORY III N = 150*			CATEGORY IV N = 109*		
	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %
8. I understand why students are divided into cultural groups at this school.	55.5	21.5	22.9	61.6	15.7	22.6	52.7	17.3	30.0	42.2	32.1	25.7
4. The whole idea of cultural groups confuses me.	3.7	7.4	88.9	8.8	13.2	78.0	20.0	13.3	66.6	20.2	24.8	55.1
26. This school should get rid of the idea of cultural groups and use some other way to put students in classes for art, band, choral music and physical education.	7.4	24.4	68.2	9.5	28.3	62.3	18.7	24.7	56.7	21.3	32.4	46.3
23. I think that most kids at this school like the idea of taking band or art or choral music and their physical education in cultural groups.	65.2	25.2	9.6	75.5	15.7	8.8	60.7	16.7	12.6	56.4	25.0	18.6

*N = Number of respondents

55.1 percent in Category Four. A similar reaction occurred when students responded to Statement 26 which suggests that the school should "get rid of" the cultural grouping idea. Again, students in Categories One and Two disagreed most strongly (68.2 and 62.3 percent respectively) with the remaining two categories disagreeing less emphatically. When asked whether they feel most students enjoy taking certain classes in cultural groups (Statement 23), the respondents in Category Two expressed the strongest agreement (75.5 percent). Less agreement with this statement was registered by students in Category One (65.2 percent) as was the case with those in Categories Three and Four (60.7 and 56.4 percent respectively).

Table XLI contains four statements dealing with attendance in cultural classes. Two of these statements received fairly significant differences in response. When responding to Statement 3, "My cultural subject teachers check attendance almost every period," the students in Categories Two, Three and Four reacted comparably with 58.5 percent, 61.4 percent and 61.4 percent in agreement respectively. The respondents in Category One were less affirmative as only 54.0 percent of these students agreed with the statement. The above-average students also expressed less agreement than did the other respondents to

TABLE XLI

STUDENT ATTITUDE TOWARD ATTENDANCE IN CULTURAL CLASSES, BY CATEGORIES

Statements	CATEGORY I N = 135*			CATEGORY II N = 159*			CATEGORY III N = 150*			CATEGORY IV N = 109*		
	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %
3. It is easy to "skip" cultural classes without being caught.	37.0	42.2	20.7	35.3	35.8	28.9	36.6	34.7	28.7	37.6	38.5	23.8
6. My cultural subject teachers check attendance almost every period.	54.0	15.6	30.4	58.5	17.0	24.5	61.4	14.7	24.0	61.4	22.0	16.6
15. My cultural subject teachers "track down" kids who miss too many classes.	28.2	38.5	33.3	47.8	27.7	24.6	44.6	30.0	25.3	50.0	28.7	21.3
9. Some kids stay away from their cultural classes without ever being missed by the teachers.	51.1	25.9	23.0	51.5	27.0	21.4	56.0	20.7	23.3	56.0	27.5	16.5

*N = Number of respondents

Statement 15, "My Cultural subject teachers track down kids who miss too many classes." Whereas 47.8 percent of students in Category Two, 44.6 percent in Category Three and 50.0 percent in Category Three agreed with this statement, only 28.2 percent of the respondents in Category One agreed.

Table XLII contains four statements dealing with the social implications of cultural grouping. Three of the four statements received responses that were significantly different. While the respondents in Categories One, Two and Three expressed strong agreement to Statement 1, "A school should be a place where you can make as many friends as possible," the students in Category Four were less positive. Only 64.2 percent of the students in Category Four agreed with this statement as compared to 80.8 percent in Category One, 74.8 percent in Category Two and 72.0 percent in Category Three. Responding to Statement 25, "Getting along with all sorts of kids at school is just as important as getting good marks," the respondents in Categories One and Two indicated strong agreement (80.0 and 71.1 percent respectively). The students in Category Three agreed to a lesser extent (62.0 percent) as did those in Category Four (53.7 percent). Above-average and average students appear more concerned about the classmates they have than do the remaining

TABLE XLII

STUDENT ATTITUDE TOWARD THE SOCIAL ASPECTS
OF CULTURAL GROUPING, BY CATEGORIES

Statements	CATEGORY I N = 135*			CATEGORY II N = 159*			CATEGORY III N = 150*			CATEGORY IV N = 109*		
	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %
12. Students should be allowed to take more periods in the cultural subjects they like the best.	84.5	11.9	3.7	75.5	13.2	11.3	72.7	13.3	14.0	69.4	24.1	6.5
1. A school should be a place where you can make as many friends as possible.	80.8	14.1	5.2	74.8	15.1	10.1	72.0	14.7	13.4	64.2	19.3	16.5
25. Getting along with all sorts of kids at school is just as important as getting good marks.	80.0	11.9	8.1	71.1	18.2	10.7	62.0	17.3	20.6	53.7	28.7	17.6
19. It is a good idea to have students take one subject from band, art or choral music.	54.8	18.5	26.6	59.2	17.0	23.9	64.7	16.7	18.6	57.4	17.6	25.0
22. I really don't care what other kids are with me in the same classes that I am in.	26.6	24.4	48.9	29.5	27.7	42.8	46.0	27.3	26.7	40.7	36.1	23.1

*N = Number of respondents

students. In response to Statement 22, "I really don't care what other kids are with me in the same classes that I am in," 48.9 percent of the respondents in Category One and 42.8 percent of those in Category Two disagreed. In contrast, only 26.7 percent of the students in Category Three and 23.1 percent in Category Four disagreed with the statement.

Table XLIII contains four statements dealing with the sociometric preferences students may have in terms of their classmates for both cultural and academic classes. A comparable response to three of the four items was recorded by the students grouped according to categories. The only item that received differences in response was Statement 24, "It would be better if kids who are in about the same levels for their academic subjects took their cultural subjects together." Students in Category Three expressed the strongest disagreement with this statement (59.4 percent) with 51.9 percent disagreeing in Category One and 52.2 percent in Category Two. The response made by the students in Category Four showed that only 39.8 percent disagreed with the statement while 30.5 percent agreed.

Table XLIV contains four statements dealing with the "different" nature of cultural grouping. Student response varied for two of these statements. Apparently,

TABLE XLIII

SOCIOMETRIC PREFERENCES OF STUDENTS IN TERMS OF CLASSMATES, BY CATEGORIES

Statements	CATEGORY I N = 135*			CATEGORY II N = 159*			CATEGORY III N = 150*			CATEGORY IV N = 109*		
	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %
24. It would be better if the kids who are in about the same levels for their academic subjects took their cultural subjects together.	18.5	29.6	51.9	15.7	32.1	52.2	20.6	20.0	59.4	30.5	29.6	39.8
13. I would rather take my cultural classes with the same kids that are in my academic classes.	34.1	23.0	43.0	22.6	32.1	45.2	26.0	25.3	48.7	27.8	26.9	45.4
11. Students who have trouble doing school work should take all their academic and cultural subjects together.	7.4	30.4	62.2	15.7	30.2	54.0	22.7	36.0	41.3	25.0	33.3	41.7
5. I would rather take my academic subjects with the same kids that are in my cultural group.	16.3	22.2	61.5	20.2	26.4	53.4	17.3	24.7	58.0	28.4	25.7	45.9

*N = Number of respondents

TABLE XLIV

STUDENT ATTITUDE TOWARD THE APPARENT "DIFFERENCES" INHERENT IN CULTURAL GROUPING, BY CATEGORIES

Statements	CATEGORY I N = 135*			CATEGORY II N = 159*			CATEGORY III N = 150*			CATEGORY IV N = 109*		
	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %
16. It is difficult to explain to my parents exactly what cultural groups are.	13.3	25.2	61.5	22.6	26.4	51.0	39.3	22.7	38.0	40.8	31.5	27.8
21. The kids in my cultural group seem "different" than the kids that are in my academic classes.	39.2	28.9	31.8	46.5	28.3	25.2	52.7	22.0	25.3	50.0	25.9	24.1
7. Being in a cultural group gives me a chance to meet kids I don't usually see in my academic classes.	82.2	8.1	9.6	79.3	8.8	11.9	75.3	14.0	10.7	80.7	11.9	7.3
17. My friends often complain about the cultural groups that they are in.	54.8	20.7	24.4	31.4	27.7	40.9	54.0	18.7	27.4	49.0	28.7	22.2

*N = Number of respondents

students in Categories Three and Four experience more difficulty than students in the other categories when they attempt to explain the nature of cultural grouping to their parents (Statement 16). Responding to this statement, 40.8 percent of Category Four students agreed as did 39.3 percent in Category Three. However, only slight agreement was expressed by the respondents in Categories One and Two (13.3 and 22.6 percent respectively). When asked whether their "friends often complain about the cultural groups they are in," 31.4 percent of the students in Category Two agreed. The respondents in the other categories were much more emphatic in their reaction with 54.8 percent in Category One, 54.0 percent in Category Three and 49.0 percent in Category Four agreeing with the statement.

XI. TEACHER OPINION CONCERNING STUDENT ATTITUDES

A questionnaire, almost identical and highly comparable to the student survey instrument, was administered to all teachers associated with the Flexible Placement Project at Sisler. The primary objective of this questionnaire was to gather data which could be used to discover the degree to which the teachers at Sisler are able to gauge the attitudes of their students. A secondary

objective was the determination of certain attitudes held by the teachers themselves. To fulfill these objectives, the total response made by the teachers was examined and compared to the response made by the students to their attitude statements. In the teacher-student comparative analysis, only those items which received significant differences in response will be discussed since all data can be seen in the accompanying tables and in the tables of the preceding sections.

General attitudes. What are the expressed opinions of teachers concerning the general attitudes of students attending school at Sisler? Table XLV contains fourteen statements dealing with teacher opinion in terms of these student attitudes. In response to Statement 23, 84.6 percent of the teachers agreed that students are generally satisfied with their "school life" at Sisler. The teachers also agreed strongly (82.1 percent) with Statement 2, "Students like most of their teachers." When asked whether "too much is expected of the students at Sisler" (Statement 1), the teachers disagreed almost unanimously (97.4 percent). However, only 35.9 percent of the teacher respondents agreed that students "find most of their school work interesting" (Statement 27) although 74.3 percent did agree that students understand most of the work that is presented to them (Statement 5). In

TABLE XLV

TEACHER OPINION CONCERNING STUDENT ATTITUDES TOWARD SCHOOL LIFE IN GENERAL, TOTAL RESPONSE

Statements*	Agree		No Opinion		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
23. Generally, most students seem satisfied with their "school life" at Sisler.	33	84.6	5	12.8	1	2.6
6. Most students prefer to stay home every chance that they can get.	10	25.6	3	7.7	26	66.7
34. Students like most of their teachers.	32	82.1	6	15.4	1	2.6
27. Generally, students feel that most of their school work is interesting.	14	35.9	7	17.9	18	46.2
30. Many students are often unhappy at this school.	8	20.5	10	25.6	21	53.8
13. Most teachers at this school are too strict with their students.	1	2.6	2	5.1	36	92.3
35. Students should be given more freedom at this school.	5	12.9	0	0.0	34	87.2

*Section I of teacher questionnaire.

(Concluded on next page)

TABLE XLV Concluded

Statements*	Agree No.	Agree %	No Opinion No.	No Opinion %	Disagree No.	Disagree %
1. Too much is expected of the students at Sisler in terms of school work and expected performance.	1	2.6	0	0.0	38	97.4
21. Students like doing most of their school work.	18	46.2	3	7.7	18	46.2
5. Generally, most students seem to understand most of the work that is presented to them.	29	74.3	2	5.1	8	20.5
15. Most students at Sisler would rather be going to another school.	1	2.6	4	10.3	34	87.2
29. Students really don't know most of their teachers very well.	25	64.1	5	12.8	9	23.1
16. There should be a detention room for those students who are discipline problems.	28	71.8	2	5.1	9	23.0
14. Most teachers at this school are very interested in helping those students who have trouble with their school work.	33	84.6	5	12.8	1	2.6

*Section I of teacher questionnaire.

response to Statement 21, "Students like doing most of their school work," opinion among teachers was split with 46.2 percent agreeing and an identical percentage disagreeing. The majority of teachers (84.6 percent) agreed that "most teachers are very interested in helping those students who have trouble with their school work" (Statement 14).

In terms of the more negative items in this section, 66.7 percent of the teachers disagreed with Statement 6, "Most students prefer to stay home every chance that they can get." Responding to Statement 30, "Many students are often unhappy at this school," 53.8 percent of the teachers disagreed while 25.6 percent registered a "No Opinion" response. When asked whether teachers are "too strict with their students" (Statement 13), the respondents disagreed emphatically (92.3 percent). Strong disagreement (87.2 percent) also prevailed in the response to Statement 35 which refers to students being allowed "more freedom" at the school. The majority of teachers (64.1 percent) feel that the students at Sisler do not "know most of their teachers very well" (Statement 29). However, in response to a final item, the teachers disagreed quite strongly (87.2 percent) that "most students would rather be going to another school" (Statement 15).

Of the fourteen statements in this particular

section, only three had significant differences in response when student and teacher opinions were compared. When asked whether students generally feel that "most of their school work is interesting" only 35.9 percent of the teachers agreed. However, when the students replied to a similar statement, "Most subjects that I take at school are interesting," 56.8 percent agreed. In response to "I like doing most of my school work", 68.9 percent of the student respondents agreed. When the teachers were asked whether students like doing most of their school work, the response showed that only 46.2 percent of the teacher respondents agreed while 46.2 percent disagreed. Apparently, the students feel they know their teachers better than the teachers think they do. Replying to the statement, "I don't know any of my teachers very well," 53.9 percent of the students disagreed. In contrast, 64.1 percent of the teachers agreed with the corresponding statement in their questionnaire, "Students don't know most of their teachers very well."

What are the expressed opinions of teachers concerning the attitudes of students toward the homeroom and the homeroom teacher? Most teachers expressed a "No Opinion" response (69.2 percent) when they replied to Statement 31, "Students would like to have the same homeroom teacher

again next year" (Table XLVI). A substantial "No Opinion" reply (41.0 percent) was also registered when the teachers responded to Statement 19, "Students would like to know their homeroom teachers better," although 48.7 percent of the respondents did agree with the statement. A stronger stand was taken by the teachers to an item stating that "most students know their homeroom teachers better than they know any of their other teachers" (Statement 4). The response to this statement showed that 66.7 percent of the teachers disagreed. Also, 61.5 percent of the teachers disagreed with Statement 22, "Students usually go to their homeroom teachers when they have a problem at school." Approximately one half of the teachers (51.3 percent) agreed that "most homeroom teachers are really interested in the progress of the students in their homerooms" (Statement 9). In addition, only a slight majority of teachers (53.8 percent) feel that students "worry about not doing well in their school work" (Statement 12).

In response to Statement 32, "Students like reporting to a homeroom class to start the day," 56.4 percent of the teachers agreed while 20.5 percent disagreed. Stronger agreement (61.5 percent) was expressed in the reply of teachers to Statement 3, "The size of this school makes many students feel lost in the crowd,"

TABLE XLVI

TEACHER OPINION CONCERNING STUDENT ATTITUDES TOWARD THE HOMEROOM AND THE HOMEROOM TEACHER, TOTAL RESPONSE

Statements*	Agree		No Opinion		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
31. Most students would like to have the same homeroom teacher again next year.	5	12.8	27	69.2	7	17.9
19. Students would like to know their homeroom teachers better than they do now.	19	48.7	16	41.0	4	10.3
32. Students like reporting to a homeroom class to start the day.	22	56.4	9	23.1	8	20.5
4. Most students know their homeroom teachers better than they know any of their other teachers.	8	20.5	5	12.8	26	66.7
22. Students usually go to their homeroom teachers when they have a problem at school.	5	12.8	10	25.6	24	61.5
9. Most homeroom teachers are really interested in the progress that the students in their homeroom classes are making at school.	20	51.3	6	15.4	13	33.3
12. Generally, students at this school worry about not doing well in their school work.	21	53.8	2	5.1	16	41.0
3. The size of this school makes many students feel "lost" in the crowd.	24	61.5	2	5.1	13	33.3

*Section I of teacher questionnaire.

although 33.0 percent of the respondents did disagree with this statement.

Of the nine statements in this section, three had differences in response when the opinions of teachers and students were compared. When asked whether their homeroom teachers appear interested in their progress at school, only 19.2 percent of the students agreed. In response to a similar statement, 51.3 percent of the teachers agreed that most homeroom teachers appear interested in the progress of students placed in their classes. Apparently, more students are concerned about not doing well in school than teachers realize. While 53.8 percent of the teachers did agree that students do "worry about doing well," student reaction was much stronger with 69.4 percent of the student body expressing concern about "failing" in their school work. Also, while the students emphatically rejected the idea that the size of the school makes them feel "lost in the crowd" (76.4 percent), the teachers expressed an entirely different opinion with 61.5 percent agreeing that this situation prevails.

Table XLVII contains six statements which deal directly with the opinions teachers have about the compatibility of students in the school and the general

TABLE XLVII

TEACHER OPINION CONCERNING STUDENT RELATIONSHIPS WITH OTHER STUDENTS AND TEACHERS, TOTAL RESPONSE

Statements*	Agree		No Opinion		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
7. Most students like the other kids in their homeroom classes.	27	69.2	7	17.9	5	12.8
17. Most students wouldn't mind having the same kids in their homeroom classes again next year.	20	51.3	13	33.3	6	15.4
2. Students in homeroom classes get along quite well together.	22	56.4	11	28.2	6	15.4
11. Most students find it easy to make friends with the other kids at this school.	33	84.6	3	7.7	3	7.7
33. Teachers and students seem to get along quite well together at this school.	35	89.7	2	5.1	2	5.1
28. Most kids really do not care if they are late for classes at this school.	22	56.4	2	5.1	15	38.5
18. Most students seem to like coming to this school.	36	92.3	3	7.7	0	0.0

*Section I of teacher questionnaire.

accord that exists between students and teachers. In response to Statement 7, 69.2 percent of the teachers agreed that "most students like the other kids in their homeroom classes." However, fewer teachers (51.3 percent) agreed that the students "wouldn't mind having the same kids in their homeroom classes again next year" (Statement 17). When asked whether "students in homeroom classes get along quite well together" (Statement 2), 56.4 percent of the teachers agreed while 28.2 percent expressed no opinion.

In terms of the entire student population, most teachers (84.6 percent) agreed that "students find it easy to make friends with the other kids at this school" (Statement 11). Also, most of the teaching staff (89.7 percent) appear convinced that "teachers and students seem to get along quite well together at the school" (Statement 33). Similarly, the teachers were most emphatic (92.3 percent agreement) in their response to Statement 18, "Most students seem to like coming to this school."

Four of the six statements discussed in this section had substantial differences in response when the opinions of teachers and students were compared. In reference to students "getting along quite well together" in their homeroom classes, the teachers expressed only mild agreement (56.4 percent) as compared to 74.7 percent for the students.

However, teacher response may have been affected by the fact that a number of teachers do not register students in a homeroom situation. In response to the statement referring to the ease with which students can develop friendships in the school, 84.6 percent of the teachers agreed that "most students find it easy to make friends with the other kids at the school." Apparently, the students were less convinced of this fact as 69.2 percent agreed with the statement.

Student and teacher opinion varied the greatest in response to the final two statements. While only 50.5 percent of the students agreed that "teachers and students seem to get along well together at the school," the teachers were most emphatic and 89.7 percent of the teacher respondents agreed with the statement. Most of the teachers (92.3 percent) agreed with the statement, "Most students seem to like coming to this school." This response compares to 61.8 percent agreement for the students who also registered a 26.2 percent "No Opinion" response.

Achievement levels. What are the expressed opinions of teachers concerning student attitudes toward the achievement level concept? Table XLVIII contains fourteen statements dealing with teacher opinion in terms of student acceptance of the school's academic program. Most teachers

TABLE XLVIII

TEACHER OPINION CONCERNING STUDENT ATTITUDES TOWARD DIFFERENTIATED LEVELS OF INSTRUCTION, TOTAL RESPONSE

Statements*	Agree		No Opinion		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
4. Most students seem to like the idea of being able to move to higher levels in the subjects in which they are doing well.	34	87.1	3	7.7	2	5.2
2. When students are moved to a higher level in a subject they then want to do better in other subjects.	26	66.6	11	28.2	2	5.1
18. Students feel that this school really tries to give kids an opportunity to do their best.	27	69.2	10	25.6	2	5.1
20. When students are moved to lower levels of instruction, they make a real effort to improve and move back up to the higher levels.	6	15.4	11	28.2	22	56.4
1. Most students accept the idea of having different academic levels for those who learn at different rates.	35	89.8	4	10.3	0	0.0
9. Students classified as "slow learners" are given a good opportunity to do their best at this school.	34	87.2	1	2.6	4	10.3
21. Students seem to like the way they can work at different levels in different subjects.	29	74.3	9	23.1	1	2.6

*Section II of teacher questionnaire.

(Concluded on next page)

TABLE XLVIII Concluded

Statements*	Agree No.	Agree %	No Opinion No.	No Opinion %	Disagree No.	Disagree %
12. Most students feel they have been evaluated fairly when they are moved to other levels.	32	82.1	5	12.8	2	5.1
13. If questioned about the "flexible placement" system, most parents of Sisler students would understand the concept of different levels for each academic subject.	15	38.5	8	20.5	16	41.0
16. Students would rather have only one level of instruction with all students being in this level.	2	5.1	18	46.2	19	48.7
10. Most students are in the right levels of instruction in terms of their relative capacity.	31	79.5	4	10.3	4	10.3
5. Students generally know how well they are doing at school at any given time.	34	87.2	0	0.0	5	12.8
13. Students accept the fact that kids who learn "faster" should be in higher levels.	36	92.4	3	7.7	0	0.0
35. Students don't mind being moved to different levels of instruction during the school year.	23	59.0	7	17.9	9	23.1

*Section II of teacher questionnaire.

(89.8 percent) indicated that they believe students accept the achievement level concept (Statement 1). Also, teachers strongly agreed (92.4 percent) that "students accept the fact that kids who learn faster should be in higher levels (Statement 13). Weaker but substantial agreement (74.3 percent) was given by teachers to Statement 21, "Students seem to like the way they can work at different levels in different subjects."

Two thirds of the teachers agreed that students are motivated "to do better in other subjects when they are moved to a higher level in one particular subject" (Statement 2). However, only 15.4 percent of the teachers feel that students "make a real effort to improve and move back up to higher levels" when they have been moved to lower levels of instruction (Statement 20). Most teachers (87.2 percent) agreed that students rated as "slow-learners" are given ample opportunity to do their best at school (Statement 9).

When asked whether "most students feel they have been evaluated fairly when moved to other levels" (Statement 12), 82.1 percent of the teachers agreed. Strong agreement (79.5 percent) was also expressed by teachers to Statement 10, "Most students are in the right levels of instruction in terms of their relative capacity." In addition, 87.2 percent of the teachers feel that

"students generally know how well they are doing at school at any given time" (Statement 5).

Two final statements were concerned with how well students comprehend the general nature of achievement-level grouping. Although 48.7 percent of the teachers disagreed that "students would rather have only one level of instruction for all subjects" (Statement 16), a similar number (46.2 percent registered a "No Opinion" response. In response to Statement 37 which refers to the understanding the parents of Sisler students might have of the flexible placement system, 41.0 percent of the teachers were of the opinion that parents lacked this understanding while 38.5 percent expressed the opposite view.

Of the fourteen statements mentioned above, five had significant differences in response when teacher and student opinions were compared. The first of these statements refers to the incentive students might have "to work harder" if they were moved to lower levels of instruction. While 72.3 percent of the students stated that they would be motivated to work more diligently, only 15.4 percent of the teachers thought that this would be the case. In reference to "fairness in evaluation", 82.1 percent of the teachers agreed that students were

judged fairly when moved to other levels. The students also agreed that they were evaluated fairly but to a lesser extent (63.1 percent).

Slightly over one half of the students (54.1 percent) felt that their parents understood the flexible placement concept. The teachers were less certain of this fact as only 38.5 percent agreed that the parents understood the system with 41.0 percent disagreeing. While the students emphatically rejected the idea that there should be only one level of instruction for all subjects (83.3 percent), less than one half of the teachers (48.7 percent) thought that students would react in this manner. In response to a final statement, "Students generally know how well they are doing at school at any given time," 87.2 percent of the teachers agreed. However, the students did not concur as only 45.5 percent of the student respondents agreed with the statement, "I always know how well I am doing with my work at school."

What are the expressed opinions of teachers concerning the attitudes of students toward the social implications of the achievement level concept? Table XLIX contains nine statements dealing with these opinions. Teachers did not take a strong stand when responding to Statement 25 which states that "students in the higher levels of instruction say cruel things about the kids who are in

TABLE XLIX

TEACHER OPINION CONCERNING STUDENT ATTITUDES TOWARD THE SOCIAL ASPECTS OF PLACEMENT IN ACHIEVEMENT LEVELS, TOTAL RESPONSE

Statements*	Agree		No Opinion		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
25. Many students who are in the higher levels of instruction say "cruel" things about the kids in the lower levels.	17	43.6	8	20.5	14	35.9
3. Many students in the higher levels of instruction often "make fun" of those students who are in lower levels.	21	53.9	4	10.3	14	35.9
19. Many students in higher levels of instruction feel "superior" to students in the lower levels.	27	69.2	3	7.7	9	23.1
8. Many students in the lower levels of instruction feel that students in higher levels are "smart alecs."	12	30.8	11	28.2	16	41.0
26. Students often complain about the levels of instruction they have been placed in.	13	33.3	5	12.8	21	53.9
38. Many students are worried about "passing" this year.	20	51.3	3	7.7	16	41.1
33. Student movement between levels during the school year causes a great deal of confusion at this school.	18	46.2	3	7.7	18	46.2
27. Students worry about being moved to lower levels.	30	77.0	3	7.7	6	15.4
30. Students feel that they should not be separated into "bright" and "slow" classes for their academic subjects.	2	5.1	11	28.2	26	66.6

*Section II of teacher questionnaire.

the lower levels." Although 43.6 percent of the teachers did agree with this statement, 35.9 percent disagreed. However, slightly more than one half of the teachers agreed that "many students in the higher levels of instruction often make fun of students in lower levels," but again, 35.9 percent disagreed (Statement 3). A more positive reaction occurred when teachers responded to Statement 19, "Many students in higher levels of instruction feel superior to students in the lower levels," as 69.2 percent of the teachers agreed with this statement. However, only 30.8 percent of the teachers agreed that students in lower levels feel that students in higher levels are "smart alecs" (Statement 8).

Two thirds of the teachers disagreed that students feel "they should not be separated into 'bright' and 'slow' classes" (Statement 30). However, one third of the teachers did feel that "students often complain about the levels of instruction they have been placed in" (Statement 6). A split response occurred when teachers replied to Statement 33, "Student movement between levels during the year causes a great deal of confusion at this school." Approximately one half of the teachers (46.2 percent) agreed with this statement while the same number disagreed. When asked whether "students worry about being moved to lower levels" (Statement 27), 77.0 percent of the teachers

agreed. However, only 51.3 percent agreed with Statement 38, "Many students are worried about passing this year."

Of the nine statements discussed in this section, three had significant differences in response when the opinions of students and teachers were compared. Most teachers (69.2 percent) expressed the opinion that students in the top levels of instruction felt "superior" to those assigned to the lower levels. The statement used to gather student opinion about this aspect of "superiority" may be a rather weak item to be used for comparative purposes since students were asked whether "most kids in the higher levels are snobs." However, response to this statement showed that 47.4 percent of the students disagreed while 27.7 percent agreed.

Slightly more than one half of the students were of the opinion that their "friends often complain about the levels of work they are placed in," while a similar proportion of the teachers disagreed that students have these complaints. Apparently, the students are less concerned about being moved to lower levels than the teachers realize. While 77.0 percent of the teachers feel that students worry about being moved to lower levels, only 53.4 percent of the students indicated that they were concerned.

What are the expressed opinions of teachers

concerning the satisfaction experienced by students in terms of their assigned achievement levels? In response to Statement 7, "Most students seem satisfied with the levels of instruction that they are placed in" (Table L), 71.8 percent of the teachers agreed. A similar response (74.4 percent agreement) was given by teachers to Statement 36, "Generally, students feel that they are in the right levels of instruction for their ability." When asked whether "most students would prefer to remain in the same levels with their friends rather than progress to higher levels" (Statement 11), 53.8 percent of the teachers agreed while 25.6 percent disagreed. The teachers were indecisive in their response to Statement 32 which suggests that "many students will do inferior work in order to be moved to the same levels as their friends." One quarter of the teachers registered a "No Opinion" response to this statement while 33.4 percent disagreed. However, 79.5 percent of the teachers did agree that "students have most of their friends in about the same levels of instruction that they are in" (Statement 14).

Of the five statements discussed in the above section, three received significant differences in response when the opinions of teachers and students were compared. Three quarters of the teaching staff were of the opinion that "students feel they are in about the right levels of

TABLE L

TEACHER OPINION CONCERNING STUDENT SATISFACTION WITH ASSIGNED ACHIEVEMENT LEVELS, TOTAL RESPONSE

Statements*	Agree		No Opinion		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
7. Most students seem satisfied with the levels of instruction that they are placed in.	28	71.8	6	15.4	5	12.8
36. Generally, students feel that they are in about the right levels of instruction for their ability.	29	74.4	6	15.4	4	10.3
11. Most students would prefer to remain in the same levels with their friends rather than progress to higher levels.	21	53.8	8	20.5	10	25.6
32. Many students will do inferior work in order to be moved to the same levels as their friends.	16	41.0	10	25.6	13	33.4
14. Generally, students have most of their friends in about the same levels of instruction that they are in.	31	79.5	5	12.8	3	7.7

*Section II of teacher questionnaire.

instruction for their ability." The students shared this opinion, but to a lesser extent, as 62.9 percent agreed that they felt they were in the "right levels of work" for most of their subjects. Approximately one half of the teachers (53.8 percent) thought "most students would prefer to remain in the same levels with their friends rather than progress to higher levels." However, 50.9 percent of the students rejected this idea. The teachers agreed quite strongly (79.5 percent) that students are inclined to develop most of their friendships with others of the same ability. Generally, the students were of the same opinion but only 58.9 percent agreed that most of their friends at school were assigned to instructional levels that corresponded to their own.

Cultural grouping. What are the expressed opinions of teachers concerning the general compatibility of students in heterogeneously grouped cultural classes? In response to Statement 2, "Most students seem to like the other kids in their cultural groups," 56.4 percent of the teachers agreed while 35.9 percent had no opinion (Table LI). The rather high "No Opinion" response may have been the result of many academic teachers not wishing to comment on the cultural program. When asked whether students in cultural groups "seem to get along well together" (Statement 14), two thirds of the teachers agreed

TABLE LI

TEACHER OPINION CONCERNING STUDENT COMPATIBILITY IN CULTURAL GROUPS, TOTAL RESPONSE

Statements*	Agree		No Opinion		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
2. Most students seem to like the other kids in their cultural groups.	22	56.4	14	35.9	3	7.7
14. Generally, the students making up the various cultural groups seem to get along well together.	26	66.6	12	30.8	1	2.6
20. Most students are in the cultural groups that they really wanted to be in.	17	43.6	15	38.5	7	18.0
18. Most students enjoy taking physical education with the cultural groups they are in.	21	53.9	18	46.2	0	0.0

*Section III of teacher questionnaire.

while 30.8 percent had no opinion. Although 43.6 percent of the teachers agreed with Statement 20, "Most students are in the cultural groups that they really wanted to be in," a large number (38.5 percent) again had no opinion. None of the respondents disagreed with Statement 20, "Most students enjoy taking physical education with their cultural groups." However, almost one half of the teachers (46.2 percent) had no opinion about the statement while 53.9 percent agreed that students do enjoy taking physical education in cultural groups.

Of the four statements mentioned above, three had differences in response when the opinions of teachers and students were compared. Most of the variance in response was attributable to the fact that many teachers expressed "No Opinion" when replying to the attitude statements. For example, 56.4 percent of the teachers did agree that "most students seem to like the other kids in their cultural groups," but 35.9 percent had no opinion. In comparison, 76.5 percent of the students stated that they "like most of the kids" in their cultural groups. The students also took fairly strong positions when asked about their general satisfaction with their particular cultural group. In response to, "I am in the cultural group that I really want to be in," 53.4 percent

of the students agreed while 29.5 percent disagreed. The teachers were less certain on this issue as 43.6 percent thought that students were satisfied but 38.5 percent expressed no opinion. A similar situation developed in reference to students "enjoying physical education classes with their cultural groups." Three quarters of the students agreed that they did enjoy these classes. This view was also taken by 53.9 percent of the teachers but, once again, 46.2 percent expressed no opinion.

What are the expressed opinions of teachers concerning the general understanding students have of the cultural group concept? In response to Statement 8, "Students understand 'why' they are divided into cultural groups," 51.3 percent of the teachers agreed while 30.8 percent disagreed (Table LII). One third of the teachers disagreed that "the whole idea of cultural grouping confuses most students" (Statement 4), but 43.6 percent agreed. When asked whether the school should "scrap" the idea of cultural groups (Statement 26), 59.0 percent of the teachers disagreed while many (25.6 percent) expressed no opinion. More than one half of the teachers (53.8 percent) had no opinion about Statement 23, "Most students like the idea of cultural grouping." However, only 5.1 percent disagreed with the statement and 41.0

TABLE LII

TEACHER OPINION CONCERNING STUDENT UNDERSTANDING OF CULTURAL GROUPS, TOTAL RESPONSE

Statements*	Agree		No Opinion		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
8. Generally, students understand "why" they are divided into cultural groups at this school.	20	51.3	7	17.9	12	30.8
4. The whole idea of cultural grouping confuses most students.	17	43.6	9	23.1	13	33.3
26. This school should "scrap" the idea of cultural grouping and look for some other way to place students in classes for art, band, choral music and physical education.	6	15.4	10	25.6	23	59.0
23. Most kids like the idea of cultural grouping.	16	41.0	21	53.8	2	5.1

*Section III of teacher questionnaire.

percent agreed that most students do like the idea of cultural grouping.

Two of the four statements discussed in the above section had differences in response when teacher and student opinions were compared. In response to, "The whole idea of cultural groups confuses me," most of the students (73.1 percent) disagreed. Apparently, the teachers were more convinced that the system was confusing to students and 43.6 percent of the teachers expressed this view. However, one third of the teachers were of the opinion that the system was not confusing and agreed with the position taken by the students. In terms of students "liking the idea of cultural grouping," most teachers (53.8 percent) had no opinion while 41.0 percent thought that students did like the system. This response contrasted to the reaction of students who gave fairly strong indication (67.9 percent) that they believed "most kids at this school like the idea of taking band, art, choral music and physical education in cultural groups."

What are the expressed opinions of teachers concerning the attendance of students in cultural classes? In response to Statement 3, "Many students skip cultural classes without being caught," slightly over one half of the teachers (51.3 percent) agreed while one third

had no opinion (Table LIII). In reference to cultural teachers "checking attendance every period" (Statement 6), 43.6 percent of the teachers stated they felt this attendance was being checked while 35.9 percent had no opinion. When asked whether teachers of cultural subjects "track down students who miss too many classes" (Statement 19), 35.9 percent of the teachers agreed; 30.8 percent disagreed; and 33.3 percent had no opinion. Approximately one half of the teachers (51.3 percent) agreed that "some students can stay away from their cultural classes without ever being missed" (Statement 9), while 30.7 percent disagreed with this statement. It should be noted once more that many teachers of academic subjects were probably inclined to express "No Opinion" to the statements dealing with the cultural program.

Of the four statements discussed above, two received differences in response when the opinions of students and teachers were compared. Apparently, teachers are more convinced "students can skip cultural classes without being caught" than are the students. While many teachers had no opinion on this issue (33.3 percent), 51.3 percent did agree that students found it "easy to skip" cultural classes. The students also gave a high "No Opinion" response (37.6 percent), but only 36.5 percent agreed that they could miss cultural classes

TABLE LIII

TEACHER OPINION CONCERNING STUDENT ATTITUDES TOWARDS ATTENDANCE IN CULTURAL CLASSES, TOTAL RESPONSE

Statements*	Agree		No Opinion		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
3. Many students "skip" cultural classes without being caught.	20	51.3	13	33.3	6	15.4
6. Generally, teachers of cultural subjects check attendance every period.	17	43.6	14	35.9	8	20.5
15. Teachers of cultural subjects usually "track down" students who miss too many classes.	14	35.9	13	33.3	12	30.8
9. Some students can stay away from their cultural classes without ever being missed by their teachers.	20	51.3	7	17.9	12	30.7

*Section III of teacher questionnaire.

without being caught. In reference to teachers "checking attendance in cultural classes every period," 58.7 percent of the students felt that this was being done. Again the teachers were less certain as only 43.6 percent were of the opinion attendance was being checked and 35.9 percent had no opinion on the subject.

What are the expressed opinions of teachers concerning student attitudes toward the social implications of cultural grouping? In response to Statement 12, "Students should be allowed to take more periods in the cultural subjects they really like the best," 89.7 percent of the teachers agreed (Table LIV). Most of the teachers (84.6 percent) also agreed that "a school should be a place where students can make as many friends as possible" (Statement 1). However, opinion was split when teachers replied to Statement 25, "Most students feel that learning to 'get along' with all types of people is just as important as getting good marks." The response to this item showed that 43.6 percent of the teachers agreed while an identical number disagreed. When asked whether "students should have to take at least one subject from band, art, or choral music" (Statement 19), teachers strongly agreed (82.1 percent). A less definite stand was taken by teachers to a final item, "Most students really don't care what kids are with them in their classes"

TABLE LIV

TEACHER OPINION CONCERNING STUDENT ATTITUDES TOWARD THE SOCIAL ASPECTS OF CULTURAL GROUPING, TOTAL RESPONSE

Statements*	Agree		No Opinion		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
12. Students should be allowed to take more periods in the cultural subjects they really like the best.	35	89.7	2	5.1	2	5.1
1. A school should be a place where students can make as many friends as possible.	33	84.6	2	5.1	4	10.3
25. Most students feel that learning to "get along" with all types of people at school is just as important as getting good marks.	17	43.6	5	12.8	17	43.6
19. Students should have to take at least one subject from band, art and choral music.	32	82.1	1	2.6	6	15.4
22. Most students really don't care what kids are with them in their classes.	14	35.9	5	12.8	20	51.3

*Section III of teacher questionnaire.

(Statement 22). Only a slight majority (51.3 percent) of the teachers disagreed with this statement while 35.9 percent agreed and 12.8 percent offered no opinion.

Two of the five statements discussed in the above section had differences in response when the opinions of the teachers and students were compared. In response to, "Getting along with all sorts of kids at school is just as important as getting good marks," 67.4 percent of the students agreed. Apparently, the teachers did not feel that the students would react so positively to this statement. Only 43.6 percent of the teachers expressed the view that most students would agree that "getting along" with others at school is as important as obtaining good grades. The students were less emphatic when asked whether "it is a good idea to have students take one subject from band, art or choral music." While 59.2 percent of the students did agree with this statement, the teachers were more positive in their reaction and 82.1 percent of the teachers agreed with a similar item in their questionnaire.

What are the expressed opinions of teachers concerning the preferences students have in terms of their choice of classmates in academic and cultural classes? In response to Statement 24, "Students who are in about the same levels for their academic subjects should also

take their cultural classes together," 56.4 percent of the teachers disagreed; 23.1 percent agreed; and 20.5 percent had no opinion (Table LV). When asked whether "many students would rather take their cultural classes with the same kids that are in their academic classes" (Statement 13), more than one half of the teachers (53.8 percent) expressed no opinion while 25.7 percent disagreed with the statement. Most teachers (61.5 percent) rejected the idea that students taking Occupational Entrance Courses should take all academic and cultural subjects together (Statement 11). Once more a high "No Opinion" response (61.5 percent) was registered by teachers when asked whether "students would like to take their academic work with the same kids that are in their cultural groups (Statement 5). However, 28.2 percent of the teachers did disagree with this statement while 10.3 percent agreed.

Of the four statements mentioned in the above section, two received differences in response when the opinions of teachers and students were compared. In reference to students preferring to "take their cultural classes with the same kids that are in their academic classes," 45.6 percent of the students rejected this idea compared to 25.7 percent of the teachers who also registered a very strong "No Opinion" response (53.8 percent). The majority

TABLE LV

TEACHER OPINION CONCERNING THE SOCIOMETRIC PREFERENCES OF STUDENTS IN TERMS OF CLASSMATES, TOTAL RESPONSE

Statements*	Agree		No Opinion		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
24. Students who are in about the same levels for their academic subjects should also take their cultural classes together.	9	23.1	8	20.5	22	56.4
13. Many students would rather take their cultural classes with the same kids that are in their academic classes.	8	20.5	21	53.8	10	25.7
11. Special Education students should be grouped in the same classes for all academic and cultural subjects.	10	25.6	5	12.8	24	61.5
5. Students would like to take their academic work with the same kids that are in their cultural groups.	4	10.3	24	61.5	11	28.2

*Section III of teacher questionnaire.

of teachers (61.5 percent) again offered no opinion in their response to a statement referring to students "preferring to take their academic classes with the same kids that are in their cultural classes." This response contrasts to that given by the students who generally disagreed (55.2 percent) with the statement.

What are the expressed opinions of teachers concerning student attitudes toward the "different" nature of cultural grouping as it relates to the remainder of the instructional program? In response to Statement 16, "Most parents of Sisler students understand the concept of cultural grouping," 43.7 percent of the teachers disagreed while 41.0 percent expressed no opinion (Table LVI). Almost three quarters of the teaching staff (74.4 percent) agreed with Statement 21, "Most students are well aware of the academic differences among the kids in their cultural groups." Strong agreement (89.8 percent) was also given by teachers to Statement 7, "Cultural grouping gives the students of this school a chance to meet other kids whom they wouldn't normally see in academic classes." However, the teachers did not take a positive stand on the final item, "Many students often complain about the cultural groups that they are in" (Statement 17). Their response to this statement showed that 28.2 percent of the teachers agreed;

TABLE LVI

TEACHER OPINION CONCERNING STUDENT ATTITUDES TOWARD THE APPARENT "DIFFERENCES" INHERENT IN CULTURAL GROUPING, TOTAL RESPONSE

Statements*	Agree		No Opinion		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
16. Most parents of Sisler students understand the concept of cultural grouping.	6	15.4	16	41.0	17	43.7
21. Most students are well aware of the academic differences among the kids in their cultural groups.	29	74.4	6	15.4	4	10.3
7. Cultural grouping gives the students of this school a chance to meet other kids whom they wouldn't normally see in academic classes.	35	89.8	1	2.6	3	7.7
17. Many students often complain about the cultural groups that they are in.	11	28.2	13	33.3	15	38.4

*Section III of teacher questionnaire.

38.4 percent disagreed; and 33.3 percent had no opinion.

Two of the four statements discussed in the above sections had differences in response when the opinions of teachers and students were compared. The first of these statements refers to students being "well aware of the academic differences among the kids in their cultural groups," and 74.4 percent of the teachers agreed that this was the case. The word "academic" was omitted from the item provided for the students and this statement read, "The kids in my cultural group seem 'different' than the kids that are in my academic classes." Responding to this statement, 47.1 percent of the students agreed; 26.6 percent disagreed; and 26.3 percent had no opinion. In reference to students objecting to their placement in a particular cultural group, 46.8 percent of the students agreed that "their friends often complain about the cultural groups that they are in." This response contrasts to that given by the teaching staff as only 28.2 percent of the teachers were of the opinion that students "often complain" about their placement in a particular cultural group.

XII. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF TEACHER RESPONSE, ACADEMIC AND CULTURAL

The data gathered from the response of the teaching staff to the items in their questionnaire was subjected

to further analysis to discover whether there were any significant differences in the opinions of academic teachers as compared to those expressed by cultural teachers. It should be noted that the response made by teachers of Latin, German, Ukrainian, industrial arts and home economics was included with that given by the cultural subject teachers. Further comparisons were made of academic teachers grouped according to their instructional responsibilities. That is, the response of teachers instructing in the regular academic stream (Levels I through V) was compared to that given by teachers who instruct exclusively in the Occupational Entrance Course program (Levels VI and VII). Only items that received significant differences in response will be discussed since all data may be observed in the accompanying tables.

General attitudes. Table LVII contains fourteen statements concerned with teacher opinion about the general attitudes students have toward attending school at Sisler. Five of these statements received significant differences in response when teacher opinions were compared. In response to Statement 34, "Students like most of their teachers," 93.8 percent of the cultural teachers agreed as did 73.9 percent of the academic teachers. One half of the cultural teachers agreed that "students

TABLE LVII

TEACHER OPINION CONCERNING STUDENT ATTITUDES
TOWARD SCHOOL LIFE IN GENERAL, CULTURAL
AND ACADEMIC TEACHERS

Statements	TOTAL CULTURAL N = 16*			TOTAL ACADEMIC N = 23*			ACADEMIC LEVELS 1-5 N = 15*			ACADEMIC LEVELS 6-7 N = 8*		
	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %
23. Generally, most students seem satisfied with their "school life" at Sisler.	87.5	12.5	0.0	82.6	13.0	4.3	80.0	13.3	6.7	87.5	12.5	0.0
6. Most students prefer to stay home every chance that they can get.	31.3	0.0	68.8	21.7	13.0	65.2	26.6	6.7	66.7	12.5	25.0	62.5
34. Students like most of their teachers.	93.8	6.3	0.0	73.9	21.7	4.3	73.3	26.7	0.0	75.0	12.5	12.5
27. Generally, students feel that most of their school work is interesting.	50.0	18.8	31.3	26.1	17.4	56.5	33.3	26.7	40.0	12.5	0.0	87.5
30. Many students are often unhappy at this school.	12.5	18.8	68.8	26.1	30.4	43.5	13.3	40.0	46.7	50.0	12.5	37.5
13. Most teachers at this school are too strict with their students.	6.3	0.0	93.8	0.0	8.7	91.3	0.0	6.7	93.4	0.0	12.5	87.5
35. Students should be given more freedom at this school.	6.3	0.0	93.8	17.3	0.0	82.6	6.7	0.0	93.3	37.5	0.0	62.5
1. Too much is expected of the students at Sisler in terms of school work and expected performance.	6.3	0.0	93.8	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
21. Students like doing most of their school work.	43.8	6.3	50.0	47.8	8.7	43.5	53.3	13.3	33.3	37.5	0.0	62.5
5. Generally, students seem to understand most of the work that is presented to them.	87.5	6.3	6.3	65.2	4.3	30.4	60.0	6.7	33.3	75.0	0.0	25.0
15. Most students at Sisler Junior High would rather be going to another school.	0.0	0.0	100.0	4.3	17.4	78.2	6.7	13.3	80.0	0.0	25.0	75.0
29. Students really don't know most of their teachers very well.	68.8	12.5	18.8	60.9	13.0	26.1	66.7	13.3	20.0	50.0	12.5	37.5
16. There should be a detention room for those students who are discipline problems.	87.5	0.0	12.6	60.8	8.7	30.4	66.7	13.3	20.0	50.0	0.0	50.0
14. Most teachers at this school are very interested in helping those students who have trouble with their school work.	81.3	12.5	6.3	86.9	13.0	0.0	86.7	13.3	0.0	87.5	12.5	0.0

*N = Number of respondents

generally feel most of their school work is interesting" (Statement 27). In contrast, 56.5 percent of the academic teachers disagreed with this statement. While 68.8 percent of the cultural teachers disagreed with Statement 30, "Many students are often unhappy at this school," only 43.5 percent of the academic teachers concurred with them. All teachers disagreed with Statement 35, "Students should be given more freedom at this school," but the cultural teachers were more emphatic in their disagreement (93.8 percent) than were the academic teachers (82.6 percent). When asked whether "students generally seem to understand most of the work that is presented to them" (Statement 5), the cultural teachers were again more positive. In response to this statement, 87.5 percent of the cultural teachers agreed as did 65.2 percent of the academic teachers who apparently were less convinced that students understand most of the work that is given to them.

Table LVIII contains eight statements concerned with teacher opinion about student attitudes toward the homeroom and the homeroom teacher. Three of these statements received differences in response when the opinions of teachers were compared. Most of these differences probably resulted from the fact that most cultural teachers do not register homeroom classes. In response to Statement 32,

TABLE LVIII

TEACHER OPINION CONCERNING STUDENT ATTITUDES
TOWARD THE HOMEROOM AND THE HOMEROOM
TEACHER, CULTURAL AND ACADEMIC TEACHERS

Statements	TOTAL CULTURAL N = 16*			TOTAL ACADEMIC N = 23*			ACADEMIC LEVELS 1-5 N = 15*			ACADEMIC LEVELS 6-7 N = 8*		
	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %
31. Most students would like to have the same homeroom teacher again next year.	6.3	75.0	18.8	17.4	65.2	17.4	6.7	80.0	13.3	37.5	37.5	25.0
19. Students would like to know their homeroom teachers better than they do now.	50.0	37.5	12.6	47.8	43.5	8.7	46.7	46.7	6.7	50.0	37.5	12.5
32. Students like reporting to a homeroom class to start the day.	43.8	25.0	31.3	65.2	21.7	13.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	62.5	0.0	37.5
4. Most students know their homeroom teachers better than they know any of their other teachers.	25.0	25.0	50.0	17.4	4.3	78.2	20.0	6.7	73.3	12.5	0.0	87.5
22. Students usually go to their homeroom teachers when they have a problem at school.	6.3	43.8	50.0	17.4	13.0	69.6	13.3	20.0	66.6	25.0	0.0	75.0
9. Most homeroom teachers are really interested in the progress that the students in their homeroom class are making at school.	56.3	18.8	25.0	47.8	13.0	39.1	46.7	13.3	40.0	50.0	12.5	37.5
12. Generally, students at this school worry about not doing well in their school work.	56.3	6.3	37.5	52.2	4.3	43.4	60.0	0.0	40.0	37.5	12.5	0.0
3. The size of this school makes many students feel "lost" in the crowd.	62.5	0.0	37.5	60.8	8.7	30.4	66.6	6.7	26.7	50.0	12.5	37.5

*N = Number of respondents

"Students like reporting to a homeroom class to start the day," 65.2 percent of the academic teachers agreed as did 43.8 percent of the cultural teachers who also registered a 25.0 percent "No Opinion" response. The academic teachers strongly disagreed (78.2 percent) to Statement 4, "Most students know their homeroom teachers better than they know any of their other teachers," while one half of the cultural teachers concurred with the opinion given by their academic counterparts. Most of the academic teachers (69.6 percent) also disagreed with the idea that "students usually go to their homeroom teachers when they have a problem at school" (Statement 22). The response by the cultural teachers to this particular statement showed that 50.0 percent also disagreed while 43.8 percent expressed no opinion.

Table LIX contains seven statements which deal with teacher opinion concerning the personal relationships that are apparent between students and the general accord that exists between teachers and students in the school. Four of these statements received differences in response when the opinions of teachers were compared. The teaching staff generally agreed with Statement 7, "Most students like the other kids in their homeroom class." However, the response to this item showed that strongest agreement (75.0 percent) was expressed by the cultural teachers with

TABLE LIX

TEACHER OPINION CONCERNING STUDENT RELATIONSHIPS WITH OTHER STUDENTS AND TEACHERS, CULTURAL AND ACADEMIC TEACHERS

Statements	TOTAL CULTURAL N = 16*			TOTAL ACADEMIC N = 23*			ACADEMIC LEVELS 1-5 N = 15*			ACADEMIC LEVELS 6-7 N = 8*		
	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %
7. Most students like the other kids in their homeroom class.	75.0	18.8	6.3	65.2	17.4	17.4	60.0	20.0	20.0	75.0	12.5	12.5
17. Most students wouldn't mind having the same kids in their homeroom class again next year.	62.5	25.0	12.5	43.5	39.1	17.4	26.7	46.7	26.7	75.0	25.0	0.0
2. Students in homeroom classes get along quite well together.	50.0	37.5	12.6	60.8	21.7	17.4	60.0	20.0	20.0	62.5	25.0	12.5
11. Most students find it easy to make friends with the other kids at this school.	93.8	6.3	0.0	78.2	8.7	13.0	80.0	6.7	13.3	75.0	12.5	12.5
33. Teachers and students seem to get along quite well together at this school.	93.8	0.0	6.3	86.9	8.7	4.3	100.0	0.0	0.0	62.5	25.0	12.5
28. Most students really do not care if they are late for classes at this school.	50.0	6.3	43.8	60.8	4.3	34.8	66.7	6.7	26.7	50.0	0.0	50.0
18. Most students seem to like coming to this school.	93.8	6.3	0.0	91.3	8.7	0.0	86.7	13.3	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0

*N = Number of respondents

the academic teachers less emphatic at 65.2 percent. In response to Statement 17, "Most students wouldn't mind having the same kids in their homeroom class again next year," the cultural teachers again agreed more strongly than the academic teachers (62.5 and 43.5 percent respectively). Since most cultural teachers do not register homeroom classes, they registered a relatively high "No Opinion" response to Statement 2, "Students in homeroom classes get along quite well together." The academic teachers, more familiar with the homeroom groups, generally agreed with this particular statement (60.8 percent). Teachers of cultural subjects were almost unanimous (93.8 percent) in their reply to Statement 33, "Teachers and students seem to get along quite well together at this school." The academic teachers also agreed with this statement but, as indicated by their response (78.2 percent), to a lesser extent than the cultural teachers.

Achievement levels. A basic feature of the "flexible placement" program is the achievement-level concept. Because the academic teachers are more involved with the achievement-level principle than are the teachers of cultural subjects, the discussions in this section are limited to the opinions of the academic teachers in terms

of the instructional levels with which they are exclusively involved. However, the cultural teachers did respond to the statements dealing with achievement levels and the result of this response can be seen in the accompanying tables.

Table LX contains fourteen statements which deal with teacher opinion concerning student acceptance of the achievement-level concept. Only three of these statements received differences in response when the opinions of the "regular" academic teachers and those of the Occupational Entrance Course (O.E.C.) teachers were compared. In response to Statement 18, "Students feel that this school really tries to give kids an opportunity to do their best," 87.5 percent of the O.E.C. teachers agreed as compared to 53.3 percent of the "regular" teachers. When asked whether "students classified as 'slow learners' are given a good opportunity to do their best" (Statement 9), the "regular" teachers expressed strongest agreement (86.7 percent) while most of the O.E.C. teachers agreed but to a lesser extent (62.5 percent). In reference to students preferring to have "only one level of instruction in each subject with all students being in this level" (Statement 16), 60.0 percent of the regular teachers disagreed as did 37.5 percent of

TABLE LX

TEACHER OPINION CONCERNING STUDENT ATTITUDES
TOWARD DIFFERENTIATED LEVELS OF INSTRUCTION
CULTURAL AND ACADEMIC TEACHERS

Statements	TOTAL CULTURAL N = 16*			TOTAL ACADEMIC N = 23*			ACADEMIC LEVELS 1-5 N = 15*			ACADEMIC LEVELS 6-7 N = 8*		
	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No opinion %	Dis-agree %
4. Most students seem to like the idea of being able to move to higher levels in the subjects in which they are doing well.	75.0	18.8	6.3	95.7	0.0	4.3	93.3	0.0	6.7	100.0	0.0	0.0
2. When students are moved to a higher level in a subject they then want to do better in their other subjects.	62.6	37.5	0.0	69.5	21.7	8.7	73.3	20.0	6.7	62.5	25.0	12.5
18. Students feel that this school really tries to give kids an opportunity to do their best.	75.0	18.8	6.3	65.2	30.4	4.3	53.3	40.0	6.7	87.5	12.5	0.0
20. When students are moved to lower levels of instruction, they make a real effort to improve and move back up to the higher levels.	12.5	37.5	50.1	17.4	21.7	60.9	20.0	20.0	60.0	12.5	25.0	62.5
1. Most students accept the idea of having different academic levels for those who learn at different rates.	81.3	18.8	0.0	95.6	4.3	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	87.5	12.5	0.0
9. Students classified as "slow learners" are given a good opportunity to do their best at this school.	87.6	0.0	12.5	86.9	4.3	8.7	93.4	6.7	0.0	75.0	0.0	25.0
21. Students seem to like the way they can work at different levels in different subjects.	68.8	31.3	0.0	78.3	17.4	4.3	86.7	13.3	0.0	62.5	25.0	12.5

*N = Number of respondents

(Concluded on next page)

TABLE LX Concluded

Statements	TOTAL CULTURAL N = 16*			TOTAL ACADEMIC N = 23*			ACADEMIC LEVELS 1-5 N = 15*			ACADEMIC LEVELS 6-7 N = 8*		
	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %
12. Most students feel that they have been evaluated fairly when they are moved to other levels.	68.8	25.0	6.3	91.3	4.3	4.3	93.3	6.7	0.0	87.5	0.0	12.5
37. If questioned about the "flexible placement" system, most parents of Sisler students would understand the concept of different levels for each academic subject.	31.3	12.5	56.3	43.5	26.1	30.4	46.7	26.7	26.7	37.5	25.0	37.5
16. Students would rather have only one level of instruction in each subject with all students being in this level.	6.3	50.0	43.8	4.3	43.5	52.1	0.0	40.0	60.0	12.5	50.0	37.5
10. Most students are in the right levels of instruction in terms of their relative capacity.	75.0	18.8	6.3	82.6	4.3	13.0	80.0	0.0	20.0	87.5	12.5	0.0
5. Students generally know how well they are doing at school at any given time.	87.6	0.0	12.5	86.9	0.0	13.0	86.7	0.0	13.3	87.5	0.0	12.5
13. Students accept the fact that kids who learn "faster" should be in higher levels.	81.3	18.8	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
35. Students don't mind being moved to different levels of instruction during the school year.	37.5	18.8	43.8	73.9	17.4	8.6	73.3	20.0	6.7	75.0	12.5	12.5

*N = Number of respondents

the O.E.C. teachers. However, both "regular" and O.E.C. teachers registered high "No Opinion" responses to this statement (40.0 and 50.0 percent respectively).

Table LXI contains nine statements dealing with teacher opinions concerning student reaction to the social implications of placement in instructional levels. Three of these statements received differences in response when the opinions of the academic teachers were compared. In response to Statement 25, "Many students who are in higher levels of instruction say 'cruel' things about the kids in the lower levels," 62.5 percent of the O.E.C. teachers agreed while the "regular" academic teachers split their opinion evenly with one third agreeing, one third disagreeing and one third having no opinion. The O.E.C. teachers were emphatic in their response to Statement 3, "Many students in higher levels of instruction often 'make fun' of those students who are in lower levels," with 87.5 percent of these teachers agreeing to the statement. The response by the "regular" academic teachers to this item showed that 53.3 percent agreed while 40.0 percent disagreed. When asked whether "students worry about being moved to lower levels" (Statement 27), the "regular" academic teachers were almost unanimous (93.3 percent) in their agreement with the statement while the O.E.C.

TABLE LXI

TEACHER OPINION CONCERNING STUDENT ATTITUDES TOWARD THE SOCIAL ASPECTS OF PLACEMENT IN ACHIEVEMENT LEVELS, CULTURAL AND ACADEMIC TEACHERS

Statements	TOTAL CULTURAL N = 16*			TOTAL ACADEMIC N = 23*			ACADEMIC LEVELS 1-5 N = 15*			ACADEMIC LEVELS 6-7 N = 8*		
	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %
25. Many students who are in the higher levels of instruction say "cruel" things about the kids in the lower levels.	43.8	6.3	50.0	43.5	30.4	26.1	33.3	33.3	33.3	62.5	25.0	12.5
3. Many students in the higher levels of instruction often "make fun" of those students who are in lower levels.	37.5	18.8	43.8	65.2	4.3	30.4	53.3	6.7	40.0	87.5	0.0	12.5
19. Many students in higher levels of instruction feel "superior" to students in the lower levels.	62.5	0.0	37.5	73.9	13.0	13.0	73.3	20.0	6.7	75.0	0.0	25.0
8. Many students in the lower levels of instruction feel that students in higher levels are "smart alecs".	18.8	18.8	62.5	39.1	34.8	26.1	40.0	33.3	26.7	37.5	37.5	25.0
26. Students often complain about the levels of instruction they have been placed in.	31.3	25.0	43.8	34.8	4.3	60.9	33.3	6.7	60.0	37.5	0.0	62.5
38. Many students are worried about "passing" this year.	56.3	12.5	31.3	47.8	4.3	47.8	46.7	6.7	46.7	50.0	0.0	50.0
33. Student movement between levels during the school year causes a great deal of confusion at this school.	56.3	6.3	37.5	39.1	8.7	52.2	40.0	6.7	53.3	37.5	12.5	50.0
27. Students worry about being moved to lower levels.	68.8	6.3	25.0	82.6	8.7	8.7	93.3	6.7	0.0	62.5	12.5	25.0
30. Students feel that they should not be separated into "bright" and "slow" classes for their academic subjects.	6.3	25.0	68.8	4.3	30.4	65.2	0.0	40.0	60.0	12.5	12.5	75.0

*N = Number of respondents

teachers also agreed but to a lesser extent (62.5 percent).

Table LXII contains five statements which deal with teacher opinion concerning student acceptance of assigned instructional levels. Three of these statements received differences in response when the opinions of academic teachers were compared. In response to Statement 36, "Generally, students feel that they are in about the right levels of instruction for their ability," 93.3 percent of the "regular" academic teachers agreed as compared to 75.0 percent of the O.E.C. teachers. When asked whether "most students would prefer to remain in the same levels with their friends rather than progress to higher levels" (Statement 11), three quarters of the O.E.C. teachers agreed. The response given by the "regular" academic teachers to this statement showed that only 53.3 percent agreed while 40.0 percent disagreed. In reference to Statement 14, "Many students will do inferior work in order to be moved to the same levels as their friends," the O.E.C. and "regular" academic teachers expressed opposite opinions. More than one half of the "regular" teachers disagreed with the statement while 62.5 percent of the O.E.C. teachers agreed.

Cultural grouping. Teacher response given to the statements dealing with instruction in the cultural areas

TABLE LXII

TEACHER OPINION CONCERNING STUDENT SATISFACTION WITH ASSIGNED ACHIEVEMENT LEVELS, CULTURAL AND ACADEMIC TEACHERS

Statements	TOTAL CULTURAL N = 16*			TOTAL ACADEMIC N = 23*			ACADEMIC LEVELS 1-5 N = 15*			ACADEMIC LEVELS 6-7 N = 8*		
	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %
7. Most students seem satisfied with the levels of instruction that they are placed in.	56.3	25.0	18.8	82.6	8.7	8.7	86.7	6.7	6.7	75.0	12.5	12.5
36. Generally, students feel that they are in about the right levels of instruction for their ability.	56.3	31.3	12.5	87.0	4.3	8.7	93.3	0.0	6.7	75.0	12.5	12.5
11. Most students would prefer to remain in the same levels with their friends rather than progress to higher levels.	43.8	37.5	18.8	60.9	8.7	30.4	53.3	6.7	40.0	75.0	12.5	12.5
32. Many students will do inferior work in order to be moved to the same levels as their friends.	37.5	37.5	25.1	43.5	17.4	39.1	33.3	13.3	53.3	62.5	25.0	12.5
14. Generally, students have most of their friends in about the same levels of instruction that they are in.	93.8	6.3	0.0	69.5	17.4	13.0	66.7	20.0	13.3	75.0	12.5	12.5

*N = Number of respondents

could not readily be used for comparative purposes because most academic teachers preferred not to give definite opinions about this part of the school's program. Therefore, the response given by the cultural teachers to the statements in Section III of the questionnaire can only be compared generally to the total response given by all staff members. Since an analysis of this total response was provided in Section XI of this chapter, only the results of the response given by the cultural teachers need be examined in this section. These results may be observed in Tables LXIII through LXVIII. However, to maintain consistency, the response given by all teachers to the statements in Section III can also be seen in the Tables.

XIII. TEACHER INTERVIEWS

Personal interviews were conducted with twenty-two academic teachers and thirteen cultural teachers on the staff at Sisler Junior High. Teachers of home economics and industrial arts were classified as cultural teachers for interview purposes since these teachers instruct classes that are heterogeneously grouped. Two interview formats were used; one for the academic teachers and another for the cultural teachers. The purpose of this survey method was to discover certain specific attitudes

TABLE LXIII

TEACHER OPINION CONCERNING STUDENT COMPATIBILITY IN CULTURAL GROUPS, CULTURAL AND ACADEMIC TEACHERS

Statements	TOTAL CULTURAL N = 16*			TOTAL ACADEMIC N = 23*			ACADEMIC LEVELS 1-5 N = 15*			ACADEMIC LEVELS 6-7 N = 8*		
	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %
2. Most students seem to like the other kids in their cultural groups.	81.3	6.3	12.5	39.1	56.5	4.3	40.0	60.0	0.0	37.5	50.0	12.5
14. Generally, the students making up the various cultural groups seem to get along well together.	87.5	12.5	0.0	52.2	43.5	4.3	53.3	40.0	6.7	50.0	50.0	0.0
20. Most students are in the cultural groups that they really wanted to be in.	43.8	25.0	31.3	43.5	47.5	8.6	40.0	53.3	6.7	50.0	37.5	12.5
18. Most students enjoy taking physical education with the cultural groups they are in.	43.8	56.3	0.0	60.9	39.1	0.0	53.3	46.7	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0

*N = Number of respondents

TABLE LXIV

TEACHER OPINION CONCERNING STUDENT UNDERSTANDING OF CULTURAL GROUPS, CULTURAL AND ACADEMIC TEACHERS

Statements	TOTAL CULTURAL N = 16*			TOTAL ACADEMIC N = 23*			ACADEMIC LEVELS 1-5 N = 15*			ACADEMIC LEVELS 6-7 N = 8*		
	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %
8. Generally, students understand "why" they are divided into cultural groups at this school.	62.6	12.5	25.0	43.5	21.7	34.8	53.3	20.0	26.7	25.0	25.0	50.0
4. The whole idea of cultural grouping confuses most students.	43.8	12.5	43.8	43.5	30.4	26.1	40.0	26.7	33.3	50.0	37.5	12.5
26. This school should "scrap" the idea of cultural grouping and look for some other way to place students in classes for art, band, choral music and physical education.	18.8	12.5	68.8	13.0	34.8	52.2	6.7	46.7	46.7	25.0	12.5	62.5
23. Most students like the idea of cultural grouping.	50.0	37.5	12.5	34.8	65.2	0.0	20.0	80.0	0.0	62.5	37.5	0.0

*N = Number of respondents

TABLE LXV

TEACHER OPINION CONCERNING STUDENT ATTITUDES TOWARD ATTENDANCE IN CULTURAL CLASSES, CULTURAL AND ACADEMIC TEACHERS

Statements	TOTAL CULTURAL N = 16*			TOTAL ACADEMIC N = 23*			ACADEMIC LEVELS 1-5 N = 15*			ACADEMIC LEVELS 6-7 N = 8*		
	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %
3. Many students "skip" cultural classes without being caught.	50.0	18.8	31.3	52.1	43.5	4.3	46.7	53.3	0.0	62.5	25.0	12.5
6. Generally, teachers of cultural subjects check attendance every period.	68.8	0.0	31.3	26.0	60.9	13.0	13.3	73.3	13.3	50.0	37.5	12.5
15. Teachers of cultural subjects usually "track down" students who miss too many classes.	56.3	6.3	37.5	21.7	52.2	26.0	6.7	66.7	26.7	50.0	25.0	25.0
9. Some students can stay away from their cultural classes without ever being missed by their teachers.	43.8	6.3	50.0	56.5	26.1	17.4	60.0	26.7	13.3	50.0	25.0	25.0

*N = Number of respondents

TABLE LXVI

TEACHER OPINION CONCERNING STUDENT ATTITUDES TOWARD THE SOCIAL ASPECTS OF CULTURAL GROUPING, CULTURAL AND ACADEMIC TEACHERS

Statements	TOTAL CULTURAL N = 16*			TOTAL ACADEMIC N = 23*			ACADEMIC LEVELS 1-5 N = 15*			ACADEMIC LEVELS 6-7 N = 8*		
	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %
12. Students should be allowed to take more periods in the cultural subjects they really like the best.	87.5	6.3	6.3	91.3	4.3	4.3	86.6	6.7	6.7	100.0	0.0	0.0
1. A school should be a place where students can make as many friends as possible.	81.3	6.3	12.5	87.0	4.3	8.7	80.0	6.7	13.3	100.0	0.0	0.0
25. Most students feel that learning to "get along" with all types of people at school is just as important as getting good marks.	43.8	0.0	56.3	43.4	21.7	34.8	46.7	20.0	33.3	37.5	25.0	37.5
19. Students should have to take at least one subject from band, art and choral music.	75.0	0.0	25.1	87.0	4.3	8.6	80.0	6.7	13.4	100.0	0.0	0.0
22. Most students really don't care what kids are with them in their classes.	18.8	6.3	75.0	47.8	17.4	34.8	40.0	20.0	40.0	62.5	12.5	25.0

*N = Number of respondents

TABLE LXVII

TEACHER OPINION CONCERNING THE SOCIOMETRIC PREFERENCES
OF STUDENTS IN TERMS OF CLASSMATES
CULTURAL AND ACADEMIC TEACHERS

Statements	TOTAL CULTURAL N = 16*			TOTAL ACADEMIC N = 23*			ACADEMIC LEVELS 1-5 N = 15*			ACADEMIC LEVELS 6-7 N = 8*		
	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %
24. Students who are in about the same levels for their academic subjects should also take their cultural classes together.	18.8	18.8	62.6	26.0	21.7	52.2	26.7	20.0	53.3	25.0	25.0	50.0
13. Many students would rather take their cultural classes with the same kids that are in their academic classes.	25.0	50.0	25.1	17.3	56.5	26.1	13.4	60.0	26.7	25.0	50.0	25.0
11. Special Education students should be grouped in the same classes for all academic and cultural subjects.	43.8	12.5	43.8	13.0	13.0	73.9	6.7	20.0	73.4	25.0	0.0	75.0
5. Students would like to take their academic work with the same kids that are in their cultural groups.	12.5	56.3	31.3	8.6	65.2	26.1	0.0	73.3	26.7	25.0	50.0	25.0

*N = Number of respondents

TABLE LXVIII

TEACHER OPINION CONCERNING STUDENT ATTITUDES TOWARD THE APPARENT "DIFFERENCES" INHERENT IN CULTURAL GROUPING, CULTURAL AND ACADEMIC TEACHERS

Statements	TOTAL CULTURAL N = 16*			TOTAL ACADEMIC N = 23*			ACADEMIC LEVELS 1-5 N = 15*			ACADEMIC LEVELS 6-7 N = 8*		
	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %	Agree %	No Opinion %	Dis-agree %
16. Most parents of Sisler students understand the concept of cultural grouping.	31.3	18.8	50.0	4.3	56.5	39.1	6.7	53.3	40.0	0.0	62.5	37.5
21. Most students are well aware of the academic differences among the kids in their cultural groups.	75.1	12.5	12.5	73.9	17.4	8.7	73.3	20.0	6.7	75.0	12.5	12.5
7. Cultural grouping gives the students of this school a chance to meet other kids whom they wouldn't normally see in academic classes.	87.5	6.3	6.3	91.3	0.0	8.6	93.4	0.0	6.7	87.5	0.0	12.5
17. Many students often complain about the cultural groups that they are in.	31.3	25.0	43.8	26.1	39.1	34.8	20.0	40.0	40.0	37.5	37.5	25.0

*N = Number of respondents

teachers have toward the Flexible Placement Project in operation at their school.

Academic teachers. When asked to compare the instructional program at Sisler with other programs known to them, the academic teachers were unanimous in their opinion that the flexible placement concept provided instruction better suited to meet the individual needs and interests of the students involved. The teachers stated that the provision of differentiated levels of instruction for each academic subject made it easier to group students in terms of their individual achievement rates and abilities. Also, the teachers felt that the range of ability within classes could be more easily identified and, consequently, instruction could be more readily adapted to meet the needs of students. The fact that students doing well in particular subjects but weaker in other areas can now be accommodated with the level system also pleased the teachers. Furthermore, teachers expressed the view that the flexible placement system helped to solve the problem of poor initial placement of students into classes. They stated that students are no longer forced to remain in classes not suited for them and can, periodically, be evaluated to determine more appropriate placement. A mild criticism of the program

was expressed by certain teachers that students might prefer to remain in lower levels rather than progress to more advanced or difficult levels of instruction. However, all teachers emphatically rejected the suggestion that the school return to the former system of grouping students for instruction. Under the previous system, attempts were made to create ability grouped homeroom classes and all students in these classes were given the same level of instruction for all subjects.

When questioned about their approach to teaching and the instructional methods used since the introduction of the flexible placement concept, most teachers stated that they have made definite changes. Since most teachers instruct at two different levels in each grade, they commented that modification in curricula and in methods of instruction are essential when students in various levels of instruction are met. There was consistent agreement among teachers that they were more aware of the general abilities of the students in their classes and this facilitated the planning of lessons; although most agreed that more lessons had to be prepared than under the former system. The majority of teachers also stated that under the flexible placement system they knew more precisely what to expect from their classes in terms of achievement and participation. This fact again assisted them in the

preparation of material and presentation of lessons. Nor was this point of view restricted to any particular levels of instruction. Although one of the basic considerations of the flexible placement scheme was to provide the incentive and opportunity for students of low and average abilities to progress at their own approximate rate in each subject, certain teachers instructing in the upper levels stated that more individual work could be attempted on the part of their students under this system.

Are seven levels of instruction for each subject unrealistic and, if so, what should be the maximum number of levels? In their response to this question, most teachers stated they were quite satisfied with seven levels of instruction. However, they realized that the use of this particular number resulted from the size of the school population, the number of teachers available and the related administrative methods used to organize the Flexible Placement Project. There was a general consensus that four or five levels of instruction might be more realistic but there was very little criticism of the seven-level concept. In the opinion of most teachers, the motivational factors associated with seven levels of achievement outweighed the instructional problems involved.

Is there really an appreciable difference in curricular content and methods of instruction between adjacent levels? The majority of teachers responding to this question were of the opinion that course content and instructional methods used between levels were not really appreciably different. However, most stated that this situation was necessary if periodic movement of students between levels was to be effective. Despite the apparent similarities in instruction given to students in adjacent levels, the teachers felt that there were other factors to be considered. They stated that their expectations in terms of student performance differed as they instructed to the various levels. Consequently, the teachers felt that their instructional approach underwent a gradual rather than a drastic change when they taught to students in adjacent levels. Thus, a general consensus was expressed that the major difference in instruction to adjacent levels was the change in teacher attitude rather than a change in subject content and teaching procedures. However, all teachers were of the opinion that difference in content and approach was apparent when instruction to students in alternate levels was considered.

Prior to the introduction of the flexible placement program at Sisler, those students assigned to the Occupational

Entrance Course usually remained in this program throughout their junior and senior high school careers. As a result of the flexible placement concept, students now initially assigned to the Occupational Entrance Course in the junior high section at Sisler have the opportunity to progress to the "regular" academic stream. When asked whether these students appeared motivated to improve their academic performance in order to advance to higher achievement levels, the teachers indicated that many students had improved in performance and were enthusiastic at the prospect of progressing to higher levels. There was a consensus among teachers that the flexible placement concept facilitated the correction of errors in initial student placement.

The teachers were also asked whether the flexible placement concept had any significant effect on the achievement levels of average and above average students. Most teachers were of the opinion that the program generally had not caused a noticeable difference in the academic performance of the average students. There was an expressed feeling that many average students were content to remain at instructional levels where they could succeed with a minimum of effort. This opinion contrasted decidely with that given by the teaching staff when they commented on the impact of the achievement-level

system in terms of the "top" students. Most teachers felt that the above-average students were highly motivated by the system with competition and prestige being cited as two of the factors that influenced these students to maintain their placement in the top levels of instruction. Although most teachers stated that they believed the academic performance of above-average students had improved under the flexible placement system, there were some who intimated that perhaps too much pressure was placed on certain students to succeed at the top levels.

Does the flexible placement program give students of lower academic ability a better chance to "mix" with other students in the school? Under the former system used at Sisler, students were homogeneously grouped into homeroom classes according to their apparent academic ability. Generally, these homeroom groups were self-contained units with students attending most classes together as well as participating in extracurricular activities together. The usual result of this grouping technique was that the students assigned to the "slow" classes often did not wish to participate as a group in the extracurricular program offered by the school. Also, these students tended to "stick together" and were generally ignored by the other students. The flexible placement program contains three basic features that

attempt to overcome some of the inadequacies of the former system. These features are: (1) heterogeneous homerooms, (2) heterogeneous cultural classes, and (3) differentiated levels of instruction in each academic subject.

Although the teachers were hesitant to make a categorical statement on the "success" or "failure" of the flexible placement system to provide a socially improved climate for the school, they were unanimous in their opinion that the system did at least provide the opportunity for more social interaction between students. Teachers in charge of heterogeneously grouped homeroom classes stated that for the most part these groups were compatible in nature. According to these teachers, there appears to be very little stigma attached to students who are in the lower levels of instruction. Also, the teachers reported that many of the academically "slower" students were participating in the extracurricular activities of the school with little disapproval being expressed by the "brighter" students.

When asked whether the flexible placement program had created an appreciable increase in their work load, the teachers offered a varied response. Some indicated that more lesson preparation was necessary but that this task was facilitated by the fact that more precise

knowledge of the general ability level of each class was available. Other teachers stated that their work loads were comparable under both the former system and the flexible placement system. However, these teachers stated that their efforts using the flexible placement scheme produced more rewarding results. All teachers agreed that the continuous testing, evaluating and regrouping of students were the major aspects of flexible placement that created increases in the duties of the instructional staff. However, the teachers were unanimous in agreement that the timetabling procedures used by the system provided ample "free" time for preparation and planning.

Cultural teachers. Whereas students are homogeneously grouped into seven levels of achievement for academic subjects under the flexible placement scheme, they are heterogeneously grouped for instruction in the cultural subject areas. Under the former system used at Sisler, students attended cultural classes grouped according to their apparent academic ability and, consequently, were considered homogeneous in nature. The teachers of cultural subjects were asked whether heterogeneous grouping has caused a significant difference in their instructional approach. In response, most of these teachers stated that they have changed their approach to

varying degrees. They commented that more internal grouping of their classes is now necessary and that more individual instruction must be given. These techniques are especially required for instruction in band and practical arts and to a lesser extent in the other cultural subject areas. Most teachers in the cultural areas of instruction were of the opinion that the degree of "interest" shown by students to particular cultural subjects was perhaps more important than actual student ability in these subjects.

In reference to the advantages of cultural grouping, the cultural subject teachers were enthusiastic about the flexible nature of the system in that it allows students to attend more classes in subjects they particularly like. Also, they stated that the use of heterogeneous grouping creates a more socially realistic climate in the school and this is especially beneficial to the Occupational Entrance Course students. In addition, the cultural teachers felt that the system attempts to provide all students with an opportunity to do well and be recognized for their efforts in at least one area of the school's instructional program. This again was considered important for the O.E.C. and low-achieving students. Many of the cultural teachers commented that is was especially satisfying to observe students who

generally have difficulty with school work experiencing a degree of success in competition with other students of "higher" academic ability.

Only one aspect of the cultural grouping system drew general criticism from the teachers. Concern was expressed about the administrative methods used to place students in particular cultural groups. Many teachers felt that some students were placed in certain cultural groups for administrative expediency rather than on the basis of student interest in particular subjects. Of course, it was realized that every student could not be accommodated in terms of subject choice since a limited number of options are offered in the cultural program. The teachers commented that students taking cultural subjects which really do not interest them often caused difficulties in instruction. However, most teachers felt that after the organizational problems associated with cultural grouping have been solved, the system will be more than adequate.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, AND CONCLUSIONS

I. SUMMARY

This study was undertaken to determine the attitudes of the students and teachers at Sisler Junior High toward the Flexible Placement Project recently introduced at their school. In order that the study would develop fully, a complete description of the instructional program at Sisler was presented in the initial stages of this thesis. The subsequent analysis of student and teacher attitudes involved: (1) the attitudes of the total student population, (2) a comparison of the attitudes of students grouped according to grade levels, (3) a comparison of the attitudes of students grouped according to achievement-level categories, (4) the general opinions of teachers concerning student attitudes, and (5) the specific attitudes of teachers toward the instructional program as expressed in personal interviews.

In order to carry out this study, two questionnaires were developed, one for students and another for teachers, and administered to 553 students and thirty-nine teachers at Sisler during April of 1972. The data received from student response to their questionnaire

was transferred to computer cards and a principal factor analysis was performed on the attitude statements. A rotated factor matrix was obtained for each of the three sections in the student questionnaire and twelve factors, each accounting for at least five percent of the total variability, emerged and were named. Section I of the questionnaire contained three factors, Section II three factors and Section III six factors. Certain items in the questionnaire received minimal loadings which indicated that these statements were not valid descriptors of student attitudes. Consequently, these items were not used in the analytical procedures that followed. However, of the ninety-nine attitude statements used, eighty-one received significant loadings and these were used to determine student attitudes.

To discover the opinions of teachers concerning student attitudes, the statements in the teacher questionnaire were grouped according to the factors which emerged from the student instrument. This procedure was made possible because the teacher and student questionnaires were highly comparable. The responses given by both the teachers and students were then calculated to determine the percentage of respondents agreeing with, disagreeing with, or having no opinion about each item isolated in

the various factors. This percentage response was then subjected to a comparative analysis to discover apparent differences in attitudes.

II. FINDINGS

This section summarizes the findings which answer the question, "What are the attitudes of teachers and students toward certain aspects of the Flexible Placement Project in operation at Sisler Junior High School?"

Student Attitudes

1. Generally, most students seem to enjoy attending school at Sisler. They apparently like most of their teachers, understand most of the material presented to them, and do not mind doing most of the work expected of them. The majority of students indicated they were relatively happy at Sisler and stated that they would not prefer to be in attendance at another school. Approximately three quarters of the student body felt that most of the teachers at Sisler were very interested in helping those students who experienced difficulty with school work. However, almost one third of the students indicated that they didn't know any of their teachers very well. Also, only a slight majority of the students felt that most of their school work was interesting.

2. Students generally like the idea of reporting to a homeroom class before the start of morning and afternoon classes. However, the majority of students indicated that they did not know their homeroom teachers very well and were noncommittal when asked whether they would like to know these teachers any better. Also most students stated that they did not go to their homeroom teachers for advice when they experienced problems at school. Significantly, most students felt that their homeroom teachers were not really concerned about their progress at school. Two further items dealing with student concern about "failing" and student reaction to the size of the school were related to the attitudes of students toward the homeroom and the homeroom teacher. Most students indicated that they were concerned about their success at school but they emphatically rejected the idea that the size of the school made them feel "lost in the crowd."

3. The majority of the students at Sisler appear to like their homeroom classmates and they stated that the students in their homerooms seem quite friendly to one another. Most students also felt that it was relatively easy to develop friendships in the school at large. Although only one half of the student respondents indicated

that there was a harmonious relationship between students and teachers at the school, over one quarter of the students were noncommittal on this point. However, most students were of the opinion that their schoolmates seemed to like attending school at Sisler.

4. The students stated emphatically that they like the idea of progressing to higher levels when it is apparent they are doing well in a subject. Most students felt that the school provides them with ample apportunity to perform at their best, and almost all students accepted the fact that there should be different levels of instruction for those who learn at different rates. Students strongly rejected the idea that there should only be one level of instruction for all students. Slightly more than three quarters of the student body stated they wanted to improve their standing in other areas when they have been advanced a level in one particular subject. Also, most students indicated they would apply themselves more diligently if moved to a lower level of instruction in a subject. The majority of students agreed that teacher evaluations were fair when student movement to other levels of instruction was considered. Although most students indicated that their friends at school considered themselves to be in the appropriate levels of instruction, only one half of the respondents felt they always knew

how well they were doing with their own school work.

5. Generally, the students were unwilling to take a strong stand on the issue of "cruel things" being said about those assigned to the lower levels of instruction. A similar situation developed when students were asked whether those assigned to the top levels of instruction were "snobs". A further indefinite stand was taken when the students were asked whether those students assigned to the lower levels felt that pupils in the higher levels were "smart alecs." However, more than one half of the students did agree that students in the higher levels "often make fun" of those assigned to the lower levels. Slightly more than one half of the students indicated that complaints about assigned achievement levels were often expressed by their schoolmates. A similar number of students also stated they worried about being moved to lower levels of instruction.

6. Generally, most students stated that they were pleased with their assigned levels of instruction and the majority felt they were in the appropriate levels for their ability. When asked whether they would prefer to remain in the same levels with their friends rather than progress to higher levels, the students did not take a positive stand and their opinion on this issue was split.

A similar situation developed when students were asked whether they would do inferior work in order to remain in the same levels with their friends although more students disagreed with this idea than agreed. However, most students did feel that the majority of their friends at school were in levels of instruction comparable to their own.

7. Seventy-five percent of the students indicated that they liked the classmates assigned to their particular cultural groups. A similar percentage agreed that the students in cultural groups appear to like one another and get along well together. In reference to a specific subject, three quarters of the respondents also felt that students enjoy taking physical education classes together in cultural groups. However, only slightly more than one half of the students stated that they were assigned to the cultural group they really preferred.

8. Only a slight majority of the students stated that they understood the reasons for the practice of cultural grouping. However, most of the student body felt that the system was not confusing and they were of the opinion that most students at Sisler liked the idea of cultural grouping. The suggestion that the school replace the concept of cultural grouping was rejected by most of the respondents.

9. The students took a relatively weak stand on the issue of attendance in cultural classes. Apparently, students preferred not to comment on the suggestion that "skipping" cultural classes was a relatively simple matter for many students. Although the majority of students felt that teachers of cultural subjects did check attendance almost every period, they were generally noncommittal on the issue of teachers "tracking down" students who habitually missed cultural classes. Approximately one half of the respondents felt that some students were able to stay away from their cultural classes without ever being missed by the teachers.

10. Approximately three quarters of the student body supported the idea that a school should be a place where as many friends as possible can be made. The students agreed less positively that "getting along with all sorts of kids" was as important as obtaining good grades. Apparently, the students related these social aspects of school life with cultural grouping. Over seventy-five percent of the respondents stated that students should receive more instructional time in the cultural subjects they like the best. However, they were less convinced that students should be required to take at least one subject from band, art or choral music. The students were noncommittal on a final item which inferred that

they might not be concerned about what other students became their classmates.

11. In reference to the classmates preferred by students, one half of the respondents disagreed with the idea that students in the same academic levels should also take their cultural subjects together. A similar number disagreed with the suggestion that students assigned to the lower academic levels should take all their classes together. Also most students rejected the idea that they would prefer to take their academic subjects with the same students that are in their cultural groups.

12. In reference to the apparent "differences" associated with cultural grouping, almost thirty percent of the students indicated that they had difficulty in explaining the concept to their parents. However, one quarter of the students had no opinion on this point and the remainder stated that they did not experience this difficulty. Almost one half of the students felt that their classmates in cultural groups seemed "different" than those in their academic classes. Almost eighty percent of the respondents stated that cultural grouping allowed them to meet other students they normally wouldn't see in their academic classes.

Student Attitudes by Grade and Category

1. Apparently, students of average and above achievement enjoy attending school at Sisler more than do those students in the other categories. Also, the students in the top categories indicated they liked their teachers more and appeared to be the "happiest" at school. Most students in grade seven felt that their subjects were interesting but, according to the respondents in grades eight and nine, these subjects become progressively less interesting.

2. The grade seven students appear to be the most enthusiastic about reporting to a homeroom before classes begin. Most grade seven students indicated they would like to have the same homeroom teacher again in the following year but this was not the case for students in the other grades. Also, the students in grade seven felt they knew their homeroom teachers better than did the students in grades eight and nine. As might be expected, the above-average students expressed the least concern about "failing" their school year. The majority of students in all other categories gave strong indication that they did have this worry with the low-average students showing the most concern.

3. The grade eight homeroom classes appear to be the most compatible and the majority of the students in

this grade stated they wouldn't mind having the same homeroom classmates in the following year. The grade seven students were the least convinced that their homeroom classmates got along well together. When grouped according to categories, the average students appear to be the most pleased with their classmates in the homeroom situation. The average students also gave the strongest indication that it was "quite easy to make friends" at the school while students assigned to the lowest achievement levels were far less convinced that this was the case.

4. In reference to the achievement-level concept, the students in Category Four (Levels V, VI and VII) were the most emphatic in stating they were motivated to do well in other areas when advanced a level in one particular subject. However, these students were less convinced than were those in the other categories that teachers were fair when evaluating performance. When grouped by grades, those students in grade seven gave the strongest indication that they would make a concerted effort to return to their former classes if moved to lower levels of instruction. While most students in the top categories stated that their parents understood the achievement-level system, the majority of students in the lower levels of achievement could not make this statement.

Also, the students in the above-average and average classes appeared to be more aware of their relative progress at school than were those students in Categories Three and Four. While students in Category Two (Levels II, III and IV) were the most certain that they were in the "right levels of work," less than one half of those in Category Four were of the same opinion. In comparison, students in the lower levels of instruction appeared to be more receptive to the idea of movement between levels at various times during the year than were those students in Categories One and Two.

5. As might be expected, the students in Category Four were the most convinced that "cruel things" were often said about them by students assigned to higher levels of achievement. Those in the lower levels also felt that other students often "made fun" of them. However, the students in the higher levels disagreed rather strongly that they were disparaging of those in the lower levels. When grouped according to grades, the students in grade seven indicated they were most aware of the derogatory remarks made by higher level students to those in the lower levels. Not unexpectedly, the students in Category One emphatically denied that they were "snobs" while almost forty percent of those in Category Four felt that this was indeed the case. Apparently, students in

Category Three are more worried about successfully completing the year than are students in the other levels of instruction. Also, Category Three students expressed the most concern about being moved to lower levels of instruction.

6. In terms of their satisfaction with assigned levels of achievement, the majority of students in Categories One and Two indicated they were pleased with their placement in most subjects. However, less than sixty percent of the students in Category Three and less than one half of those in Category Four expressed satisfaction with their assigned levels. In addition, while most students in the upper levels of instruction felt they were in the appropriate classes for their ability, the students in the lower levels did not indicate this feeling as strongly. Almost seventy percent of the students in Category One, as compared to approximately fifty percent in each of Categories Three and Four, stated that most of their friends at school were in levels of instruction comparable to their own. When grouped by grades, almost one third of the students in grade eight appeared to feel they were not in the levels best suited to them while most of the students in the other grades indicated general satisfaction with their assigned levels. Also, the response by grades showed that students in grade seven were less willing to

remain in the same levels with their friends rather than progress to higher levels than were students in grades eight and nine.

7. When grouped according to grades and categories, most students were of the opinion that their classmates in cultural classes were compatible and enjoyed working together. However, students in Categories Three and Four did give some indication that they were less pleased with their placement in specific cultural groups than were students in the higher levels of achievement. Students in grades eight and nine were slightly more affirmative than those in grade seven when asked whether students in cultural classes appeared to get along well together.

8. As compared to the other categories, fewer students in the lower levels of instruction appeared to understand the reasons behind the cultural grouping concept. Although most of the student body disagreed that the idea of cultural groups confused them, the students in the lower levels were less emphatic in their response and twenty percent in each of Categories Three and Four did indicate they were somewhat confused by the system. The average students (Category Two) gave the strongest indication that most students enjoy taking cultural classes together while the other categories agreed less strongly.

9. Although most students were convinced that cultural subject teachers check attendance each period, those in Category One indicated they were the least sure of this fact. Also, the students in the top levels were less certain than those in the other categories that cultural teachers "track down" students who missed too many classes. When grouped by grades, the students in grade nine were of the strongest opinion that it was "easy to skip cultural classes without being caught." The same students also gave the strongest indication that some students were able to stay away from cultural classes without ever being missed by the teachers.

10. Most of the respondents indicated that a school should be a place where as many friends as possible can be made. However, the students in Categories One, Two and Three were far more positive than those in Category Four about this aspect of school life. When the students were grouped by grades, those in grade nine expressed the strongest agreement concerning the acquisition of friends at school. Although all students agreed that being able to "get along with all sorts of kids at school" was as important as gaining good grades, different opinions were expressed by students grouped according to grades and categories. The students in Categories One and Two were the most positive on this issue as were the majority

of students in grades eight and nine. However, students in grade seven and those in Categories Three and Four expressed only moderate agreement that "getting along" with others at school was as important as obtaining good marks.

11. The majority of students in Categories One, Two and Three disagreed with the suggestion that students who are in approximately the same levels for their academic subjects should take their cultural subjects together. Although a substantial number of the respondents in Category Four also disagreed with this suggestion, more than thirty percent of these students did agree with it.

12. In reference to the "different" nature of cultural grouping, the students in Categories Three and Four apparently experience more difficulty than do students in the other categories when they attempt to explain the system to their parents. Also, the majority of students in Categories One, Three and Four indicated that their friends often complain about their placement in particular cultural groups. Apparently, fewer students in Category Two register these complaints.

Teacher Opinion Concerning Student Attitudes

1. The majority of teachers were of the opinion that most students at Sisler liked the instructional staff and enjoyed attending the school. However, almost one half

of the teachers felt that students did not find most of their work interesting. The teachers were almost unanimous in their rejection of the idea that too much was expected of the students. Most staff members felt that the majority of students understood the work presented to them but they were undecided when asked whether students liked doing this work. Almost all teachers indicated they were very interested in helping students who had difficulties at school. Two thirds of the staff disagreed that most students prefer to stay home at every opportunity while slightly more than one half also disagreed that many students were often unhappy at the school. Almost all teachers disagreed they were too strict with their pupils and strongly rejected the idea that students be given "more freedom." Surprisingly, the majority of teachers felt that the students didn't know most of their instructors very well. However, only one member of the staff felt that most students would rather be going to another school.

Differences in teacher opinion occurred in five of the areas mentioned above. The cultural teachers agreed more strongly than did the academic teachers that students liked most of their instructors. Also, while one half the cultural teachers were of the opinion that students liked doing most of their school work, the majority of

academic teachers disagreed with this idea. More than two thirds of the cultural teachers, as compared to less than one half of the academic teachers, rejected the idea that many students were often unhappy at school. The cultural teachers were also more emphatic in their rejection of the idea that the students be given more "freedom". Finally, the cultural teachers were more convinced than the academic teachers that the majority of students understood most of the work given to them.

2. Apparently, the majority of teachers did not wish to comment on the suggestion that students would like to have the same homeroom teacher in the following school year. A similar reaction occurred when the staff was asked whether students might like to know their homeroom teachers better. A definite response was registered in reference to the idea that students know their homeroom teachers better than they know any of their other teachers. Not only did most teachers disagree with this idea but also rejected the suggestion that most students go to their homeroom teachers when they have a problem at school. Only one half of the staff thought that most homeroom teachers were really interested in the progress of the students registered in their homeroom classes. Similarly, only one half of the teachers felt that students worry about not doing well at school. However, the majority of teachers did feel that most students liked reporting

to a homeroom to start the school day. Also, there was fairly strong agreement among teachers that the "size of the school often makes many students feel lost in the crowd."

3. In reference to the compatibility of students in homeroom classes, the majority of teachers felt that the students generally liked one another and "got along well together" in these classes. Furthermore, the teachers strongly agreed that students found it easy to make friends with others in the school. The staff also appeared firmly convinced that teachers and students enjoyed a friendly relationship at the school and that most students liked attending Sisler.

Differences in teacher opinion occurred in two of the areas mentioned above. The cultural teachers agreed more strongly than their academic counterparts that most students in homeroom classes liked one another. Also, although there was a general consensus on the part of the total staff that students and teachers at the school "got along well together," the cultural teachers were almost unanimous on this point.

4. Almost all teachers were of the opinion that the students at Sisler have generally accepted the achievement-level concept. They also believed that most students accept the fact that different students learn

at different rates. Consequently, the majority of teachers expressed the view that most students liked the achievement-level idea and that most students felt the school really tried to give them an opportunity to do their best. Also, two thirds of the staff felt that many students were motivated to do well in other areas when they experienced success in one particular subject. However, less than twenty percent of the teachers agreed that students worked diligently to return to their former classes when moved to lower levels of instruction. Most teachers agreed that students rated as "slow learners" were given the best possible opportunity to do their best at school. Also, the majority of teachers were of the opinion that most students felt the evaluations made of them were fair when movement between levels was considered. In addition, the teachers stated quite emphatically that most students were in the appropriate levels of instruction for their relative abilities and, generally, most students knew how well they were progressing at any given time.

When the opinions of the Occupational Entrance Course teachers and the "regular" teachers were compared, differences occurred in two of the areas mentioned above. The O.E.C. teachers were almost unanimous in their opinion that most students felt the school really tried to provide

the opportunity for them to perform at their best. However, the "regular" teachers were far less sure of this and just over one half of these teachers held the same view as the O.E.C. instructors. However, the "regular" teachers strongly agreed that "slow learners" were given ample opportunity to do their best while the O.E.C. teachers expressed only moderate agreement with this idea.

5. Although many staff members did not express an opinion concerning students in higher levels of instruction making derogatory remarks about students in lower levels, a substantial minority did feel that this rather unhealthy social situation prevailed. Also, more than one half of the teachers were of the opinion that students in the higher levels "made fun" of those in the lower levels. Almost seventy percent of the teachers stated that many students in the higher levels felt superior to those in the lower levels. Most teachers disagreed that students in the lower levels felt those in the higher levels were "smart alecs." The majority of teachers thought students generally accepted the fact that the division of pupils into "bright" and "slow" classes was necessary. However, one third of the teachers did feel that students often complained about their placement in particular achievement levels. The staff appeared uncertain whether student movement between levels caused confusion in the school and

opinion on this issue was split. More than three quarters of the teachers agreed that students worried about being moved to lower levels but only one half felt that most students worried about passing the year.

When the opinions of the Occupational Entrance Course teachers and the "regular" teachers were compared, differences occurred in three of the areas mentioned above. While the majority of O.E.C. teachers felt that disparaging remarks were made about students in the lower levels, the "regular" teachers did not take a strong stand on this issue as one third concurred with the O.E.C. teachers, one third held no opinion and one third disagreed that these derogatory remarks were made. Also, the O.E.C. instructors were almost unanimous in their opinion that higher level students "made fun" of those in lower levels while only one half of the "regular" teachers thought this was the case. More than ninety percent of the "regular" academic teachers, as compared to sixty percent of the O.E.C. teachers, felt that most students worry about moving to lower levels.

6. The majority of teachers were of the opinion that students were generally satisfied with their assigned levels of instruction. A slight majority of the teachers expressed the view that most students preferred to remain with their friends rather than progress to higher levels

of instruction. However, the teachers were generally noncommittal when asked whether students might do inferior work in order to be moved to the same levels as their friends. Almost eighty percent of the staff did agree that students made most of their friends in their own approximate levels of instruction.

When the opinions of the Occupational Entrance Course teachers and the "regular" teachers were compared, differences occurred in three of the areas mentioned above. More than ninety percent of the "regular" academic teachers, as compared to seventy-five percent of the O.E.C. teachers, agreed that most students were satisfied with their assigned levels of instruction. Three quarters of the O.E.C. teachers, as compared to one half of the "regular" teachers felt that most students preferred to remain with their friends rather than progress to higher levels. Also, most O.E.C. teachers agreed that students might do inferior work in order to be moved to other levels while the "regular" academic teachers generally disagreed with this idea.

7. The teachers generally agreed that most students in cultural groups were compatible and enjoyed taking classes together. However, staff members appeared uncertain when asked whether most students were in the cultural groups they really preferred. In the opinion of most

teachers, students in cultural groups enjoy taking physical education classes together. This appears to be a further indication of student compatibility in cultural groups.

8. Approximately one half of the teachers felt students did have a general understanding of "why" cultural grouping was used at the school. However, a substantial number on the staff were of the opinion that the system caused a certain amount of confusion among students. The majority of teachers rejected the suggestion that the school "scrap" the idea of cultural grouping. Although forty percent of the teachers did agree that most students liked the idea of cultural groups, most of the staff were noncommittal on this topic.

9. On the issue of student attendance in cultural classes, more than one half of the teachers felt that many students were able to absent themselves from these classes without ever being brought to account. However, most teachers involved in the cultural areas stated that attendance was taken almost every period and that a check was made on students who missed too many classes. Despite their efforts, one half of the cultural teachers expressed the view that some students habitually stayed away from classes without ever being missed. This situation may indicate an organizational weakness in the system.

10. In reference to the social implications of school life, the teachers strongly agreed that a school should be a place where students can make as many friends as possible. However, staff opinion was evenly divided in reaction to the suggestion that students considered their friendships at school to be as important as obtaining good grades. On the related issue of cultural grouping, the majority of teachers felt that students should be allowed to take more instructional periods in the cultural subjects they preferred the most. However, the teachers stated quite emphatically that students should take at least one subject from band, art or choral music.

11. The majority of teachers were opposed to the suggestion that students who are in the same approximate academic levels should also be taking their cultural subjects together. Most teachers also rejected the idea that students involved in the Occupational Entrance Course program should be taking instruction in all classes together. However, the teachers were generally non-committal when asked whether the students might prefer to take their cultural classes with the same classmates they have for their academic subjects. A similar reaction occurred when the teachers were asked whether students might prefer to take their academic classes with the same

classmates they have for their cultural subjects.

12. In reference to the "different" nature of the cultural grouping concept, a substantial minority of teachers expressed the view that the parents of students at Sisler probably did not understand the system. However, seventy-five percent of the teachers stated that students were well aware of the "academic differences" which prevail among students in cultural groups. Also, there was strong agreement that cultural grouping gave students the opportunity to meet many others whom they would not normally see in their academic classes. While most teachers disagreed that students often complained about their placement in particular cultural groups, one third preferred not to offer an opinion.

Specific Teacher Attitudes

1. The academic teachers at Sisler were of the opinion that the flexible placement concept, when compared to the former system of grouping used at the school, provided instruction better suited to meet the individual needs and interests of students. These teachers unanimously rejected the suggestion that the school return to the former system of grouping students for instruction.

2. The teachers felt the use of differentiated levels of instruction assisted them in grouping students according

to individual abilities and achievement rates. They stated the range of apparent ability within their classes could be more easily identified with the result that course content and instructional methods could be readily adapted to meet the needs of students.

3. Furthermore, the teachers considered flexible placement beneficial in correcting errors made in the initial placement of students. That is, students were no longer required to remain in particular programs appropriate for them.

4. Some concern was registered by teachers that certain students might use the level system to achieve at rates lower than their ability indicated.

5. Most teachers indicated they had made substantial changes in their approach to teaching and the instructional methods used as a result of the flexible placement program. While drastic changes in terms of differentiated curricula have not been made for most subjects, the teachers were almost unanimous in stating that their more accurate knowledge of the ability levels in their classes had caused them to make gradual changes in the content of courses.

6. The majority of teachers indicated that they knew more precisely what to expect from their students

and this fact assisted them in the preparation of material and the presentation of lessons.

7. The teachers appeared quite content with seven levels of instruction in each academic subject although some indicated that four or five levels might be more appropriate. In the opinion of most teachers, the motivational benefits arising from seven levels far outweighed the instructional problems involved. Most teachers agreed that the actual differences in course content and presentation of lessons to classes in adjacent levels were minimal. However, when alternate levels were considered, the teachers felt that the content and presentation of material were drastically different.

8. The teachers were unanimous in stating that the flexible placement program had motivated many students who had been assigned to the Occupational Entrance Course. The teachers stated that many O.E.C. students had taken advantage of the opportunity to advance to higher levels of achievement and were generally doing well in the "regular" academic program.

9. In reference to the "average" students, most teachers were of the opinion that the flexible placement program had not produced an appreciable difference in the academic performance of most of these students. Some

teachers expressed the view that many average students were content to remain at instructional levels where they could succeed with minimal effort. However, most teachers stated that the average students with problems in specific subjects could be more easily accommodated by the achievement-level system.

10. The teachers associated with instruction to students in the highest levels of achievement felt that the flexible placement program had generally improved the academic performance of these pupils. The teachers stated that these students were highly motivated to remain in the top levels and applied themselves correspondingly. However, some teachers indicated that perhaps too much pressure was placed on certain students in the top levels to succeed.

11. Most teachers felt that it was difficult to assess the relative success of the flexible placement program in providing a more socially acceptable climate in the school. However, they did feel that the system did at least provide more opportunity for "slow", "average", and "bright" students to socialize than did the former system. The teachers cited heterogeneously grouped homeroom classes, heterogeneously grouped cultural classes and the use of differentiated levels of instruction in the academic areas as being potentially beneficial to all

students in terms of the social aspects of school life.

12. The majority of academic teachers indicated that their work load had increased, but not appreciably, as a result of the introduction of the flexible placement program. They stated that more lesson preparation, testing and evaluation of students was necessary. The movement of students between levels at various times during the year was not considered to be an especially disruptive process. There was almost unanimous agreement on the part of teachers that the timetabling procedures used for the system provided ample in-school time for preparation and planning.

13. In reference to the cultural areas of instruction, the teachers involved were of the general opinion that the heterogeneous grouping of students for cultural classes had created certain changes in the instructional situation. Most cultural subject teachers felt there was a broader range of ability in their classes although this was not the case for all subjects. Consequently, certain cultural teachers indicated they used more internal grouping and individual instruction than was the case under the former system. However, these teachers generally agreed that this situation did not create any special difficulties.

14. Most cultural teachers approved of the way in

which students were allowed to take more instruction in the cultural subjects they preferred. These teachers also stated that student interest in a particular subject was the best criterion for student placement in cultural groups.

15. Although most cultural teachers expressed the view that heterogeneous grouping created a socially improved climate for all students, they generally felt that the system was especially beneficial for Occupational Entrance Course students.

16. The only major criticism of the cultural grouping system involved the methods used to place students in cultural groups. The cultural teachers felt that many students were placed in groups that did not interest them and, consequently, problems arose in these particular groups. However, most teachers agreed that this situation was an organizational problem which could be eventually solved. There was little indication on the part of cultural teachers that they preferred to return to the former system of grouping students for instruction.

III. CONCLUSIONS

Some of the more important conclusions drawn from this study are indicated below.

1. The students at Sisler Junior High appeared

generally satisfied with their school life. This may indicate that the school has provided an instructional and social climate in which the needs and interests of students are being met. Specifically, the satisfaction expressed by students concerning their attendance at Sisler may indicate that they have accepted and approve of the flexible placement program.

2. Most students approved of reporting to a homeroom before the start of classes. However, the influence of the homeroom teacher on the school life of students appeared to be minimal.

3. The students apparently enjoyed compatible relationships with their homeroom classmates. This may indicate that the students have accepted the concept of heterogeneous grouping for homeroom classes.

4. The majority of students were enthusiastic about the use of differentiated levels of instruction for each academic subject. They appeared to feel that this system motivated them to do well at school and they approved of movement between levels of instruction at various times during the school year. Most students considered themselves to be in the appropriate levels of instruction and felt that the teachers evaluated them fairly when movement between levels was considered.

5. Although a general consensus was not established

by the entire student population concerning the social implications of placement in achievement levels, many students in the lower levels of instruction were of the opinion that derogatory remarks were often made about them by other students. Most students in the school indicated that they worried about being moved to lower levels of instruction and were concerned about success in their studies.

6. Generally, most students were pleased with their assigned levels of instruction although those in the lower levels expressed less satisfaction about their placement than did those students in the upper levels. The students classified as "average" and "above-average" appeared more convinced than the other students that most of their friends at school were in levels of instruction comparable to their own.

7. The majority of students stated that they experienced harmonious relationships with their classmates in cultural groups. They added that students in cultural groups seemed to enjoy taking classes together. This may be an indication that the use of heterogeneous grouping for cultural classes has been generally accepted by the students. However, many students stated that they were not particularly pleased with the cultural group to which they had been assigned.

8. Students almost unanimously rejected the idea that the school replace the concept of cultural grouping. Apparently, the system does not "confuse" the students although only a slight majority indicated that they understood "why" cultural grouping was used at the school.

9. The students were relatively noncommittal on the issue of attendance in cultural classes. However, there was an indication that many students felt they could absent themselves from cultural classes without being missed. This situation may have developed as a result of the organizational procedures used to place students in cultural groups.

10. Most students appeared aware of the social implications of cultural grouping and felt that the school should be a place in which as many friends as possible can be made.

11. Although most students in cultural groups enjoyed taking their cultural subjects together, they indicated that they would not prefer to take their academic subjects with these groups. Apparently, the students were well aware of the "academic differences" that prevailed in heterogeneously grouped cultural classes.

12. The opinions expressed by teachers concerning student attitudes were generally accurate in their estimation of student feelings. However, there were a

number of areas in which student and teacher opinion differed. The more important differences are noted as follows:

a. A greater number of students than was supposed by teachers indicated that most of their school work was interesting and that they enjoyed doing this work.

b. More students than teachers believed were concerned about their success at school.

c. Fewer students than teachers believed were concerned about the size of the school and the related issue of "being lost in the crowd."

d. Although most teachers felt that their relationships with the students were very amicable, the students were less convinced about this fact.

e. A greater number of students than was anticipated by teachers felt that they were motivated "to do better" by the achievement-level concept.

f. Fewer students than teachers assumed felt that they always knew how well they were progressing at school.

g. A greater number of students than was supposed by teachers rejected the idea that they preferred to remain in the same levels of instruction as their friends rather than progress to higher levels.

h. More students than teachers expected indicated that they enjoyed their cultural classes and the other students in their cultural groups.

i. A greater number of students than was anticipated by teachers were unhappy with their placement in particular cultural groups.

j. A fewer number of students than was supposed by teachers felt that the cultural grouping system was confusing.

k. Fewer students than anticipated by teachers felt that they could absent themselves from cultural classes without being missed.

13. The members of the teaching staff at Sisler were almost unanimous in their support of the flexible placement program. They rejected the idea that the school return to the former system used to group students for instruction.

14. Most academic teachers felt that the achievement-level concept had resulted in a better instructional program than had prevailed under the former system.

15. Most academic teachers indicated they had made changes in their approach to teaching and the instructional methods used as a result of the flexible placement system.

16. Apparently, the content of course offerings and the instructional methods used in adjacent levels of achievement were not drastically changed by the teachers. However, they indicated that course content and approach were appreciably different when alternate levels of instruction were considered.

17. In the opinion of most academic teachers, the students in the Occupational Entrance Course and those classified as "above-average" appeared to benefit the most from the flexible placement program.

18. Most academic teachers appeared satisfied with seven levels of instruction in each subject and they cited the flexibility of the system and the motivational factors involved as the basic reasons for their decision.

19. Apparently, the work load of most academic teachers did not increase appreciably as a result of the flexible placement program although these teachers did indicate that more lesson preparation, testing, and student evaluation had become necessary.

20. The major criticism expressed by the cultural teachers concerned student placement in cultural groups. These teachers believed that more emphasis should be placed on student "interests" when cultural groups are formed.

In summation, the Flexible Placement Project at Sisler Junior High School appears to have been generally accepted and approved of by the students and instructional staff at the school. By combining the more positive aspects of heterogeneous and homogeneous ability grouping, the school has attempted to provide an educational climate within which the instructional and social needs of individual students can be met. Although there appear to be some organizational and administrative problems which must be solved, the flexible placement system, or variations of it, will probably be continued at Sisler if the attitudes of teachers and students toward the program are any indication of its relative "success".

IV. FURTHER STUDY

This study has attempted to discover certain attitudes which prevail among the students and teachers toward the Flexible Placement Project at Sisler Junior High. A further study might be attempted to compare the attitudes of students and teachers at other schools which use different grouping procedures with those attitudes found in the staff and student body at Sisler. Also, a further study might be attempted in future years at Sisler to ascertain whether the flexible placement system has any effect on the programs and courses selected by students when they enter the senior high division of the school.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

_____. Ability Grouping: Research Summary, 1968-S3 Research Division - National Education Association, Marsha A. Ream (Project Director) Washington, 1968.

Attwell, A.A. and Linton, T.E., "Problems Inherent In Ability Grouping," Alberta Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 10, no. 1, March, 1964.

Butsch, R.L.C., How To Read Statistics. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1946.

Byers, L., "Ability Grouping - Help or Hindrance to Social and Emotional Growth?" School Review, Vol. 69., no. 4, Winter, 1961.

Clarizio, H.F.; Craig, R.C.; and Mehrens, W.A. (eds) Contemporary Issues In Educational Psychology. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1970.

Cochran, J.R., "Grouping Students in Junior High School," Educational Leadership, Vol. 18, no. 7, April, 1961.

Dyson, E., "A Study of Ability Grouping and the Self Concept," Journal of Educational Research, Vol.60., no. 9, May-June, 1967.

Eash, M.J., "Grouping: What Have We Learned?" Educational Leadership, Vol. 18, April, 1961.

Eilers, W. Jr., "San Angelo's Three-Rail Program," The American School Board Journal, Vol. 149, Sept. 1964.

Fruchter, B., Introduction to Factor Analysis. Princeton, New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., 1954.

Gelinas, P.J., and Lacoste, A., "Setauket Junior High School," Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, Vol. 49, Sept. 1965.

Green, D.R., Educational Psychology. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

Guignard, J., "Teaching By Achievement-Level Grouping," Western European Education, Vol. 111, nos. 2-3 Summer-Fall, 1971.

Hall, A., "Ability Grouping is Democratic," Contemporary Issues In Educational Psychology, H.F. Clarizio, et.al., eds., Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1970.

Heathers, G., "Grouping," Encyclopedia of Educational Research, 4th ed., London: Collier-Macmillan Ltd., 1969.

Hemenway, M.E., "Improvement of Instruction in the Junior High School," from Proceedings of the Second Upper Midwest Regional Conference on Junior High Education: Wisconsin State College, La Crosse, Wisconsin, 1962. In the N.A.S.S.P. Bulletin, Vol. 47, no. 280, Feb. 1963.

Horner, H.F., "What Are Current Trends in Grouping Students For Effective Instruction?" N.A.S.S.P. Bulletin, Vol. 43, April, 1959.

Mueller, R.J. and Frerichs, A.H., "Alienation in the Low-Ability Classroom," School and Society, Vol. 95, April, 1967.

Ogletree, E.J. and Ujlaki, V.E., "Role Disparities and Homogeneous Ability Grouping," Education, Vol. 9, no. 3, Feb-March, 1971.

Oleson, J., "Should We Group By Ability?" The Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. 18, no. 2, Summer, 1967.

Otto, H.J., "Grouping Pupils for Maximum Achievement," School Review, Vol. 67, Winter, 1959.

Passow, A.H., "The Maze of the Research on Ability Grouping," Educational Forum, Vol. 26, no. 3, March, 1962.

Pearson, J.C., "Certainly, We Group Our Students," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 39, May, 1958.

Remmers, H.H.; Gage, N.L.; and Rummel, J.F., A Practical Introduction to Measurement and Evaluation. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

Rinehart, G., "Ability Grouping: Out or In?" Education Digest, Feb. 1971.

Rummel, J.F., An Introduction to Research Procedures in Education. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958.

Rummel, R.J., Applied Factor Analysis. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1970.

Urevick, S.J., "Ability Grouping, Why Is It Undemocratic?" The Clearing House, Vol. 39, 1965.

Van Til, W.; Vars, G.F.; and Lounsbury, J.H., Modern Education for the Junior High School Years, Kansas City: The Bobbs-Merrill Co. Ltd., 1967.

Welke, H.C. and Bragg, D.H., "A Study in Ability Grouping," N.A.S.S.P. Bulletin, Vol. 42, Nov., 1958.

Westby-Gibson, D., Grouping Students for Improved Instruction. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1966.

Wrightstone, J.W., "Ability Grouping and the Average Child," National Education Association Journal Vol. 57, Jan. 1968.

Yates, A. (ed)., Grouping in Education, New York: London: John Wiley and Sons, 1966.

APPENDIX A

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA
SISLER JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDY

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Your name is NOT required on this questionnaire.

The purpose of this questionnaire is to find out what the Junior High students at Sisler THINK about their school. This is NOT a test but each part of the questionnaire must be carefully read and answered to the best of your ability. There are NO WRONG ANSWERS because we are only interested in your HONEST OPINION or FEELINGS about certain things.

PART A of the questionnaire asks you to give your GRADE and the LEVELS of work you are NOW in for English, mathematics, science, and social studies. It also asks you to give the LEVELS of work that you were placed in at the BEGINNING OF THIS SCHOOL YEAR for each of these subjects.

PART B of the questionnaire has three sections. Each section is made up of a number of statements. You must read each of these statements CAREFULLY and then decide how you FEEL about each one. You then state your FEELING or OPINION by CIRCLING a number in one of the columns that are beside each statement. These columns are numbered from ONE to FIVE. Number ONE means you "Strongly Agree" with the statement; number TWO means you simply "Agree"; number THREE means you have "NO OPINION"; number FOUR means you "Disagree"; and number FIVE means you "Strongly Disagree".

These instructions will be repeated as you go through the questionnaire. Please answer ALL STATEMENTS and be careful to circle the proper number that tells how you feel about each statement. Thank you for your cooperation.

PART A

1. Place an (x) in the bracket beside the Grade you are in. 4

   Grade 7 ( )
   Grade 8 ( )
   Grade 9 ( )

2. All students must take English, science, mathematics and social studies. These subjects are listed below with a bracket beside each. In the bracket place the NUMBER of the LEVEL you are NOW in for each of these subjects. 5

	I am now in Level
English	( )
Science	( )
Mathematics	( )
Social Studies	( )

3. English, science, mathematics, and social studies are again listed below. Place the NUMBER of the LEVEL that you were placed in for each of these subjects at the START of THIS SCHOOL YEAR. (If you are a new student, simply place the number of the LEVELS you were placed in when you first came to the school).

	I started the year in Level
English	( )
Science	( )
Mathematics	( )
Social Studies	( )

PART B

SECTION I

INSTRUCTIONS:

This section deals with your general feelings toward this school, your school work, your teachers, and the other students at this school.

Read each statement carefully and decide to what extent you agree or disagree with it. Then state your opinion by CIRCLING one number in the columns marked "Strongly Agree", "Agree", "No Opinion", "Disagree", or "Strongly Disagree". Do not pay any attention to the numbers on the right-hand side of the paper.

Circle ONE number for each statement:	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
1. The work that I have to do at this school is too hard.	1	2	3	4	5	8
2. Most students in my homeroom class get along well together.	1	2	3	4	5	9
3. Because of the size of this school, I often feel "lost in the crowd".	1	2	3	4	5	10
4. I know my homeroom teacher better than I know any of my other teachers.	1	2	3	4	5	11
5. I like most of the kids in my homeroom class.	1	2	3	4	5	12
6. I understand most of the work that is given to me at this school.	1	2	3	4	5	13
7. I like to stay away from school every chance that I can get.	1	2	3	4	5	14
8. It is quite easy to make friends with the other kids at this school.	1	2	3	4	5	15
9. Most students at this school really do not worry about being caught if they "skip" classes.	1	2	3	4	5	16
10. My homeroom teacher seems interested in how well I am doing in my school work.	1	2	3	4	5	17
11. Most of my teachers "check up" on students who skip classes.	1	2	3	4	5	18
12. I often worry about "failing" in my school work.	1	2	3	4	5	19
13. Teachers are too strict at this school.	1	2	3	4	5	20
14. Most of my teachers seem very interested in helping students who have trouble with their school work.	1	2	3	4	5	21
15. I would rather be going to another school.	1	2	3	4	5	22
16. Students who misbehave at school should be made to "stay in" after 3:30.	1	2	3	4	5	23
17. I wouldn't mind having the same kids in my homeroom class again next year.	1	2	3	4	5	24
18. Most students seem to like coming to this school.	1	2	3	4	5	25
19. I would like to know my homeroom teacher better than I do now.	1	2	3	4	5	26
20. The way that I am placed in classes at this school sometimes "mixes me up".	1	2	3	4	5	27

	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
21. I like doing most of my school work.	1	2	3	4	5	28
22. I go to my homeroom teacher for advice when I have a problem at school.	1	2	3	4	5	29
23. I enjoy coming to this school.	1	2	3	4	5	30
24. Students can get away with a lot at this school.	1	2	3	4	5	31
25. Many of my friends at school complain about the way that they are put in classes.	1	2	3	4	5	32
26. Most of my teachers check attendance every period.	1	2	3	4	5	33
27. Most subjects that I take at school are interesting.	1	2	3	4	5	34
28. Most kids really do not care if they are late for classes at this school.	1	2	3	4	5	35
29. I don't know any of my teachers very well.	1	2	3	4	5	36
30. I would like to have the same homeroom teacher again next year.	1	2	3	4	5	37
31. I am often unhappy when I am at school.	1	2	3	4	5	38
32. Reporting to a homeroom class is a good way to start the day.	1	2	3	4	5	39
33. Teachers and students seem to get along quite well together at this school.	1	2	3	4	5	40
34. I like most of my teachers.	1	2	3	4	5	41
35. Students should be allowed to do exactly what they want at this school.	1	2	3	4	5	42

SECTION II

INSTRUCTIONS:

This section deals with your feelings about the way students may be placed in different LEVELS of work for such subjects as English, science, mathematics, and social studies.

Read each statement carefully and decide to what extent you agree or disagree with it. Then state your opinion by CIRCLING one number in the columns marked "Strongly Agree", "Agree", "No Opinion", "Disagree", or "Strongly Disagree".

Circle ONE number for each statement.	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
1. It is a good idea to have different levels of work for students who learn at different speeds.	1	2	3	4	5	
2. Being moved to a higher level in one subject makes a student want to do better in his other subjects.	1	2	3	4	5	
3. Students who are in higher levels of work often "make fun" of kids who are in lower levels.	1	2	3	4	5	1

	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
4. I like the idea of being able to move to a higher level if I am doing well in a subject.	1	2	3	4	5	11
5. I always know how well I am doing with my work at this school.	1	2	3	4	5	12
6. Students are often sent to lower levels of work because they cause trouble in class.	1	2	3	4	5	13
7. I am pleased with the levels that I am in for most of my subjects.	1	2	3	4	5	14
8. Students in lower levels think that students in higher levels are "smart alecs".	1	2	3	4	5	15
9. Students who learn things slower are given a chance to do their best at this school.	1	2	3	4	5	16
10. Most of my friends at school think they are in about the right levels of work.	1	2	3	4	5	17
11. I would rather stay in the same levels with my friends than move to higher levels.	1	2	3	4	5	18
12. Most teachers are very fair when they move kids to other levels of work.	1	2	3	4	5	19
13. Students who learn faster should be in higher levels of work.	1	2	3	4	5	20
14. Most of my friends at this school are in about the same levels of work that I am in.	1	2	3	4	5	21
15. There is a lot of "skipping" by kids who are in the same academic classes as I am in.	1	2	3	4	5	22
16. This school should have only <u>one</u> level of work for all subjects and all students should be in this level.	1	2	3	4	5	23
17. I am in higher levels in subjects that I like.	1	2	3	4	5	24
18. I feel that this school really tries to give kids a chance to do the best they can.	1	2	3	4	5	25
19. Most kids in higher levels of work are snobs.	1	2	3	4	5	26
20. If I were moved to a lower level in a subject I would work very hard to be moved back up again.	1	2	3	4	5	27
21. I think that students at this school like the way that they can work at different levels in different subjects.	1	2	3	4	5	28
22. Students who are in the lower levels of work seem to "stick together" at this school.	1	2	3	4	5	29
23. It is easy to "skip" academic classes without being caught.	1	2	3	4	5	30
24. It really doesn't matter to me what levels I am in as long as I pass the year.	1	2	3	4	5	31
25. Students who are in higher levels for most of their subjects often say cruel things about the kids who are in lower levels.	1	2	3	4	5	32
26. My friends sometimes complain about the levels of work they are placed in.	1	2	3	4	5	33

	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
25. Many students who are in the higher levels of instruction say "cruel" things about the kids in the lower levels.	1	2	3	4	5	33
26. Students often complain about the levels of instruction they have been placed in.	1	2	3	4	5	34
27. Students worry about being moved to lower levels.	1	2	3	4	5	35
28. Generally, teachers of academic subjects take attendance almost every period.	1	2	3	4	5	36
29. Most students are doing about the best work they can at school.	1	2	3	4	5	37
30. Students feel that they should not be separated into "bright" and "slow" classes for their academic subjects.	1	2	3	4	5	38
31. Students would like it better if they took all of their subjects with their homeroom class.	1	2	3	4	5	39
32. Many students will do inferior work in order to be moved to the same levels as their friends.	1	2	3	4	5	40
33. Student movement between levels during the school year causes a great deal of confusion at this school.	1	2	3	4	5	41
34. Students prefer to "make friends" with those kids who are in about the same levels of instruction that they are in.	1	2	3	4	5	42
35. Students don't mind being moved to different levels of instruction during the school year.	1	2	3	4	5	43
36. Generally, students feel that they are in about the right levels of instruction for their ability.	1	2	3	4	5	44
37. If questioned about the "flexible placement" system, most parents of Sisler students would understand the concept of different levels for each academic subject.	1	2	3	4	5	45
38. Many students are worried about "passing" this year.	1	2	3	4	5	46

SECTION III: Attitudes toward Cultural Grouping

Circle ONE number for each statement.	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
1. A school should be a place where students can make as many friends as possible.	1	2	3	4	5	9
2. Most students seem to like the other kids in their Cultural groups.	1	2	3	4	5	10
3. Many students "skip" Cultural classes without being caught.	1	2	3	4	5	11
4. The whole idea of Cultural grouping confuses most students.	1	2	3	4	5	12
5. Students would like to take their academic work with the same kids that are in their Cultural groups.	1	2	3	4	5	13

	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
6. Generally, teachers of Cultural subjects check attendance every period.	1	2	3	4	5	14
7. Cultural grouping gives the students of this school a chance to meet other kids whom they wouldn't normally see in academic classes.	1	2	3	4	5	15
8. Generally, students understand "why" they are divided into Cultural groups at this school.	1	2	3	4	5	16
9. Some students can stay away from their Cultural classes without ever being missed by their teachers.	1	2	3	4	5	17
10. Students generally accept the concept of heterogeneous grouping for Cultural subjects.	1	2	3	4	5	18
11. Special Education students should be grouped in the same classes for all Academic and Cultural subjects.	1	2	3	4	5	19
12. Students should be allowed to take more periods in the Cultural subjects they really like the best.	1	2	3	4	5	20
13. Many students would rather take their Cultural classes with the same kids that are in their academic classes.	1	2	3	4	5	21
14. Generally, the students making up the various Cultural groups seem to get along well together.	1	2	3	4	5	22
15. Teachers of Cultural subjects usually "track down" students who miss too many classes.	1	2	3	4	5	23
16. Most parents of Sisler students understand the concept of Cultural grouping.	1	2	3	4	5	24
17. Many students often complain about the Cultural groups that they are in.	1	2	3	4	5	25
18. Most students enjoy taking Physical Education with the Cultural groups they are in.	1	2	3	4	5	26
19. Students <u>should</u> have to take at least <u>one</u> subject from Band, Art, and Choral Music.	1	2	3	4	5	27
20. Most students are in the Cultural groups that they really wanted to be in.	1	2	3	4	5	28
21. Most students are well aware of the "academic differences" among the kids in their Cultural groups.	1	2	3	4	5	29
22. Most students really don't care what kids are with them in their classes.	1	2	3	4	5	30
23. Most students like the idea of Cultural grouping.	1	2	3	4	5	31
24. Students who are in about the same levels for their academic subjects should also take their Cultural classes together.	1	2	3	4	5	32
25. Most students feel that learning to "get along" with all types of people at school is just as important as getting good marks.	1	2	3	4	5	33
26. This school should "scrap" the idea of Cultural grouping and look for some other way to place students in classes for art, band, choral music, and physical education.	1	2	3	4	5	34

APPENDIX B

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

SISLER JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDY

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Your name is NOT required on this questionnaire.

A questionnaire will soon be administered to the junior high students at Sisler. The information gathered from the students will be used to determine certain attitudes they may have toward their school and, more specifically, the "flexible placement" program.

The purpose of the TEACHER questionnaire is to determine to what extent teachers sense the attitudes of their students and the degree to which teachers agree with student opinions.

PART A of the questionnaire deals with your teaching experience, general responsibilities, and main areas of instruction.

PART B of the questionnaire is comprised of three sections each containing a number of statements that can be responded to on a scale numbered from ONE to FIVE. Number ONE means you "Strongly Agree" with the statement, number TWO means you simply "Agree", number THREE means you have "No Opinion", number FOUR means you "Disagree" and number FIVE means you "Strongly Disagree".

Most of the statements in PART B correspond closely to those given to the students in their questionnaire. To maintain consistency, some of the terminology used in the teacher questionnaire is similar to that used in the student instrument.

Please read each statement in PART B carefully and decide to what extent you agree or disagree with it. Then express your opinion by CIRCLING the appropriate number in the columns marked ONE to FIVE.

Thank you for your cooperation.

PART A

General Information and Teaching Areas

1. Please indicate your teaching experience including this year. 3

   Indicate: (x)
   - a) 1 or 2 yrs. ( ) 1
   - b) 3 or 4 yrs. ( ) 2
   - c) 5 or 6 yrs. ( ) 3
   - d) 7 or 8 yrs. ( ) 4
   - e) 9 or 10 yrs. ( ) 5
   - f) 11 yrs. or more ( ) 6

2. Please indicate how long you have been teaching in the junior high section at Sisler. (include this year). 4

   Indicate: (x)
   - a) 1 or 2 yrs. ( ) 1
   - b) 3 or 4 yrs. ( ) 2
   - c) 5 or 6 yrs. ( ) 3
   - d) 7 or 8 yrs. ( ) 4
   - e) 9 or 10 yrs. ( ) 5
   - f) 11 yrs. or more ( ) 6

3. a) If you register a homeroom class, please indicate. (x) 5

   I register a homeroom class ( ) 1

   b) If you do NOT register a homeroom class, please indicate. (x)

   I do NOT register a homeroom class ( ) 2

4. a) If your MAIN teaching area is ACADEMIC (ie.a subject in which there are "levels" of instruction - English, maths, science, social studies, French, Sociological Survey) please indicate. (x) 6

   Indicate here: ( ) 1

4. b) If your MAIN teaching area is CULTURAL (ie. guidance, art, band, choral music, physical education); OR if you teach home economics or industrial arts; OR if you teach Latin, German, or French; please indicate. (x)

Indicate here: ( ) 2

5. Teachers who have indicated that their MAIN teaching area is ACADEMIC please now indicate what LEVELS of instruction you are PRIMARILY involved with. For the purposes of this study, we have divided the levels into two major groups. Indicate one group. (x) 7

a) Levels: 1,2,3,4 and 5 ( ) 1
b) Levels: 6 and 7 ( ) 2

PART B

SECTION I: General Attitudes

Circle ONE number for each statement.	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
1. Too much is expected of the students at Sisler in terms of school work and expected performance.	1	2	3	4	5	9
2. Students in homeroom classes get along quite well together.	1	2	3	4	5	10
3. The size of this school makes many students feel "lost in the crowd."	1	2	3	4	5	11
4. Most students know their homeroom teachers better than they know any of their other teachers.	1	2	3	4	5	12
5. Generally, students seem to understand most of the work that is presented to them.	1	2	3	4	5	13
6. Most students prefer to stay home every chance that they can get.	1	2	3	4	5	14
7. Most students like the other kids in their homeroom class.	1	2	3	4	5	15
8. Most students really do not worry about being caught if they "skip" classes.	1	2	3	4	5	16
9. Most homeroom teachers are really interested in the progress that the students in their homeroom class are making at school.	1	2	3	4	5	17
10. Most teachers "check up" on students who "skip" classes.	1	2	3	4	5	18
11. Most students find it easy to make friends with the other kids at this school.	1	2	3	4	5	19
12. Generally, students at this school worry about not doing well in their school work.	1	2	3	4	5	20
13. Most teachers at this school are too strict with their students.	1	2	3	4	5	21
14. Most teachers at this school are very interested in helping those students who have trouble with their school work.	1	2	3	4	5	22
15. Most students at Sisler Junior High would rather be going to another school.	1	2	3	4	5	23
16. There should be a detention room for those students who are discipline problems.	1	2	3	4	5	24

	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
17. Most students wouldn't mind having the same kids in their homeroom class again next year.	1	2	3	4	5	25
18. Most students seem to like coming to this school.	1	2	3	4	5	26
19. Students would like to know their homeroom teachers better than they do now.	1	2	3	4	5	27
20. The "flexible placement" concept confuses many students.	1	2	3	4	5	28
21. Students like doing most of their school work.	1	2	3	4	5	29
22. Students usually go to their homeroom teachers when they have a problem at school.	1	2	3	4	5	30
23. Generally, most students seem satisfied with their "school life" at Sisler.	1	2	3	4	5	31
24. There is a discipline problem at this school.	1	2	3	4	5	32
25. Students often complain about the way that they are placed in classes for instruction at this school.	1	2	3	4	5	33
26. Most teachers check attendance every period.	1	2	3	4	5	34
27. Generally, students feel that most of their school work is interesting.	1	2	3	4	5	35
28. Most students really do not care if they are late for classes at this school.	1	2	3	4	5	36
29. Students really don't know most of their teachers very well.	1	2	3	4	5	37
30. Many students are often unhappy at this school.	1	2	3	4	5	38
31. Most students would like to have the same homeroom teacher again next year.	1	2	3	4	5	39
32. Students like reporting to a homeroom class to start the day.	1	2	3	4	5	40
33. Teachers and students seem to get along quite well together at this school.	1	2	3	4	5	41
34. Students like most of their teachers.	1	2	3	4	5	42
35. Students should be given more "freedom" at this school.	1	2	3	4	5	43

SECTION II: Attitudes toward Academic Instruction

	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
1. Most students accept the idea of having different academic levels for those who learn at different rates.	1	2	3	4	5	9
2. When students are moved to a higher level in a subject they then want to do better in their other subjects.	1	2	3	4	5	10
3. Many students in the higher levels of instruction often "make fun" of those students who are in lower levels.	1	2	3	4	5	11

	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
4. Most students seem to like the idea of being able to move to higher levels in the subjects in which they are doing well.	1	2	3	4	5	12
5. Students generally know how well they are doing at school at any given time.	1	2	3	4	5	13
6. Students are often moved to other levels in a subject because they cause trouble in class.	1	2	3	4	5	14
7. Most students seem satisfied with the levels of instruction that they are placed in.	1	2	3	4	5	15
8. Many students in the lower levels of instruction feel that students in higher levels are "smart alecs."	1	2	3	4	5	16
9. Students classified as "slow learners" are given a good opportunity to do their best at this school.	1	2	3	4	5	17
10. Most students are in the right levels of instruction in terms of their relative capacity.	1	2	3	4	5	18
11. Most students would prefer to remain in the same levels with their friends rather than progress to higher levels.	1	2	3	4	5	19
12. Most students feel that they have been evaluated fairly when they are moved to other levels.	1	2	3	4	5	20
13. Students accept the fact that kids who learn "faster" should be in higher levels.	1	2	3	4	5	21
14. Generally, students have most of their friends in about the same levels of instruction that they are in.	1	2	3	4	5	22
15. There is a great amount of "skipping" by students in academic classes.	1	2	3	4	5	23
16. Students would rather have only <u>one</u> level of instruction in each subject with all students being in this level.	1	2	3	4	5	24
17. Students are generally in higher levels for subjects they "like".	1	2	3	4	5	25
18. Students feel that this school really tries to give kids an opportunity to do their best.	1	2	3	4	5	26
19. Many students in higher levels of instruction feel "superior" to students in the lower levels.	1	2	3	4	5	27
20. When students are moved to lower levels of instruction, they make a real effort to improve and move back up to the higher levels.	1	2	3	4	5	28
21. Students seem to like the way they can work at different levels in different subjects.	1	2	3	4	5	29
22. Students who are in the "lower levels of instruction tend to "stick together" at this school.	1	2	3	4	5	30
23. Most students feel that it is easy to "skip" academic classes without being caught.	1	2	3	4	5	31
24. Most students really don't care what levels they are in so long as they pass the year.	1	2	3	4	5	32

	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
25. Many students who are in the higher levels of instruction say "cruel" things about the kids in the lower levels.	1	2	3	4	5	33
26. Students often complain about the levels of instruction they have been placed in.	1	2	3	4	5	34
27. Students worry about being moved to lower levels.	1	2	3	4	5	35
28. Generally, teachers of academic subjects take attendance almost every period.	1	2	3	4	5	36
29. Most students are doing about the best work they can at school.	1	2	3	4	5	37
30. Students feel that they should not be separated into "bright" and "slow" classes for their academic subjects.	1	2	3	4	5	38
31. Students would like it better if they took <u>all</u> of their subjects with their homeroom class.	1	2	3	4	5	39
32. Many students will do inferior work in order to be moved to the same levels as their friends.	1	2	3	4	5	40
33. Student movement between levels during the school year causes a great deal of confusion at this school.	1	2	3	4	5	41
34. Students prefer to "make friends" with those kids who are in about the same levels of instruction that they are in.	1	2	3	4	5	42
35. Students don't mind being moved to different levels of instruction during the school year.	1	2	3	4	5	43
36. Generally, students feel that they are in about the right levels of instruction for their ability.	1	2	3	4	5	44
37. If questioned about the "flexible placement" system, most parents of Sisler students would understand the concept of different levels for each academic subject.	1	2	3	4	5	45
38. Many students are worried about "passing" this year.	1	2	3	4	5	46

SECTION III: Attitudes toward Cultural Grouping

Circle ONE number for each statement.	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
1. A school should be a place where students can make as many friends as possible.	1	2	3	4	5	9
2. Most students seem to like the other kids in their Cultural groups.	1	2	3	4	5	10
3. Many students "skip" Cultural classes without being caught.	1	2	3	4	5	11
4. The whole idea of Cultural grouping confuses most students.	1	2	3	4	5	12
5. Students would like to take their academic work with the <u>same</u> kids that are in their Cultural groups.	1	2	3	4	5	13

	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
6. Generally, teachers of Cultural subjects check attendance every period.	1	2	3	4	5	14
7. Cultural grouping gives the students of this school a chance to meet other kids whom they wouldn't normally see in academic classes.	1	2	3	4	5	15
8. Generally, students understand "why" they are divided into Cultural groups at this school.	1	2	3	4	5	16
9. Some students can stay away from their Cultural classes without ever being missed by their teachers.	1	2	3	4	5	17
10. Students generally accept the concept of heter-ogeneous grouping for Cultural subjects.	1	2	3	4	5	18
11. Special Education students should be grouped in the same classes for all Academic and Cultural subjects.	1	2	3	4	5	19
12. Students should be allowed to take more periods in the Cultural subjects they really like the best.	1	2	3	4	5	20
13. Many students would rather take their Cultural classes with the same kids that are in their academic classes.	1	2	3	4	5	21
14. Generally, the students making up the various Cultural groups seem to get along well together.	1	2	3	4	5	22
15. Teachers of Cultural subjects usually "track down" students who miss too many classes.	1	2	3	4	5	23
16. Most parents of Sisler students understand the concept of Cultural grouping.	1	2	3	4	5	24
17. Many students often complain about the Cultural groups that they are in.	1	2	3	4	5	25
18. Most students enjoy taking Physical Education with the Cultural groups they are in.	1	2	3	4	5	26
19. Students <u>should</u> have to take at least <u>one</u> subject from Band, Art, and Choral Music.	1	2	3	4	5	27
20. Most students are in the Cultural groups that they really wanted to be in.	1	2	3	4	5	28
21. Most students are well aware of the "academic differences" among the kids in their Cultural groups.	1	2	3	4	5	29
22. Most students really don't care what kids are with them in their classes.	1	2	3	4	5	30
23. Most students like the idea of Cultural grouping.	1	2	3	4	5	31
24. Students who are in about the same levels for their academic subjects should also take their Cultural classes together.	1	2	3	4	5	32
25. Most students feel that learning to "get along" with all types of people at school is just as important as getting good marks.	1	2	3	4	5	33
26. This school should "scrap" the idea of Cultural grouping and look for some other way to place students in classes for art, band, choral music, and physical education.	1	2	3	4	5	34

APPENDIX C

SISLER JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

TEACHER INTERVIEW FORMAT

ACADEMIC TEACHERS

NAME: _____

Area of Instruction:

		Levels Taught			Levels Taught
English: ( )			Mathematics: ( )		
	Gr. 7	( )		Gr. 7	( )
	Gr. 8	( )		Gr. 8	( )
	Gr. 9	( )		Gr. 9	( )
Science: ( )			Social Studies: ( )		
	Gr. 7	( )		Gr. 7	( )
	Gr. 8	( )		Gr. 8	( )
	Gr. 9	( )		Gr. 9	( )
French: ( )			Sociological Survey: ( )		
	Gr. 7	( )		Gr. 7	( )
	Gr. 8	( )		Gr. 8	( )
	Gr. 9	( )		Gr. 9	( )

---

1. Compared with other schools known to you, does Sisler Junior High really provide instruction suited to the individual needs and interests of its students?

2. Under the previous system of grouping for instruction used at this school, students were placed in homogeneous homerooms in terms of their apparent academic ability and record of past achievement. Students in these homerooms then attended all classes together and received instruction at the same level for all subjects. Would you prefer to return to this system rather than continue on with the flexible placement concept presently being used at Sisler? Do you have any special reason(s) for this response?

2. Continued:

3. Has your approach to teaching and the instructional methods now used differed appreciably since the flexible placement concept was initiated at this school?

4. Has the flexible placement concept created any organizational or other problems that interfere with or disrupt your particular instructional program?

5. Compared with the former system, do you think that the flexible placement concept gives students of lower academic ability a better chance to "mix" with other students in the school? Do you think that the program makes it easier for these students to take part in more school activities?

5. Continued:

6. Do you feel that students who were formerly referred to as "O.E.C." benefit academically from the flexible placement program?

7. In your opinion has the flexible placement concept had any significant effect on the achievement levels of average students? Has it had any effect on 'top' students?

8. Do you feel that the flexible placement concept has resulted in the motivation of low achieving and average students to do better academically?

9. Compared with the former system used at this school, has the flexible placement concept created an appreciable increase in your work load? Does this program provide you with adequate preparation time?

9. Continued:

10. How do you feel about the number of levels used for instruction in each subject? Do you feel that seven levels may be unrealistic? If so, what do you feel should be the maximum number of levels?

11. Is there really an appreciable difference in curriculum content and methods of instruction between adjacent levels? (ie. between Levels 1 & 2; 3 & 4; etc)

12. In your opinion, what are the major advantages (if any) of the flexible placement program as compared to the former system used at this school?

13. In your opinion, what are the major disadvantages (if any) of the flexible placement program as compared to the former system used at this school?

14. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

SISLER JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

TEACHER INTERVIEW FORMAT

CULTURAL TEACHERS

NAME: _____

Area of Instruction:

Guidance	( )	Home Economics	( )
Art	( )	Industrial Arts	( )
Band	( )	Latin	( )
Choral Music	( )	German	( )
Physical Education		Ukrainian	( )
boys	( )		
girls	( )		

1. Students are now grouped into heterogeneous classes for instruction in their cultural subjects and Practical Arts. Under the previous system used at this school, classes in these subjects were made up of students grouped according to their academic ability and were, in this sense, comparatively homogeneous. Has the institution of the present system of cultural or heterogeneous grouping made any difference in your teaching approach or methods of instruction?

2. Do you notice any difference in the behaviour of the students in your present classes as compared to the behaviour of students in classes grouped using the previous system?

2. Continued:

3. Would you prefer to return to the former system of placing students into classes for instruction in your subject? For what reasons?

4. Do you find it more or less difficult to keep track of students under this system as compared to the previous system used at this school? Is absenteeism or "skipping" a more or less prevalent problem under this system as compared to the former system?

5. Do you think that the students in your classes are very concerned about the methods used to group them for instruction? Do you think that it really matters to students what other students are in the class with them?

5. Continued:

6. Do you feel that the cultural or heterogeneous grouping system used in this school confuses some students? Is there any particular category of student who might tend to become "confused" by this system?

7. In your opinion, does cultural grouping and heterogeneous instruction have any advantages over the previous system used at this school? For any particular category of student? For the teacher?

8. In your opinion what are the disadvantages or weaknesses of using "cultural groups" or heterogeneous instruction in your particular subject area? In terms of students? In terms of the teacher?

9. Do you have any suggestions or recommendations to make concerning student placement in classes for instruction in your subject?

10. OTHER COMMENTS:

APPENDIX D

TABLE LXIX

MATRIX OF INTERCORRELATIONS OF ATTITUDE STATEMENTS IN SECTION I

Item	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	1.00						
2	0.06	1.00					
3	0.05	-0.05	1.00				
4	0.04	-0.04	0.09	1.00			
5	-0.06	0.27	-0.03	-0.04	1.00		
6	-0.29	-0.06	-0.06	-0.02	0.14	1.00	
7	0.20	0-05	0.02	-0.16	0.01	-0.18	1.00
8	-0.04	0.15	-0.11	-0.06	0.30	0.06	0.02
9	0.02	-0.11	0.02	-0.02	-0.13	-0.02	0.04
10	-0.05	0.05	-0.03	0.25	0.07	0.06	-0.13
11	-0.04	0.07	0.00	0.05	0.14	0.01	0.01
12	0.13	-0.03	0.13	0.12	0.05	-0.08	0.02
13	0.27	-0.09	0.04	0.00	-0.05	-0.14	0.28
14	0.11	-0.02	-0.06	0.05	0.17	0.12	-0.14
15	0.09	-0.04	0.12	-0.02	-0.13	-0.14	0.22
16	-0.15	0.00	0.06	0.16	0.16	0.13	-0.26
17	0.01	0.34	0.01	0.03	0.44	0.09	-0.04
18	-0.03	0.07	-0.05	0.03	0.12	0.04	-0.03
19	-0.06	-0.08	0.17	0.23	0.10	0.10	-0.21
20	0.08	-0.06	0.18	0.06	-0.05	-0.10	0.06
21	-0.29	0.00	0.08	-0.09	0.17	0.29	-0.26
22	0.02	0.03	0.08	0.36	0.10	0.18	-0.18
23	-0.19	0.04	0.04	0.06	0.20	0.23	-0.35
24	-0.02	0.01	-0.02	-0.09	0.00	0.05	0.03
25	0.16	-0.09	0.07	0.11	-0.09	-0.07	0.06
26	-0.03	-0.03	-0.08	-0.05	0.02	0.03	-0.01
27	-0.22	0.04	-0.03	0.10	0.17	0.22	-0.41
28	-0.00	-0.18	0.07	0.06	-0.12	-0.06	-0.00
29	0.17	-0.05	0.11	-0.00	-0.13	-0.25	-0.15
30	-0.11	0.02	0.08	0.37	0.14	0.10	-0.25
31	0.24	-0.08	0.05	-0.04	-0.18	-0.22	0.37
32	-0.07	-0.00	0.11	0.24	0.09	0.00	-0.30
33	-0.10	0.17	0.04	-0.01	0.26	0.16	-0.15
34	-0.26	0.07	-0.06	0.01	0.33	0.31	-0.33
35	0.23	0.01	-0.01	-0.05	-0.11	-0.08	0.34

(Continued on next page)

TABLE LXIX Continued

Item	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							
6							
7							
8	1.00						
9	-0.01	1.00					
10	0.01	-0.03	1.00				
11	0.10	-0.00	-0.00	1.00			
12	0.05	-0.06	0.09	0.05	1.00		
13	-0.11	0.04	-0.09	0.09	0.07	1.00	
14	0.28	0.09	0.19	0.16	-0.01	-0.19	1.00
15	-0.20	0.01	-0.14	-0.06	-0.01	0.13	-0.23
16	0.04	0.02	0.12	0.04	0.05	-0.21	0.20
17	0.14	-0.04	0.12	0.07	-0.02	-0.01	0.15
18	0.19	-0.06	0.08	0.06	0.03	-0.05	0.15
19	0.03	-0.09	0.21	0.02	0.13	-0.13	0.09
20	-0.05	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.17	0.17	-0.06
21	0.11	-0.04	0.10	0.05	0.00	-0.20	0.10
22	0.08	-0.04	0.27	0.05	0.08	-0.09	0.18
23	0.27	-0.02	0.14	0.02	0.02	-0.25	0.24
24	0.12	0.17	-0.11	-0.09	-0.08	-0.12	0.05
25	-0.00	0.09	0.06	0.06	0.08	0.14	-0.03
26	0.09	0.10	-0.05	0.21	0.03	0.12	0.09
27	0.16	-0.06	0.16	0.07	-0.01	-0.23	0.25
28	-0.15	0.30	-0.07	0.07	0.04	0.11	-0.05
29	-0.15	-0.02	-0.07	-0.03	0.11	0.15	-0.17
30	0.00	-0.07	0.32	0.00	0.09	-0.13	0.09
31	-0.14	0.04	0.01	-0.01	0.13	0.25	-0.15
32	-0.00	-0.04	0.15	0.07	0.07	-0.15	0.12
33	0.22	0.02	0.14	0.04	-0.03	-0.21	0.31
34	0.18	-0.05	0.14	0.09	-0.02	-0.25	0.27
35	-0.04	0.01	-0.08	-0.03	0.02	0.34	-0.18

(Continued on next page)

TABLE LXIX Continued

Item	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							
6							
7							
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15	1.00						
16	-0.09	1.00					
17	-0.08	0.14	1.00				
18	-0.22	0.02	0.07	1.00			
19	-0.09	0.22	0.14	0.09	1.00		
20	0.09	-0.11	-0.02	0.06	0.12	1.00	
21	-0.09	0.18	0.10	0.11	0.18	0.03	1.00
22	-0.11	0.23	0.12	-0.01	0.33	0.02	0.12
23	-0.53	0.15	0.12	0.33	0.23	-0.05	0.32
24	0.04	0.02	-0.01	-0.02	-0.04	-0.02	0.04
25	0.05	-0.01	-0.01	-0.08	0.03	0.16	-0.07
26	0.03	-0.02	0.04	-0.01	-0.00	0.08	0.11
27	-0.20	0.28	0.17	0.18	0.24	-0.05	0.36
28	0.05	0.08	-0.08	-0.06	0.05	0.02	-0.01
29	0.16	-0.09	-0.13	-0.02	0.03	0.15	-0.15
30	-0.09	0.24	0.23	0.02	0.58	0.04	0.16
31	0.24	-0.17	-0.13	-0.04	-0.09	0.17	-0.13
32	-0.11	0.24	0.17	0.10	0.37	0.05	0.16
33	-0.20	0.12	0.26	0.23	0.12	-0.09	0.12
34	-0.23	0.25	0.23	0.10	0.24	-0.10	0.35
35	0.16	-0.25	-0.02	-0.11	-0.13	0.14	0.14

(Continued on next page)

TABLE LXIX Continued

Item	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							
6							
7							
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22	1.00						
23	0.13	1.00					
24	0.01	-0.01	1.00				
25	0.11	-0.08	-0.00	1.00			
26	-0.10	-0.00	-0.13	0.04	1.00		
27	0.20	0.41	-0.00	-0.06	0.07	1.00	
28	-0.06	-0.07	0.13	0.15	0.11	-0.02	1.00
29	-0.18	-0.20	-0.02	-0.01	0.07	-0.22	0.13
30	0.39	0.20	-0.03	0.04	-0.05	0.31	0.00
31	-0.04	-0.38	-0.03	0.17	0.05	-0.26	0.07
32	0.31	0.23	0.01	0.03	-0.02	0.31	0.11
33	0.10	0.31	0.02	-0.14	0.03	0.26	-0.09
34	0.14	0.39	0.08	-0.12	-0.04	0.41	-0.00
35	-0.02	-0.32	0.08	0.16	0.02	-0.31	0.00

(Concluded on next page)

TABLE LXIX Concluded

Item	29	30	31	32	33	34	35
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							
6							
7							
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							
29	1.00						
30	-0.06	1.00					
31	0.24	-0.10	1.00				
32	-0.08	0.48	-0.14	1.00			
33	-0.16	0.12	-0.20	0.13	1.00		
34	-0.24	0.26	-0.26	0.25	0.34	1.00	
35	0.12	-0.15	0.26	-0.23	-0.11	-0.27	1.00

TABLE LXX

MATRIX OF INTERCORRELATIONS OF ATTITUDE STATEMENTS IN SECTION II

Item	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	1.00							
2	0.24	1.00						
3	-0.12	0.17	1.00					
4	0.28	0.49	0.12	1.00				
5	0.14	0.14	-0.01	0.08	1.00			
6	0.00	-0.05	0.15	-0.07	-0.13	1.00		
7	0.28	0.03	-0.15	0.03	0.21	-0.02	1.00	
8	0.01	0.08	0.37	0.11	0.02	0.12	-0.05	1.00
9	0.26	0.21	-0.09	0.23	0.17	-0.05	0.12	0.11
10	0.18	0.16	-0.15	0.13	0.22	-0.12	0.28	-0.01
11	-0.12	-0.23	-0.05	-0.26	0.03	0.09	0.15	-0.05
12	0.22	0.22	-0.08	0.19	0.25	-0.09	0.25	-0.00
13	0.20	0.20	0.04	0.23	0.13	0.14	0.06	0.05
14	0.03	0.02	-0.03	0.01	0.01	-0.04	0.24	-0.02
15	-0.06	0.03	0.21	0.01	0.04	0.05	-0.08	0.06
16	-0.52	-0.11	0.22	-0.20	-0.06	0.04	-0.16	0.08
17	0.00	0.08	-0.02	0.10	0.08	-0.07	0.11	0.00
18	0.27	0.28	-0.09	0.33	0.27	-0.15	0.17	-0.05
19	0.08	0.00	0.32	-0.02	-0.11	0.11	-0.09	0.24
20	0.19	0.38	0.01	0.38	0.20	-0.15	0.13	0.13
21	0.31	0.20	-0.10	0.22	0.21	-0.08	0.22	-0.04
22	-0.00	0.09	0.08	0.01	0.00	0.01	-0.22	0.18
23	-0.13	-0.09	0.12	-0.13	0.06	0.06	0.02	0.01
24	-0.02	-0.11	0.10	-0.10	-0.11	0.00	-0.01	-0.00
25	-0.12	0.07	0.58	0.11	-0.05	0.09	-0.15	0.36
26	-0.13	0.01	0.25	0.01	-0.03	0.13	-0.20	0.17
27	0.01	0.25	0.18	0.24	-0.01	0.05	-0.09	0.10
28	0.08	0.03	0.04	0.10	-0.08	0.11	-0.02	0.08
29	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.05	0.02	-0.08	0.12	0.04
30	0.19	-0.01	0.10	-0.02	-0.04	0.08	-0.02	0.11
31	-0.11	0.04	0.13	-0.00	-0.06	-0.01	-0.06	0.11
32	-0.10	-0.11	-0.00	-0.14	0.06	0.09	0.10	-0.01
33	-0.15	-0.08	0.18	-0.17	-0.15	0.13	-0.04	0.12
34	-0.02	0.02	0.07	0.05	0.02	0.02	0.05	0.08
35	0.19	0.16	-0.08	0.19	0.12	-0.00	0.14	0.03
36	0.18	-0.02	-0.14	0.02	0.15	-0.07	0.62	-0.09
37	0.20	0.07	-0.18	0.19	0.28	-0.12	0.17	-0.07
38	-0.01	0.05	0.23	0.03	-0.20	0.08	-0.11	0.08

(Continued on next page)

TABLE LXX Continued

Item	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1								
2								
3								
4								
5								
6								
7								
8								
9	1.00							
10	0.15	1.00						
11	-0.01	-0.00	1.00					
12	0.28	0.22	0.13	1.00				
13	0.19	0.03	-0.05	0.16	1.00			
14	0.05	0.13	0.15	0.08	-0.01	1.00		
15	-0.04	-0.03	-0.04	-0.09	0.00	-0.01	1.00	
16	-0.17	-0.14	0.05	-0.13	-0.20	-0.02	0.07	1.00
17	-0.00	0.02	0.00	-0.00	0.01	0.15	-0.11	-0.04
18	0.05	0.20	-0.17	0.32	0.08	0.04	0.04	-0.15
19	-0.11	-0.12	0.09	-0.15	-0.07	-0.02	0.15	0.15
20	0.18	0.22	-0.24	0.19	0.13	0.04	0.04	-0.11
21	0.22	0.23	-0.00	0.22	0.20	0.07	0.00	-0.36
22	-0.00	0.03	0.02	-0.02	0.11	0.13	0.08	-0.04
23	0.01	-0.11	0.02	-0.08	-0.07	-0.04	0.16	0.09
24	-0.10	-0.09	0.20	-0.06	-0.04	-0.00	0.10	0.05
25	-0.00	-0.10	-0.04	-0.12	0.00	-0.08	0.20	0.22
26	-0.02	-0.18	-0.04	-0.11	0.09	-0.12	0.12	0.11
27	0.02	0.05	-0.20	0.06	0.05	-0.02	-0.05	0.03
28	-0.01	-0.05	-0.00	0.01	0.10	-0.01	0.03	-0.04
29	0.03	0.14	0.03	0.04	0.07	0.06	0.00	0.02
30	-0.02	-0.01	-0.01	-0.03	-0.04	-0.02	0.07	0.24
31	-0.10	0.02	-0.03	0.03	-0.08	-0.01	0.04	0.27
32	-0.09	-0.01	0.48	-0.03	-0.01	0.15	0.03	0.07
33	-0.14	-0.12	0.13	-0.16	-0.03	0.04	0.09	0.20
34	0.11	0.03	0.07	0.05	0.04	0.21	-0.07	-0.02
35	0.09	0.16	-0.14	0.14	0.14	-0.09	0.08	-0.12
36	0.09	0.27	0.14	0.18	-0.01	0.22	-0.08	-0.16
37	0.20	0.20	-0.13	0.18	0.14	0.03	-0.13	-0.18
38	-0.03	-0.05	-0.04	-0.02	-0.08	-0.08	0.09	0.09

(Continued on next page)

TABLE LXX Continued

Item	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
1								
2								
3								
4								
5								
6								
7								
8								
9								
10								
11								
12								
13								
14								
15								
16								
17	1.00							
18	0.10	1.00						
19	-0.03	-0.16	1.00					
20	0.02	0.28	-0.05	1.00				
21	0.07	0.24	-0.11	0.20	1.00			
22	-0.00	-0.00	0.13	-0.01	0.13	1.00		
23	-0.07	-0.02	0.07	-0.12	-0.05	0.02	1.00	
24	-0.04	-0.13	0.18	-0.22	-0.01	0.01	0.03	1.00
25	0.00	-0.02	0.48	0.04	-0.13	0.05	0.11	0.12
26	0.00	-0.07	0.16	-0.02	-0.05	0.00	0.10	0.03
27	0.10	0.13	0.07	0.20	0.03	-0.02	-0.07	-0.03
28	0.05	-0.08	0.00	-0.04	0.09	0.09	-0.08	0.07
29	0.14	-0.01	0.02	0.14	0.12	-0.02	-0.09	0.07
30	-0.03	-0.01	0.21	0.02	-0.12	0.02	0.12	0.14
31	0.09	-0.02	0.08	-0.02	-0.12	0.02	0.05	0.05
32	-0.01	-0.07	0.12	-0.20	-0.07	0.05	0.03	0.21
33	0.05	-0.15	0.29	-0.15	-0.21	0.08	0.04	0.17
34	0.11	-0.00	0.03	0.04	0.05	0.15	-0.04	0.01
35	-0.00	0.19	0.01	0.07	0.12	0.02	0.07	-0.03
36	0.15	0.10	-0.07	0.08	0.18	-0.07	0.06	0.08
37	0.11	0.26	-0.25	0.21	0.19	-0.02	-0.04	-0.21
38	0.00	0.02	0.19	-0.03	-0.06	-0.06	-0.07	0.20

(Continued on next page)

TABLE LXX Continued

Item	25	26	27	28	29	30	31
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							
6							
7							
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25	1.00						
26	0.22	1.00					
27	0.18	0.15	1.00				
28	0.05	0.11	0.07	1.00			
29	0.03	0.04	0.01	0.14	1.00		
30	0.12	0.15	0.09	0.07	0.06	1.00	
31	0.12	0.06	0.18	0.02	0.02	0.12	1.00
32	-0.04	-0.01	-0.08	-0.07	0.03	0.07	0.02
33	0.22	0.15	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.17	0.18
34	0.07	0.13	0.10	0.01	0.07	0.12	0.04
35	0.04	0.02	0.04	0.06	0.03	0.01	-0.03
36	-0.18	-0.22	-0.09	0.01	0.20	-0.10	-0.07
37	-0.14	-0.03	0.05	0.06	0.12	-0.10	-0.09
38	0.24	0.13	0.29	0.06	0.09	0.11	0.11

(Concluded on next page)

TABLE LXX Concluded

Item	32	33	34	35	36	37	38
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							
6							
7							
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							
29							
30							
31							
32	1.00						
33	0.19	1.00					
34	0.09	0.12	1.00				
35	-0.08	-0.14	-0.07	1.00			
36	0.13	-0.08	0.05	0.04	1.00		
37	-0.06	-0.23	0.07	0.14	0.20	1.00	
38	-0.03	0.14	0.08	-0.04	-0.08	-0.11	1.00

TABLE LXXI

MATRIX OF INTERCORRELATIONS OF ATTITUDE STATEMENTS IN SECTION III

Item	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	1.00						
2	0.14	1.00					
3	-0.01	-0.08	1.00				
4	-0.04	-0.13	0.05	1.00			
5	-0.02	0.26	0.04	0.14	1.00		
6	0.00	0.05	-0.29	0.01	0.04	1.00	
7	0.01	0.19	-0.08	-0.12	0.02	0.11	1.00
8	0.07	0.12	-0.04	-0.35	-0.12	-0.02	0.14
9	0.05	-0.17	0.28	0.05	0.03	-0.17	-0.04
10	0.11	0.11	0.04	-0.03	-0.10	-0.09	0.09
11	-0.04	-0.07	0.10	0.14	0.20	-0.01	-0.01
12	0.16	-0.02	0.21	-0.05	0.05	-0.04	-0.07
13	0.07	-0.04	-0.02	0.06	0.21	0.05	-0.01
14	0.10	0.40	0.04	0.20	0.12	0.01	0.17
15	-0.00	0.01	0.26	0.57	-0.05	0.30	0.10
16	-0.00	-0.05	0.03	0.31	0.07	0.09	0.05
17	-0.00	-0.17	0.06	0.08	-0.09	0.02	0.02
18	0.00	0.26	-0.01	-0.06	-0.00	0.03	0.11
19	-0.02	0.09	-0.13	-0.10	0.18	0.04	0.14
20	-0.03	0.31	-0.03	-0.27	0.15	-0.03	0.12
21	0.01	-0.10	0.06	0.05	-0.00	0.01	0.08
22	-0.01	-0.03	-0.02	0.02	0.04	0.01	0.02
23	0.04	0.15	-0.04	-0.22	0.00	-0.02	0.24
24	-0.02	-0.10	-0.02	0.13	0.18	0.05	-0.02
25	0.18	0.09	-0.07	-0.15	-0.06	0.06	0.17
26	0.02	-0.18	0.13	0.29	0.06	0.05	-0.10

(Continued on next page)

TABLE LXXI Continued

Item	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							
6							
7							
8	1.00						
9	-0.02	1.00					
10	0.12	0.09	1.00				
11	-0.05	-0.04	-0.06	1.00			
12	-0.06	0.14	0.06	0.05	1.00		
13	0.07	0.01	-0.03	0.15	0.06	1.00	
14	0.11	-0.06	0.10	0.02	0.03	0.01	1.00
15	0.09	-0.10	0.00	-0.01	-0.04	0.02	-0.05
16	-0.19	0.07	-0.09	0.19	-0.02	0.06	-0.03
17	-0.05	0.04	0.05	0.03	-0.04	0.02	-0.04
18	0.03	-0.01	0.03	-0.06	0.10	-0.01	0.17
19	0.13	-0.06	-0.01	0.01	-0.16	-0.01	0.11
20	0.18	-0.01	0.09	0.01	-0.04	-0.02	0.27
21	-0.05	0.09	-0.04	0.11	0.05	0.13	-0.11
22	0.00	0.01	-0.05	0.02	-0.09	-0.02	0.03
23	0.23	-0.05	0.11	-0.05	0.05	-0.01	0.22
24	0.05	-0.01	-0.04	0.25	-0.07	0.43	0.00
25	0.15	-0.02	0.08	-0.03	0.13	0.08	0.15
26	-0.17	0.05	-0.09	0.18	0.06	0.10	-0.14

(Continued on next page)

TABLE LXXI Continued

Item	15	16	17	18	19	20
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						
11						
12						
13						
14						
15	1.00					
16	0.06	1.00				
17	0.08	0.12	1.00			
18	0.06	-0.01	-0.11	1.00		
19	-0.02	-0.00	-0.07	0.06	1.00	
20	-0.11	-0.09	-0.18	0.12	0.30	1.00
21	0.07	0.18	0.07	0.00	0.05	-0.12
22	0.07	0.10	0.07	-0.03	-0.02	-0.02
23	0.03	-0.05	-0.05	0.22	0.29	0.19
24	0.05	0.08	0.06	-0.02	-0.03	-0.04
25	0.05	0.03	-0.04	0.05	0.08	0.11
26	0.03	0.23	0.08	-0.09	-0.11	-0.22

(Concluded on next page)

TABLE LXXI Concluded

Item	21	22	23	24	25	26
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						
11						
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21	1.00					
22	-0.04	1.00				
23	0.01	0.03	1.00			
24	0.13	0.01	-0.06	1.00		
25	0.05	-0.14	0.19	0.04	1.00	
26	0.11	0.01	-0.24	0.14	-0.01	1.00